

**The Demographers' Moment: Georges Mauco,
Immigration and Racial Selection in Liberation France,
1945-46**

Greg Burgess

The legal status of foreigners and their place within the French polity confronted the new post-war order with questions of its future direction and its ideological remaking. The restoration of the lawful status of foreigners after the annulment in 1944 of the Vichy denationalisation law of 22 July 1940 opened a serious ideological division which continued into debates on the new nationality code.¹ But there were also broader questions about immigration and a new statute that would codify the legal status of all foreigners travelling through or living and working in France. The immigration statute was a particular matter of contention as France faced up to the need for new workers to aid economic recovery while also confronting the memory of how migration and the presence of foreigners had troubled the final years of the Third Republic.

One figure of historical importance at this moment was the demographer Georges Mauco, a leading expert on immigration and population in the 1930s. He took the opportunity that the questions of nationality and immigration posed in early 1945 to assert again his pre-war arguments about the harmful impact of foreigners on the French nation. The racial composition of the population remained his pressing concern and determined his post-war thinking on immigration and naturalisation. French nationality had to be guarded jealously and extended to foreigners only on precisely prescribed conditions.² Only preferred ethnicities could therefore be

Greg Burgess is a Senior Lecturer in History at Deakin University, Australia, where he teaches courses in world history, the French Revolution, and historiography. He is the author of *Refuge in the Land of Liberty: France and its Refugees from the Revolution to the End of Asylum, 1787-1939* (Palgrave, 2008) and is presently engaged in a follow-up volume on refugees in post-war France.

¹ Patrick Weil, "The Return of Jews in the Nationality or in the Territory of France," in *The Jews Are Coming Back: The Return of the Jews to Their Countries of Origin after WWII*, David Bankier, ed. (Jerusalem, 2005), 58-71. Patrick Weil, *Qu'est-ce qu'un Français? Histoire de la nationalité française depuis la Révolution* (Paris, 2002), 138ff. The new nationality code was adopted on 19 October 1945 and published in the *Journal officiel* of 20 October 1945.

² Weil, *Qu'est-ce qu'un Français?*, 142-150.

admitted as immigrants in order to maintain the racial integrity of the French population.

Historians consequently argue that Mauco's role in debates on nationality and immigration tainted post-war policy with his pre-war racism. By placing him and his racial ideas at the centre of their historical analyses, they in fact attribute him with a disproportional influence on law-making and policy. Other questions follow. If he did not have the influence attributed to him, why is he of such historical interest? Moreover, why do historians pay attention to him and his ideas, even at the cost of attention to some of the more constructive details of the post-war remaking of a republican political culture? This article considers Mauco's influence specifically on debates about the new immigration statute. He argued for the need for ethnic selection, which was for him critical to future immigration. Rather than shaping immigration policy, however, his ideas were in fact out of place in the new economic, political and social context of Liberation France.

With the publication in 1934 of his major work on the impact of foreigners, *Les étrangers en France*, Mauco was acknowledged as France's foremost expert on migration and population.³ His ideas on race and the decline of the French population in the face of the unrestricted flows of new immigrants found a ready audience in the crisis years of the late 1930s. Appointed in 1938 to the office of Philippe Serre, Under-Secretary of State for Immigration, he was an adviser on the restrictive Daladier decree-laws of November 1938 and May 1939.⁴ Mauco's post-war career was tainted by suspicion of Vichy collaboration. The accusations included publishing in the anti-Semitic journal *L'ethnie française* and his association with its editor, Georges Montandon, who was later murdered during the *épuration*. Also, in 1941, Mauco prepared a report for the Riom trial, condemning the Third Republic for its egalitarian principles and for failing to protect the country's ethnicity.⁵ With the Liberation he seems to have had successfully remade himself as a *résistant à la dernière heure*.⁶ After the Liberation, he re-emerged in public life as the secretary to the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family (*Haut Comité Consultatif de la Population et de la Famille*), which, among other briefs, was charged with advising the provisional government on the proposed new statute on immigration.⁷

Continuities between the Vichy regime and the post-war republic, Robert Paxton writes, was a consequence of the demands of the times, above all the need for

³ Georges Mauco, *Les étrangers en France: leur rôle dans l'activité économique* (Paris, 1934).

⁴ K. H. Adler, *Jews and Gender in Liberation France* (Cambridge, 2003), 108; Vicki Caron, "Unwilling Refuge: France and the Dilemma of Illegal Immigration, 1933-1939," in *Refugees from Nazi Germany and the Liberal European States*, Frank Caestecker and Bob Moore, eds. (New York, 2010), 64-65.

⁵ Patrick Weil, "Georges Mauco, expert en immigration: Ethnoracisme pratique et antisémitisme fielleux," in *L'antisémitisme de plume 1940-1944*, Pierre-André Taguieff, ed. (Paris, 1999), 267-76.

⁶ On Mauco's career, see especially Weil, "Georges Mauco," 267-76; Adler, *Jews and Gender*, ch. 6. See also Patrick Weil, *Liberté, égalité, discriminations. 'L'identité nationale' au regard de l'histoire* (Paris, 2008), 30 and 39-49; Patrick Weil, "Racisme et discrimination dans la politique Française de l'immigration 1938-1945/1974-1995," *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire* 47 (July-September, 1995): 77-102; Patrick Weil, *La France et ses étrangers. L'aventure d'une politique de l'immigration de 1938 à nos jours* (2nd ed.) (Paris: 2001), *passim*, esp. 36-40, 57-62 and 71-75; Patrick Weil, *Qu'est-ce qu'un Français?*, 86-93 and 142-50; Patrick Weil, "The Return of Jews," 71; Gérard Noiriel, *Le creuset français. Histoire de l'immigration XIXe-XXe siècles* (Paris, 1988), 121; and Gérard Noiriel, *Immigration antisémitisme et racisme en France, XIXe-XXe siècles. Discours publics, humiliations privées* (Paris, 2007), 428-33.

⁷ Archives Nationales de France, Centre des Archives Contemporaines (CAC), 0019860269, Articles 1, 2, 3 & 7.

stability, modernisation and planning. Professionals and experts in the civil administration, judiciary, business and technical spheres therefore fared better after the Liberation than traditionalists and intellectuals whose words were later used against them.⁸ The example of Mauco demonstrates wider continuities between the Third Republic and the first steps towards the restoration of the republican political order in late-1944 and early-1945. Experts of the former republic such as Mauco re-emerged in this brief interregnum to reassert their former ideological positions as the starting point for the new republic.

For historians drawn to Mauco's post-war career, he represents the persistence into the Liberation era of the anti-Semitism that had poisoned the late Third Republic. Racial tendencies behind changes to immigration and nationality laws in France during the 1990s, furthermore, turn attention to racial influences embedded deeply in the republic and its laws, and Mauco's role in this was seen as pivotal.⁹ Racism was indeed a consistent theme in his writings during the 1930s and 1940s, Karen Adler asserts, demonstrating the durability of his thought and his appeal across different political regimes.¹⁰ His pre-war reputation and expertise brought him to the centre of post-war debates on population policy, which, Adler continues, had a central place in Liberation France because of its visions of national revival. This was, she asserts, the demographers' moment, into which came experts on population, the family, and migration who had made their names during the later years of the Third Republic and now stood ready to lead debate and shape policy for the new republic.¹¹ Their concerns in the interwar period had been France's chronic demographic stagnation, its reliance on immigration to replenish the manpower lost in the Great War, the overpopulation of the cities, and the need for young, fertile families of the right ethnic stock to repopulate the depleted regions of rural France.¹² Mauco clung to these concerns when he seized the moment presented to him in 1945. In a position that he had not enjoyed in the 1930s, he could now shape the principles that would underpin the new statute on immigration and set out an agenda for administrative processes that would subordinate immigration policy to specific demographic and populationist priorities.

For Patrick Weil, the place of the "Vichy collaborator Mauco" within the remaking of French nationality in 1945 exposed an ideological division between the "more timorous and clearly antisemitic approaches" to national revival on the one side, and those with an "egalitarian conception of the French republic" on the other, such as René Cassin, President of the Legal Committee of the CFLN, and Adrien Tixier, Interior Minister in de Gaulle's provisional government.¹³ This "constant battle," Weil argues, was not resolved until 1947. The new immigration statute was one more issue over which this ideological division was fought, between demographers of the Third Republic in the case of Mauco and Alfred Sauvy on the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family, and the former *résistants* Alexandre Parodi and Pierre Tissier on the Conseil d'État.¹⁴ The task of legislating

⁸ Robert O. Paxton, *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940-1944* (New York, 1972), 330-52. See also Philip M. Williams, *Crisis and Compromise: Politics in the Fourth Republic*, 3rd ed. (London, 1964), 15-16.

⁹ Weil, *Liberté, égalité, discriminations*, 23f. Chapter 1 of this book reprints Weil, "Racisme et discrimination dans la politique française de l'immigration."

¹⁰ Adler, *Jews and Gender*, 109.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, chs. 5 and 6.

¹² *Ibid.*, ch. 5 and 68-9. All are themes of Mauco's *Les étrangers en France*.

¹³ Weil, "The Return of Jews," 70-71.

¹⁴ Weil, *Liberté, égalité, discriminations*, ch. 1.

on immigration therefore brought ethnicity and selection into mainstream debates, but each of these individuals had his own view on what these meant.

Mauco himself had a clearly racial understanding of selection. He presented his ideas in a detailed report on the imperative of ethnic selection circulated among the members of the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family even before it first met on 30 April 1945. General de Gaulle himself sat as the committee's president during its first two sessions and gave it three specific functions. One was to advise on family policy and a revision of the Family Code; another was to advise on immigration policy for the next ten years, in view of France's continued need for foreign workers. Finally, it was asked to scrutinise draft texts for the new statute on immigration, advise the relevant ministries with an interest in immigration matters, and recommend a final text for the consideration of the Council of Ministers.¹⁵ For Mauco, now secretary of the Committee, this was an opportunity to advance the cause of ethnic selection, which alone, he believed, would redress the imbalances in French demography and would lead to the revitalisation of the nation.¹⁶

With his preliminary report Mauco claimed the agenda for himself. He stressed how policy had to respond to the critical questions of the ethnic origin of immigrants, their professional backgrounds, health and family matters, and geographical distribution upon settlement. All of these points, de Gaulle noted in his opening address, provided a useful starting point for the Committee's work, as it set out some necessary choices that France had to make.¹⁷

The immigration quota system used in the United States had long been considered as an ideal model for France, and Mauco applied its principles to argue for the implementation of selection before prospective immigrants were admitted.¹⁸ This would allow France itself to determine their personal, professional, and above all ethnic qualities. Immigration would consequently better serve French national interests, not the interests of immigrants. Consequently, Mauco continued, policy had to be based on three critical pillars: selection in the country of source to ensure only those best suited to live and work in France were admitted; adaptation to employment conditions once admitted to France, which meant that the immigrants were to be dispersed into those regions with low population and into occupations with a high demand for workers; and, finally, assimilation into French nationality through social and cultural adaptation. Ethnic selection was the first criterion from which other regulations would follow, as this would ensure that France admitted those best suited to adaptation in the short term and assimilation in the longer term. In short, Mauco argued that the ethnic composition of immigration was too important to be left to chance.¹⁹

A projection of future immigrant numbers proved for him the clear need for rigorous controls. An annual shortage of 300,000 workers could only be filled by recruitment abroad. Numbers of this order – three million new immigrants over the

¹⁵ CAC, 0019860269. Art 1. Haut comité consultatif de la population et de la famille. Séance, 30 avril 1945.

¹⁶ Weil, "The Return of Jews," 59-60.

¹⁷ CAC, 0019860269. Art 1. Haut comité consultatif de la population et de la famille. Séance, 30 avril 1945.

¹⁸ Greg Burgess, "Selection, Exclusion and Assimilation: The *Projet Lambert* of 1931 on the Reform of French Immigration Policy," *French History and Civilisation: Papers from the George Rudé Seminar* 1 (2005): 190-207.

¹⁹ "Projet pour un plan de l'immigration étrangère." CAC, 0019860269. Art 1. Haut comité consultatif de la population et de la famille. Other versions of this document, with some details elaborated upon, are found on CAC, 0019860269. Art 7.

ten years for which the Committee was asked to plan – turned Mauco back to the years after the First World War, when the realisation that there were three million foreigners living among the French people had a profound impact on their psyche, society, and national culture.²⁰ Mauco's racial intentions were suggested most clearly in his assertion that all future immigration must remain "in harmony with the human structure of France" (*en harmonie avec la structure humaine de la France*). Preferred ethnicities were defined, and their precise proportions were calculated, in view of the existing "human structure." Mauco set out in precise terms how he saw the future ethnic composition of migration: 195,000 immigrants of "Nordic" origin, and 105,000 of "Mediterranean" and "Slavic" origins, would make up the projected 300,000 annual figure. Mauco was particularly precise in his proportions. He listed among the "Nordic" races Belgians, Luxembourgais, Dutch, British, Scandinavians, Swiss, and Germans; they would make up 65 per cent of all future immigration. Next he listed "Mediterranean" races (Italians, Spanish, Portuguese and so on), whose level of migration would be set at 32 per cent in order to remain in harmony with the population. Finally, at three per cent, the least preferred were the "Slavic" races, which he classified simply as "Balkaniques et divers."²¹

Mauco followed the example of the U.S. quotas, which were determined by the ethnic composition of the U.S. population reported in the census of 1890, before the "Nordic" immigrants were subsumed by the massive numbers of "Mediterranean" immigrants. Mauco accordingly used the census data from 1881-1891 to determine the "human structure" of the French nation.²² Yet this is a curious construction that historians have yet to analyse critically, as Mauco imagines France as a "Nordic" country and not a Latin one, with greater affinities to northern Europe than to the Mediterranean. He divided France between the north and south historically, as the history of immigration demonstrated a clear distinction between immigrants who had settled in the north and east (Belgians, Luxembourgais, Germans, British) and those who had settled in the south and west (Italians, Spanish and others from the Mediterranean world). The former were all preferred to the latter.

In other words, Mauco brought a particular reading of French history into his discourse on immigration and ethnicity. He justified ethnic selection by the evidence of history, as relative levels of assimilations showed how different peoples of the Mediterranean and Eastern Europe were from the French. Immigrants from Mediterranean countries who had arrived in their largest numbers after 1900, Mauco wrote, were less capable of successful adaptation than immigrants from Nordic countries who had predominated until then. Differences of language, the climatic conditions they were used to, and their backgrounds in employment made them less inclined to work; they had higher levels of criminality as a consequence. Similar differences of language, life and climate, he continued, were behind the failure of "Slavic" immigrants to assimilate when they had been recruited into the French labour force after 1918. This was all too evident. They lived separately from the French. Polish immigrants, he specifically noted, lived in an "ethnic island" among the French people, with their own Polish priests, teachers and merchants. Mauco's racialism went even further, as he blamed France's demographic decline in the years after the First World War on the admission of large numbers of refugees from the Middle East. Armenians and Assyrians especially were very different to voluntary migrants, he

²⁰ Ibid. Cf. Mauco, *Les étrangers en France*, 557f.

²¹ "Projet pour un plan de l'immigration étrangère." CAC, 0019860269. Art 1. Haut comité consultatif de la population et de la famille.

²² Weil, *Qu'est-ce qu'un Français?*, 145.

claimed; they were “diminished psychologically and even physically by their anguish and their persecution,” were poorly adapted for productive employment, and remained isolated in their communities within the overpopulated cities.²³

These points illustrate the paucity of Mauco’s future vision. He was not writing policy for the ten years ahead, but for the years before the war and Occupation. He was more attuned to the history of immigration as he saw it than to the future needs of the French economy and its society. He advocated a plan that, in 1945, responded to the problems of the 1930s, when he had criticised immigration for having no clear guiding principles and for being indiscriminate in terms of ethnic origin and the capacity of immigrants to adapt to life in France. Indeed, there was little new in the plan Mauco advanced in 1945. He merely restated issues about which he had written before the war. In a submission to the committee on population (*Haut Comité de la Population*, as it was then called) in July 1939, for example, he had already complained that differences of language, custom, religion and cultures made adaptation difficult. These problems, he claimed, were most acute among those of Slavic origin from Russia, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and among the Jewish refugees crowding French cities, where their impact on the “nerve centres of the country” was particularly harmful.²⁴

For Karen Adler, Mauco’s reuse of old material shows the durability and appeal of his racial ideas.²⁵ In fact, his appeal in 1945 does not seem to have extended beyond the same audience he had before the war, as renowned demographers, populationists and natalists of the 1930s formed the core membership of the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family. Among them were Adolphe Landry, Robert Debré, Maurice Monsaigeon, Jacques Doublet and Alfred Sauvy. They had continued their careers during the 1940s and resumed their expert roles in government or policy after Liberation.²⁶ In this circle of pre-war populationists and demographers, Mauco’s restatement of ideas with which they were well familiar would account for his appeal. There is no surprise that at the Committee’s second session, Mauco’s plans were accepted without discussion as the “principles of a general policy on immigration.”²⁷

The recent interest of historians in Mauco’s post-war career suggests that the kind of racial notions he expressed were embedded in post-war republicanism from its first years. Moreover, there are imputations of wider influence. So, for example, de Gaulle’s presence at the first two sessions of the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family, and his acknowledgement that Mauco’s plan was a useful starting point for new policy directions, imply his sympathy with its racial character.²⁸

²³ These comments are included in an alternative text of his plans, which differs from other texts only in this one paragraph. “Projet pour un plan de l’immigration étrangère.” CAC, 0019860269. Art 1. Haut comité consultatif de la population et de la famille.

²⁴ Georges Mauco, “L’appoint démographique et agricole fourni par l’immigration étrangère.” AN, F60 494. Haut comité de la population. Séance du Haut comité de la population du 4 juillet 1939.

²⁵ Adler, *Jews and Gender*, 109.

²⁶ CAC, 0019860269, Art. 1. Adler, *Jews and Gender*, ch. 5, examines the influence of some of these populationists at Liberation. See also Andrés Horacio Reggiani, “Procreating France: The Politics of Demography, 1919-1945,” *French Historical Studies* 19:3 (1996): 754.

²⁷ CAC, 0019860269. Art 1, Séance du 16 mai 1945.

²⁸ Weil, *Liberté, égalité, discriminations*, 51-52. Elsewhere, Weil notes specifically de Gaulle’s advocacy of Mauco’s plans in relation to naturalisation. Weil, *Qu’est-ce qu’un Français?*, 147. In addition, in March 1945 de Gaulle received a report into the ‘problem of foreigners in France’, the contents of which appear to lead directly into the policy advice that the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family was asked to provide. The authors of this report – Charles Beaumont, whose authority on immigration by his own admission rested on his having travelled frequently to the United

These imputations support the broad conclusion that Mauco's ideas on race tainted post-war policy with pre-war and even Vichy era racism.²⁹

The demographic experts brought together in the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family bridged the pre-war and post-war republics, and each had his own career during the Occupation. Mauco's racial categories echoed the "scientific" racism of the Vichy years, when anthropology, "anthroposociology" and "bio-geography," among other approaches, prescribed racial boundaries between peoples of various origin, all once legally classified by naturalisation as French citizens.³⁰ But Mauco was thorough in making his case in historical and social terms, therefore avoiding the taint of racism among his post-war peers. His racial thought was consequently legitimised in this post-Liberation context as proper social considerations to which immigration policy must respond. The ethnic composition of the population and the classification of preferred ethnicities among future immigrants were rooted in the transformations that past migrations had brought to the French population and French national culture. The need for demographic harmony, which Mauco located in the dominant ethnicities that had settled over the previous century, would underpin social harmony and economic prosperity, and, importantly for him, would go some way towards preserving French cultural traditions through the resettlement of the depopulated countryside.³¹ This also helps explain Mauco's post-war appeal and the legitimacy of his post-war racial thought. Ethnicity and selection both resonated more widely than the select group on the Consultative Committee since both suggested positive approaches to future migration policy – the immigrants' cultural and linguistic affinities with the French, for example, or their professional skills that would allow them to make a useful contribution. In short, the assimilability of prospective immigrants had broad appeal.³² But when put together as "ethnic selection," then racial origin was the dominant factor, and this had limited appeal.

Mauco's plan, as it transpired, went no further than informing initial discussions on the shape of post-war policy. But this was not because his racial ideals were rejected. Rather, his plan had gone well beyond the mandate of the Committee in advocating radical legislative and administrative reforms. These would have required substantial changes to the ministries and offices with responsibility for immigration – the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, the Interior, Justice, Agriculture and Health, for example, each had an immigration bureau – so that the programs of selection, geographical distribution and settlement could be implemented. The task of the Committee was instead to advise on immigration policy and consult on a draft statute on immigration. Certainly, Jules Jeanneney, minister responsible for the reorganisation of the public administration in de Gaulle's provisional government,

States and having examined its migration system (administratively, he had served as head of the Information and Interpreting Service for the 1937 International Exposition in Paris), and Maurice Laure, a lawyer with established links to immigration communities – made no great claims to demographic or populationist expertise. Their report consequently restated principles of population and the "problem of foreigners" established in the 1930s: the importance of the American model of selection as a basis for regulation, the need for immigration to respond to economic imperatives, geographical distribution and rural resettlement as a means of preventing the growth of ethnic enclaves. All were familiar themes and were widely accepted as necessary measures to bring immigration under the firmer control of the state so that it served better France's national interests. "Comment résoudre le problème des étrangers en France," 20 Mars 1945. CAC, 0019860269. Art 7.

²⁹ Weil, "Georges Mauco"; Gérard Noiriel, *Les origines républicaines de Vichy* (Paris, 1999), 215.

³⁰ *ibid.*, 211f.

³¹ "Projet pour un plan de l'immigration étrangère." CAC, 0019860269. Art 1. Haut comité consultatif de la Population et de la Famille.

³² Weil, *Liberté, égalité, discriminations*, 83f.

firmly reminded its members of this when he attended its session on 4 July on the General's behalf.³³ The Committee, Jeanneney cautioned, had to limit itself to advice on general policy and exclude from its work all propositions aimed at ministerial reform. There was subsequently no further discussion on Mauco's plan, and the Committee's attention turned to examining and advising on draft texts of the new statute.³⁴

Another reason why Mauco's plan made no further progress was that it did not stand up to critical scrutiny; indeed, it was considered out of step with the demands of the times, such as the actual problems of the status of foreigners and the economic difficulties France faced in 1945. One member of the Committee, Maxime Blocq-Mascart, questioned whether ethnic selection was a proper response to the economic need for labour that France now confronted. The problem of immigration, he wrote privately to the other members, cannot be considered only in terms of those "elements who can be integrated into the French population." Blocq-Mascart instead insisted on a distinction between two categories of immigrants, temporary and permanent, between those who did not intend to attach themselves to France and those who came with the intention of settling and obtaining naturalisation.³⁵

The notion of ethnic selection was also absent from the many draft texts, revisions and critical commentary on the proposed immigration statute that came before the Committee, although all were concerned with the need for effective immigration policies that would serve France's future interests. Three general trends are evident in these papers.³⁶ Many of them accepted Mauco's position on the social and economic implications of immigration, but did not accept his position on ethnicity. Indeed, by its omission they highlight instead how far to the extreme Mauco stood. The language of "assimilability" was often used, but it is clear that assimilation did not mean racial or ethnic traits that made some more suited to life and work in France than others, but simply the ability to speak French. This alone would mean some had a greater capacity to adapt than others who did not speak French. Other desirable traits were social and economic. A preference for younger immigrants was common, and their settlement in the depopulated countryside was a priority. Professional selection, so that immigrants served France's economic interests, was also a priority. Preference would be given to those with professional skills in occupations where there was a labour shortage (manual workers, agricultural workers and miners were a priority, for example), while unproductive immigrants or workers in crowded occupations were excluded. None of this accords with the ethnic, racial or national priorities that Mauco intended.

Another position envisaged minimal legislative prescription for the regulation of immigration. Even the language of assimilation was marginal in these texts and replaced instead with a technical language of regulatory measures on the grant and administration of permits (*cartes de travail, cartes de séjour*). These proposals were prescriptive only in so far as eligibility criteria for permits had to be defined. This was the favoured position among the ministries responsible for immigration matters, as it avoided bureaucratic complexity and the creation of new offices and posts. It was also consistent with France's long history of immigration, which was regulated

³³ CAC, 0019860269. Art 1, Séance du 4 juillet 1945.

³⁴ Weil shows that at much the same time, Mauco was defeated in his advocacy of a more stringent approach naturalisation by the "egalitarian republican" Interior Minister André Tixier. Weil, *Qu'est-ce qu'un Français?*, 150.

³⁵ Maxime Blocq-Mascart, 15 mai 1947. CAC, 0019860269, Art 1.

³⁶ CAC, 0019860269. Art 7. Statut des étrangers.

not through a general statute on immigration but by laws and regulations pertaining to residence and work permits.

On the Left, there was antipathy towards both these approaches as they failed to acknowledge the profound changes of the years of war and Occupation. A draft presented by the SFIO at the second *session ordinaire* of the 1945 Assemblée Consultative Provisoire certainly looked back to the problems that immigration has raised in the past, but only in order to highlight the tendencies in pre-war policies that had led to Vichy and its concentration camps for foreigners.³⁷ The situation of foreigners was now an urgent matter, the SFIO asserted, and it had to be addressed independently of any demographic considerations. There was a simple, practical remedy that was not only just but would also serve France's interests. Foreigners had endured the war and Occupation alongside the French: many had volunteered to fight the enemy and had fallen before them; many had joined the Resistance; many were deported to Germany as "free workers," and others were deported by force; many had perished in the internment camps and in companies of foreign workers. Now that France was in need of foreign workers, why should they be sought abroad? A solution would be found immediately if France were to tie its resident foreigners to its soil through their "assimilation" and their "naturalisation."³⁸

The final text of the statute of immigration adopted the distinction between temporary and permanent immigrants drawn by Blocq-Mascart, and it excluded all distinctions of an ethnic, racial or national nature. The text itself elaborated on the diverse reasons for entry and residence and the criteria that should apply to residence and work permits.³⁹ In short, practical demands isolated and marginalised the ideological agenda of the demographers and the populationists of the 1930s. This was not so much a moment for the demographers to carry forward an ideological agenda, but rather a time for technocrats and policy-makers to come to the fore. The demographers' moment was short-lived, and they soon gave way to legal experts.

First and foremost, policy followed the practical initiatives taken amid the legal uncertainties of the time. Already the Interior Minister, Adrien Tixier, had moved to enact administrative measures on the residence of foreigners in order to distinguish between nationals of Allied nations, foreigners who had joined the Resistance, suspect nationals of enemy countries, and collaborators.⁴⁰ The Socialist position, furthermore, had recognised the problem of a lack of workers in February 1945 and proposed the naturalisation of all eligible foreigners as a solution.⁴¹ Tixier himself acknowledged that his approach to policy and the regularisation of the status of foreigners was informed precisely by concerns such as these. But the question of labour would dominate policy approaches to immigration in the immediate post-war period, which neither ethnic nor professional selection as Mauco had envisaged could

³⁷ Parti Socialiste, SFIO, Commission d'Immigration, de la conditions des étrangers et de leur naturalisation, 1945. CAC, 0019680269, Art 7. Statut des étrangers.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ The final ordinance, 45-2.658, "Définissant le statut des étrangers," was accepted by the Council of Ministers on 2 November 1945 and published in the *Journal Officiel* on 4 November 1945.

⁴⁰ Ministère de l'Intérieur, Direction Générale de la Sécurité Nationale, Direction des Étrangers et des Passeports, Circulaire SNEP 13, No. 172, 21 décembre 1944. F7 16117. Circulaires aux préfets rédigées par le service, 1944-1969.

⁴¹ Marcel Livian, "Rapport à la Commission d'Immigration: Des solutions urgentes pour donner un statut aux étrangers à propos de questions démographiques et de reconstruction"; Daniel Mayer, Parti Socialiste, SFIO, Commission d'Immigration, au Ministre de l'Intérieur, 21 février 1945. F7 16102. *Circulation transfrontière (1892-1985)*. The SFIO's position, however, gave no new workers to the French labour market.

address. By 1947, the problem of labour overwhelmed all other considerations. There was an estimated shortage of 320,000 workers which traditional source countries – those from which Mauco would have drawn his preferred ethnicities – could no longer supply. Georges Monnet's economic plan suggested instead that France turn to North Africa (specifically Morocco and Algeria), Italy and the occupied zones of western Germany as new sources of immigrant workers.⁴²

Weil's notion of a "constant battle" from 1943 to 1947 between "egalitarian republicans" and "timorous" anti-Semites suggests that a profound ideological division was long in resolution after the Liberation and was played out in the remaking of republican political culture. The battle was mostly over naturalisation and the extent to which France should confer nationality on foreigners, but immigration was also a point of contention.⁴³ Mauco's re-emergence in 1945 indicates that ideological positions assumed prior to the German Occupation and the Vichy regime were also reasserted in the remaking of the post-war republic. Men of the 1930s like Mauco showed in 1945 that they were looking backwards as the republic was being remade and carried with them the same anxieties and fears that had shaped their pre-war ideologies. Mauco's ideological formation in the 1930s is well documented, and his writings on population, migration and race were critical influences on pre-war phobias about the impact of foreigners. His post-war plans for ethnic selection and notions of racial preference were indeed not new ideas on the question of immigration, but rather a new expression of these old phobias. The foreign presence remained for him an imposition on, and a challenge to, the racial and cultural homogeneity of the French people, and it would continue to be so unless his kind of selective measures were implemented.

However, we cannot read this view as suggesting that deep, underlying currents of old thought affected and shaped new republican institutions. The approaches to immigration that Mauco advocated were commonly held in pre-war France, and indeed had been deeply rooted in French republican consciousness since the turn of the twentieth century. From the moment when immigration impinged on public consciousness in the late-nineteenth century, it was regarded with reluctance and sometimes dread. Many believed that little good could come from it. Not only were foreign immigrants charged with all the ills associated with long imagined stereotypes – criminality, harbingers of immorality, competition for work, an imposition on the state's welfare services, creation of ethnic enclaves – naturalisation itself was seen as contrary to nature. It was against the national sentiment; it weakened the nation's moral unity and the nation's defences.⁴⁴ Notions such as these persisted in, and were perpetuated by, Mauco's pre-war writings.

In 1945, Mauco's vision was still that of a population under great demographic stress. It had become disconnected from national cultural roots and was formless in its ethnic makeup. Demographic change had placed the nation itself under stress. The depopulation of rural France was symptomatic of the decline of French culture; so too was the overcrowding of the cities, in which highly visible ethnic enclaves were considered a cancer on the nation. While Mauco found a forum for such views among some of his contemporaries, these were not the questions that concerned the remaking of the republic. The questions in 1945 related to the laws and

⁴² Communication des Ministres des Affaires étrangères et du Travail sur la politique française d'immigration de main d'oeuvre (Le Plan Monnet), 21 mai 1947. CAC, 0019860269, Art 7.

⁴³ Weil, *Qu'est-ce qu'un Français?*, 138f; Weil, *Liberté, égalité, discriminations*, Ch 1.

⁴⁴ J. Berjont, *De l'invasion des étrangers en France. Les Italiens en Provence. Naturalisations, criminalité, protection du travail national* (n.p., 1903), 34.

institutions that would revive republican political culture. Men of the Third Republic like Mauco found a place in making the new republic because the Gaullist position that the armistice and the Vichy regime were illegal stirred the legitimate revival of the former republic. The pre-war Consultative Committee on Population was remade as the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family, and the men and their ideas of the Third Republic found a place where they could again exert their influence on ideology and policy. The Consultative Committee, and Mauco himself, looked back from 1945 to the Third Republic with the illusion that it would serve as the foundation upon which the post-war republic would be remade.

The actual conditions facing France in 1945 and after, however, called for immediate, practical and effective responses to immigration and the status of foreigners. These responses were effected through the technicalities of residence and work permits, and the categorisation of foreigners in economic and social terms: whether, for example, they would settle permanently, whether they would pursue a profession, whether they would remain temporarily for purposes of study or tourism, and so on.

There are implications here in how historians are drawn to the sorts of retrospective opinions that Mauco advanced in 1945 while history itself had moved forward in another direction. His influence has been overstated, while other developments have received less attention. His plans simply did not advance beyond what he put before the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family. Mauco's influence as a demographer and expert on immigration went no further, and he remade himself in the field of psychology and education.⁴⁵ But he is perceived as a figure of importance because he alerts historians to the danger that anti-Semitism and racial ideas drawn from the past could have infiltrated post-war French consciousness, and for this reason he has been a figure of historical importance. Historians are indeed mindful of the reappearance of immigration and race as critical problems of recent years.⁴⁶ The implication is clear that race has long been a problem hidden in French national consciousness, erupting to the surface at different times: at the turn of the twentieth century, in the 1930s, under Vichy, and again in the 1980s and 1990s. Mauco, whose enduring influence remains debatable, is a man who reflects the more enduring influence of race in French republican consciousness.

⁴⁵ He did, however, publish one more work on immigration and race late in life: *Les étrangers et le problème du racisme* (Paris, 1977).

⁴⁶ Weil, *Liberté, égalité, discriminations*, 23-25.