

Towards an emotional history of settler decolonisation: De Gaulle, political masculinity and the end of French Algeria 1958-62.

Martin Evans

University of Sussex, UK

M.J.Evans@sussex.ac.uk

Towards an emotional history of settler decolonisation: De Gaulle, political masculinity and the end of French Algeria 1958-62.

Abstract

This article focuses upon the complex emotional relationship between the settlers and Charles de Gaulle. De Gaulle returned to power in May 1958 ostensibly to maintain French Algeria and with the new Fifth Republic many settlers felt emotional and politically secure after four years of conflict. Yet, as de Gaulle's position shifted in 1959, this article traces the changing emotional landscape of the settlers, examining how they responded to de Gaulle's pronouncements with a mixture of fear, anxiety and anger. Following this relationship, the article will explore the way in which de Gaulle used television to project a certain image of political masculinity that was rational, detached and objective. In particular, it will foreground how this political masculinity, embodying the higher interests of the French Republic, was seen to stand in opposition to the European settler 'other' - irrational, unrealistic, driven by narrow, selfish interests. Here specific emphasis will be given to the January 1960 crisis, when the settlers rebelled against the dismissal of General Massu. This will be interpreted as a crystallising moment in this 'othering' of the settlers, which then became a key part of de Gaulle's decolonisation rationale. In conclusion the article will place these findings within the framework of the notion of settler colonialism advanced by Lorenzo Veracini. It will show how the understanding of the emotional history of the settler presence deepens our understanding of the specific dynamics of settler colonialism, in particular the complex and shifting triangular relationships between the Metropole, the settlers and the indigenous populations which, it will be argued, must always be placed within an international framework. As such the article will make a general contribution to the field, opening up a connected and comparative history of the emotional dynamics of other settler colonial societies as well as the decolonisation process in general.

Keywords: settlers, de Gaulle, emotion, masculinity, decolonisation

Fear was a constant emotional presence for Europeans in French Algeria. Initially this fear was derived from the physical threat posed by the indigenous population, usually referred to generically as 'Arabs' or 'natives'. The first settlers were afraid of being wiped out by attack, reflecting the way in which between 1830 and 1871, the initial invasion period, Algeria was a battlefield. Then, once the political existence of French Algeria seemed secure, this fear became more nebulous. It was about the perceived threats to individuals and property posed by the indigenous population rather than the threat to the European presence per se. However, with the emergence of modern Algerian nationalism during the 1920s, fear again took on a concrete form because it was clear that such nationalism posed a real danger to French Algeria.

Relatively quickly this first fear became allied to a second one: being unprotected by the French state. Already by the 1860s the settlers were accusing the French Army and the Second Empire of being pro-Arab, which explains the large scale republicanism amongst the settlers. Then, from the 1870s onwards, this fear focused upon reforming ideas emanating from Paris. Repeatedly, settlers opposed even the smallest reforms promoting greater Muslim equality on the grounds that it would threaten French Algeria.¹ Significantly, by January 1960 these two fears had become indissolubly linked. For settler political leaders defending French Algeria was a war on two fronts: against the FLN *and* Paris.

The purpose of this article is to map out the emotional history of these fears which, it will be argued, were constitutive elements of European self-identities. They were at the heart of an emotional dynamic between themselves, Algerian nationalists, the French state, the French metropole and an unfolding international context that is crucial in understanding the end of settler colonialism in French Algeria.² Any explanatory model of the end of French Algeria must have the history of emotions at the core. It must assess both how these emotions drove actors and agencies and how they were connected to political and economic transformations brought about by decolonisation. In particular it must explore the specific tension between the public expression of emotion and personal subjective feelings. In other words how de Gaulle's careful deployment of emotional codes in his public performance of politics - top down, uncompromising, stentorian – was underpinned by his own feelings which then clashed with the settlers, provoking emotionally driven public protests on their part that stressed a very personal sense of betrayal, despair and anger. This in turn led de Gaulle to justify the end of French Algeria in terms of a 'othering' of the settlers which, both feminised the settlers as hysterical and irrational, and racialized them in terms of being Algerian and therefore inherently violent. As a result settler masculinity, by violently opposing de Gaulle's proposed reforms, was seen to be out of control and therefore deeply

unnerving in the eyes of mainstream metropolitan France: an emotional distancing by de Gaulle that in effect removed French Algeria from the boundaries of the true French nation state and became his rationale for the end of French Algeria. Yet, as it became clear in the summer of 1962 that the majority of settlers were going to leave, this distancing did not lead de Gaulle to reject the settlers as French citizens. On the contrary he accepted that the settlers had to be integrated into French society; a point he underlined by making a clear distinction between the settlers and the *harkis*. For him the former could be assimilated in to the new France because of their language and culture, while the latter could not because were ethnically too different.

In this way this article sets out a template for other decolonisation processes and settler societies on the basis that any historical example will involve the same negotiation of emotions, even if the end of French Algeria is at the most intense end of the spectrum. In each case, therefore, there must be a careful calibration of what I term the ‘emotional nexus’; the measure of the emotional investment in the colonial project by all the key actors and agencies. This nexus allows us to assess why some processes were more traumatic than others.

At this point it must be noted that the study of emotions is already part of the historiography of the Algerian War. But this analysis has been couched in terms of a psychoanalytic framework of memory, mirroring Henry Rousso’s seminal 1987 study of the memory of Vichy France since 1945.³ Specifically this historiography has explored the psychological after effects of the conflict in terms of grief, depression and melancholia.⁴ By contrast, this article takes a different angle. The focus is not on after effects but on the emotions during the conflict itself, in particular Charles de Gaulle and his unfolding

emotional relationship with the Europeans of Algeria between 1958 and 1962. This unfolding emotional relationship, it will be argued, eventually became the crux of de Gaulle's justification for the end of French Algeria, where de Gaulle saw himself as standing for a certain type of political decision making based upon a rational, balanced, detached calculation; a political masculinity that involved an emotional othering of the settlers who were stigmatised as being driven by narrow, selfish interests.

De Gaulle's political masculinity saw himself as the embodiment of state power from above. It was defined by emotional self-control and was typified by de Gaulle's projection of decorum, dignity and discipline on public state ceremonies: a masculine leadership legitimised by the establishment of the Fifth Republic and operating within the law. In contrast the settlers, in particular their political leaders, were derided by de Gaulle in terms of an illegitimate, unruly street masculinity from below. This was viewed as a threatening hyper-masculinity that became ultimately so disconcerting to mainland opinion because it was seen to be emotionally unstable where anger quickly transformed into violence. Crucial to the projection and final victory of this political masculinity over the hyper-masculinity of the settlers was the role played by television. In effect, de Gaulle, France's first televisual star, used television to redefine politics. Through a series of decisive live television interventions he dominated the intimate domain of the family home in visual terms in a way that had never been done before. He produced carefully choreographed displays of public emotion that carried his audience with him and isolated the defenders of French Algeria. It was a new emotional politics that used television brilliantly to connect emotionally with large numbers of French people and convince that it was France's best interests to end French Algeria.

This article will be divided into two parts. The first part will examine how de Gaulle navigated the complex political landscape from June 1958 until January 1960. The second

part will focus upon one particular event: the ‘Barricades Week’ in January 1960. This, it will be argued, was a crystallising moments that led to an emotional othering of French Algeria. The conclusion will then consider this analysis in respect to the Lorenzo Veracini framework.⁵ By considering how the end of French Algeria contributes to the colonial settler studies debate, it will open up the possibility of a genuinely global history of settler culture that goes beyond the Anglophone sphere to examine settler societies in the Francophone, Hispanic and Lusophone worlds.

French Algeria 1958

The trigger that brought de Gaulle to power in June 1958 was rebellion by settlers and parts of the army.⁶ For the purposes of this article what needs to be understood is that this rebellion was sparked by fear. Both settlers and army leaders were afraid that the government, under pressure from Britain and the USA, was about to negotiate with the FLN. In this tense atmosphere President Coty recalled de Gaulle from political exile to become prime minister, seeing him as the only person capable averting a civil war.⁷

On 4 June de Gaulle was welcomed to great acclaim in Algiers as a saviour figure. Crowds, settler and Algerian, thronged the streets waiting to hear what he was going to say. All knew that it was a pivotal moment and, given the subsequent turn of events, his words and gestures would be analysed again and again. The speech, broadcast live on radio, recorded for French newsreels and television and widely reprinted in the national and international press, lasted nine minutes.⁸ His words were carefully chosen. Above all he reached out to his audience. He wanted to assuage their fears and on this basis his first phrase, hands held high, was: ‘I have understood you!’⁹

It was a moment of enormous emotional intensity. The crowd exploded with joy. The cheering was so loud that de Gaulle paused to acknowledge the response. He had made a crucial connection with his audience. But de Gaulle did not talk of French Algeria. Instead he underlined how the events in Algeria were opening the way to institutional renewal and fraternity where ‘there is only the category of inhabitant: there are none here but fully-fledged Frenchmen, fully-fledged Frenchmen with the same rights and the same duties.’¹⁰ His model was of political equality, even if the words were gendered. Thereafter his speech reached out to different groups. Although he did not talk of Muslims he implicitly recognised that many had been held back by prejudice:

That is to say that avenues must be opened up which, until now, have been closed to many.

That is to say that the means to live must be given to those that lacked them.¹¹

He lauded the role of the army, words that produced huge cheering, so much that de Gaulle again momentarily stopped; a measure of how the army was seen as the guarantor of French Algeria. He outlined how elections were going to be based upon a single electoral college, talking explicitly at this point about the participation of men *and* women.¹² Carefully he did not box himself in stating that once ‘those representatives are elected, we will see how the rest can be achieved.’¹³ Importantly, the speech also contained conciliatory words for the FLN, although he did not mention the FLN by name. He recognised their fight as ‘courageous’, motivated by ‘despair.’¹⁴ Yet, he hoped that they too would participate in elections because he was opening ‘the doors of reconciliation.’ The speech then climaxed with a final flourish:

Never more than here, and never more than this evening, have I understood how fine, how great, how generous is France!

Long live the Republic !

Long live France !¹⁵

The speech, spoken with passion, produced an ecstatic response. However, a careful rereading of the speech shows that de Gaulle might have connected with the settlers but crucial passages were open ended. This was not an acceptance of the status-quo. Rather the stress was on transformation based upon political equality and institutional renewal; one that could potentially accommodate all of the interested parties, including the FLN. In this sense, for him Algeria was one dimension in his desire to renew France. He had famously resigned in 1946 and was always scathing about the Fourth Republic which he dismissed as weak and unstable. Throughout the late 1940s and early 1950s de Gaulle argued for a strong presidential leadership and now he had the opportunity to apply these ideas.¹⁶ So, in the autumn of 1958 he oversaw a process that established the Fifth Republic where the presidency became the key decision making office. Effectively taking control of foreign and defence policy, such a presidency, de Gaulle argued, would give France the sense of purpose that had been so lacking, instilling the institutional resilience to take the difficult, long term decisions necessary for the recovery of great power status.¹⁷ At the core of this thinking was the projection of political masculinity. Embodied in de Gaulle, this political masculinity was about tough decision making based upon the best interests of the French state; a notion that would become central to de Gaulle's eventual decolonisation narrative.

The political and emotional landscape

De Gaulle's 4 June speech was astute. He understood that the speech had to speak to a number of key constituencies who each had a differing emotional investment in French Algeria. The challenge was to navigate this highly charged emotional landscape that had five interconnected dimensions, the first of which was the international context. This was an implicit aspect of the speech. He understood that France could not impose a solution through violence because the core of the conflict was an emotional one: a battle for 'hearts and minds' in a world of human rights, even if he was dismissive of the United Nations. He understood, too, how this emotional conflict was shaped by the Cold War context and the rise of the Non-Aligned Movement.¹⁸ Any solution had to meet Algerian aspirations. It had to offer a better future that firmly anchored them in the NATO sphere of influence; a global context that explains why de Gaulle was under so much pressure from Britain and the USA to arrive at a solution. For British and US leaders, the Algerian War needed to be resolved because it was alienating so many countries in Africa and Asia, drawing them towards the Soviet Union, which was presenting itself as the champion of decolonisation.¹⁹

The next dimension was the French state. In 1956 the French state had deployed massive violence in order to defeat the FLN.²⁰ This was partly to protect the European minority while opening the way to a reformed Algeria based upon Franco-Muslim equality. But it was also about protecting France's strategic colonial interests both in terms of global influence, notably through a Eurafrikan bloc led by France that could challenge the USA and the Soviet Union, and the huge gas and oil resources that had been discovered in the Sahara.²¹ Yet, it is vital to understand, that the French state was riven with tensions. In May 1958 leading army officers had rebelled against civilian authority in order to bring de Gaulle back to power. Moreover these officers continued to see themselves as the arbiters of power, ready to rebel again if they thought that French Algeria was threatened which explains why de Gaulle sought to re-establish the primacy of civilian authority under the Fifth Republic.

Equally, it is important to understand that this was not a separate colonial settler state. French Algeria was never independent. Settler colonialism always operated under the auspices of the French colonial state.

Added to this was the further dimension of French mainland opinion. Within the world of political activism a minority were fervent supporters of French Algeria, drawing upon not just those on the far-right but also some Gaullists and a current of socialists and radicals who believed in the French civilising mission.²² Another micro-minority were involved in illegal action with the FLN.²³ There was also a small but vocal anti-torture movement, while the Communist Party, the largest force on the left, led an anti-war campaign that, although hanging back from advocating desertion, still tested the law by circulating banned anti-torture literature.²⁴ The Socialist Party (Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière – SFIO), as the establishment party of the Fourth Republic, had supported a policy of repression and reform.²⁵ But with the Fourth Republic parties swept aside by the 1958 elections, the landscape was now dominated by the Gaullist movement that looked to de Gaulle to find an honourable solution. Beyond committed political activism, in other words, amongst the majority of France, the opinion polls point to shifting perspectives. Here the primary concern was the safety of the conscripts. By 1958, 450,000 troops were in Algeria, of which the overwhelming majority were conscripts whose military service was twenty seven months. The emotional impact upon family life was enormous.²⁶ It produced a strain that led families to ponder how long the metropole would be expected to sustain this level of military engagement. In fact by 1959, with a majority supporting negotiations with the FLN, it was clear that, given this strain, large numbers wanted some form of solution that would bring the conscripts home; a reasoning that became part of de Gaulle's political calculation as he sought to find this solution.²⁷

The fourth dimension was Algerian society. Large parts of this society harboured long-standing anger at colonial rule. The physical and emotional suffering that underpinned this anger was the way that the FLN legitimised violence. This was repeated on a daily basis in FLN documents. Admittedly, FLN leaders internally and externally were momentarily thrown by the May 1958 events, in particular the fraternisation between settlers and Muslims.²⁸ They saw it as a setback which is why the FLN leadership sought to regain the initiative with the formation of a provisional government in exile in September 1958, while simultaneously reiterating Algerian suffering with a new narrative of one and half million martyrs killed by French colonialism; a claim already cited in FLN documents by 1959 but which gained ever more intensity in the lead up to independence.²⁹ Yet, it is also important to understand that the FLN was not the only factor in Algerian society. There was the rival Algerian National Movement (MNA), which, although much smaller, still enjoyed support amongst Algerians on the French mainland and with which the FLN was engaged in a murderous civil war.³⁰ There was, too, the *harki* phenomenon, that is, Muslims who were recruited into anti-FLN militias because of their fear of FLN violence.³¹ Writing after the war in 1980, the FLN activist and academic historian, Mohammed Harbi, acknowledged that the numbers recruited was striking, a fact that he put down to the indiscriminate use of FLN violence, which led many Algerians to look towards the French Army for protection.³² And then there were the pro-French Muslims, the segment of the population that identified with French rule, albeit one based upon equality. They were led by Bachaga Boualam, and Nafissa Sid Cara, the first Muslim woman to be given a position in a French government in 1959.³³

The final dimension was the settlers. Again, like French mainland and Algerian societies, settler society was not an undifferentiated bloc. A small minority embraced the FLN and saw themselves as Algerian.³⁴ A small number, such as the writer Albert Camus, saw the future in terms of a liberal solution that would reach out to Algerian opinion in some

way.³⁵ The majority were conservative, however. They were resistant to change; an attachment to the status-quo that encapsulated a complex amalgam of fears beginning with, first and foremost, the fear of the ‘natives’. This fear had long roots and was a constituent aspect of French Algeria. During the forty years after 1830 this trepidation was largely about fear of attack from the Muslim forces confronting the French invasion. Then, in the 1870s, as French Algeria at last looked secure and more settlers arrived, this fear changed shape, principally because, given the devastating impact of the invasion, indigenous society looked very fragile.³⁶ On this basis, it seemed logical to assume that this indigenous society posed no existential threat to French Algeria. It could, therefore, either be eliminated, absorbed or pushed to the least productive parts of the countryside. Yet, over the next sixty years the Muslim birth rate surged dramatically, not just making up for the lives lost during the invasion but also outstripping the settler birth rate. In the 1870s the Muslim population was two million, down from three million in 1830. By 1936 it stood at six million, outnumbering the one million Europeans by six to one, a ratio that rose to nine to one by the mid-1950s.³⁷ What flowed from this demographic imbalance was a whole series of fears. Settlers felt fearful about certain geographical areas – the Algiers Casbah, the mountains, the east of the country – because in these areas there were none or few settlers.³⁸ Effectively they became psychological no-go areas, creating a clearly segregated society even if this segregation was not formalised like in Apartheid South Africa. Such anxiety was also wrapped up with a more generalised fear of the Arabo-Berber population, usually referred to in generic terms as the ‘Arabs’.

A whole series of racial stereotypes peppered settler conversation which underlined the emotional insincerity of the ‘Arabs’. According to these stereotypes ‘Arabs’ could not be trusted. They were seen to be lazy, untrustworthy and easily angered, and populating an increasingly threatening hinterland.³⁹ These stereotypes were gendered because the focus

was upon an aggressive Arab masculinity. Arab men were seen to be so threatening because they were allegedly driven by base, primal emotions. This is why crowds of Arab men induced fear. It is also why there was so much fear around the danger Arab men posed to the safety of European women; anxieties that became an intrinsic part of the inner emotional lives of settlers by the mid-1950s. From the 1920s onwards these fears were increasingly shaped by a new dread: the rise of Algerian nationalism, a development that was closely connected to the spread of pan-Arab nationalism across the Middle East and North Africa. This fear was a clear threat to their social and political existence; it transformed their emotional relationship to both France and French Algeria.

By the end of the nineteenth century many leading settlers had begun to think of themselves as Algerian in some way, perhaps most obviously with the novels by Auguste Robinet and Louis Bertrand, which celebrated the patois and distinct identity of the settler population.⁴⁰ As in the Anglophone settler colonies this identity was based upon a narrative of the colonial frontier where the settlers - tough resourceful, fearless - had overcome a hostile environment to establish their own society. In contrast, metropolitan France was seen to be weak, decadent and corrupt. Thus, there was a process of indigenisation where the settlers conceived of themselves as rooted in the country; a sense of belonging that simultaneously legitimised the settler presence and established a distinction between the settler and the metropolitan. By the 1930s, this discourse of belonging had acquired a new dimension which absorbed an Algerian settler identity into a wider "Latin" imaginary that looked back to the Roman Empire. Under this schema, the settlers were the new Romans. As a result they had not invaded Algeria but returned to restore the landscape to the glories of the Roman Empire when North Africa had been the granary of Rome. But, by the mid-1950s although these notions were still present in terms of strong settler identity, in reality most settlers knew that, given the demographic dynamic, they needed the protection of the French

colonial state. This is why war monuments became symbolically so important for settlers during the Algerian War itself. In May 1958 and again in January 1960, they were the focus of settler demonstrations because they encapsulated the patriotic link between French Algeria and France. They represented the blood sacrifice that these settlers had made in defending France during two World Wars, which now, the settler argument ran, had to be repaid. By the 1960s, the dominant settler discourse was not indigenisation. Rather, it was that French Algeria was a French province that had to be integrated into the Republic and protected against FLN violence.

By the mid-1950s the fear of Algerian independence had become completely intertwined with a fear of reformism from Paris which was seen as a byword for betrayal, in effect independence by the back door. This hatred of Paris reformism had a long history. It was based upon the assumption that Paris did not understand Algeria. This is why there was so much settler opposition to the enfranchisement of Algerian Jews in 1870, principally because this was seen as the thin end of the wedge that would lead ultimately to the assimilation of the Arabs and Berbers and the end of the settlers' privileged position. It is also why settler political leaders had established the colonial lobby in the National Assembly by the beginning of the twentieth century; a coalition of colonial interests that became expert at defending the status-quo and blocking change, most obviously with the sabotaging of the Popular Front reforms in 1936. The result was a conservative political culture that immediately stigmatised any liberal Governor-General appointed from Paris as being "pro-Arab". Thus the Radical Maurice Viollette in the mid-1920s and the Socialist Yves Chataigneau in the mid-1940s were known as 'Viollette the Arab' and 'Mohammed Ben Chataigneau' in settler circles because they proposed small measures to promote Muslim equality. In both cases the colonial lobby engineered their early removal. This fear of Paris hardened during the Algerian War itself as settlers became afraid that Paris politicians would

give in to FLN violence. Particular hatred was reserved for the Radical politician Pierre Mendès-France, who had negotiated French withdrawal from Indochina and Tunisia in 1954. These were both seen as betrayals and settlers became fearful that under the Fourth Republic French Algeria would suffer the same fate. Such insecurity explains why Prime Minister Guy Mollet was attacked by settler crowds when he visited Algiers on 6 February 1956. It explains the settler protests in May 1958 that led to the return of de Gaulle. The vast majority of settlers wanted no more anxiety about possible negotiations with the FLN. They wanted to feel secure in the knowledge that the link with France was unbreakable. They wanted to know that their future lay in an Algeria fully integrated into the Republic.

Television

De Gaulle had to find a way through this fraught landscape and here television became the crucial medium, the means by which he connected emotionally with the mass of French people. Of course de Gaulle already understood the importance of the media. During World War Two he made his political name through the radio. Now, however, he had to adapt to the televisual age and this he did because he quickly understood that television was a new way of doing politics. It was a question of the look and the body gestures as well as the voice. In short, he had to communicate in emotional terms.

At this point France was in the midst of a media revolution.⁴¹ Admittedly the print media still predominated with 13 dailies based in Paris and 110 in the provinces, with circulations of 4,300,000 and 7,300,000 respectfully. Similarly, eight out of ten households had a radio; an omnipresence bolstered still further by the invention of the portable transistor. Yet, the television revolution was taking off, even if with seven out of one hundred households owning a set in 1958, France was still far behind the USA and Britain, which had

37 million and 19 million respectively. However, by 1962 this had increased four-fold as television brought moving images directly in homes and bars. Probably more than any other politician de Gaulle understood the implications of this revolution and he immediately took control of the one television channel. Jacques Soustelle, Minister of Information, put Gaullists into key positions, arguing that democracy needed this balance because the press was so anti-Gaullist. Great attention was paid to the control of the news. This always presented the Gaullist message in a positive light, giving blanket saturation not just to television speeches but his press conferences and presidential tours as well, and the result was what Kuhn has termed 'telecracy' – government by television'.⁴²

Initially de Gaulle was ill at ease in front of the cameras. For his first televised address on 27 June 1958 his style was wooden. Moreover, he had no makeup and the lighting was unflattering, adding years to his face. As a result, de Gaulle recognised that he needed training and sought advice from three media experts: Marcel Bleustein-Blanchet, a resistance veteran who was the country's leading advertiser, Jacques Anjubault, a television editor, and Pierre Sabbagh, a seasoned journalist who presented France's first televised news programme in 1949.⁴³ Specifically Bleustein-Blanchet underlined that the television audience was watching not listening. They were scrutinising looks and gestures. They were judging not just the message but how this was being delivered. Four weeks later on 1 August 1958 and the transformation was astonishing. Now de Gaulle's style was emphatic. There was direct eye contact and hand gestures, too, were used to drive home a point. He had become France's first television star.

De Gaulle understood that he had to perform live in front of millions of viewers and for this he needed to appear to be sincere, animated and spontaneous. It was an intimate, highly personal medium, beamed in the main into a domestic context, and to succeed de Gaulle knew that he had to make every French person feel that he was speaking to them on a

one-to-one basis. He needed to reach out to tell people directly and simply what the issues were. In short he had to be an actor and on this basis his television performances encapsulated a forceful mannerism. They projected a stern, performative masculinity that would carry people with him. This made television the perfect medium for de Gaulle because it allowed him to by-pass political parties, parliament and the print based media and speak directly to the people. Indeed, frequently television was the context when he revealed key decisions for the first time. During his time in power between 1958 and 1969 he made 53 television speeches, half of which were during the first four years. Between January 1960 and October 1962, de Gaulle addressed the French people directly 21 times and in each case his interventions were major media events. Eagerly anticipated by viewers, they dominated the television schedules as de Gaulle's used television to establish a new type of emotional politics. So, this was not secret diplomacy or high politics taking place out of the gaze of the vast majority of people. Rather politics was being played out on television in the full public glare. De Gaulle knew that he had to convince viewers emotionally. This meant that audiences were playing an active, and ultimately decisive, role. They were the judges and popular reaction to his television appearances, expressed in opinion polls, the sending of telegrams of support, letters to the media, public demonstrations, was the crucial measure of the success or failure of de Gaulle's performances. As members of a television audience, people were empowered in new ways. They were conscious that, given that millions of others were watching the same broadcast, they were part of a process that was in effect plebiscite by television. Televisual performance was the way in which de Gaulle won support for his political choices which he then backed up with political referendums, thus giving him the popular mandate to carry through the decolonisation process.

Such usage of television also reflected the way in which de Gaulle grasped the new international realities of the late 1950s. He knew that France could no longer impose any

solution by force. He knew that the final outcome had to win popular consent in Algeria and France. It also had to take account of world opinions expressed in the United Nations as well as those of France's key NATO allies, Britain and the USA. For de Gaulle the mass media battle was crucial and here the defenders of French Algeria had no equivalent to de Gaulle's access to state television. They could not connect to such an audience in the same way and as such television became *the* decisive weapon in his armoury. It was the means by which he resolved and won crises. It was how he explained and justified the decolonisation process.

Settler fears

Initially, the settlers were jubilant about de Gaulle as his reception on 4 June 1958 showed. Misgivings quickly began to emerge, however. There was shock at the amnesty for FLN prisoners and the attempts to enter into some sort of dialogue with the FLN.⁴⁴ There was also shock at his derogatory remarks about French Algeria, in particular the words uttered on 29 April 1959 that the 'Algeria of Papa is dead.'⁴⁵ By 1959, many settlers were interpreting his views as ambiguous if not downright hostile. This conclusion fed into longstanding insecurities meaning that settler political leaders such as Pierre Lagailard, deputy for Algiers, and Alain de Sérigny, the owner of the daily *Echo d'Alger*, came to see de Gaulle as the new reformist threat from Paris. This disquiet was mirrored amongst leading officers in the Army, such as Pierre Sergeant and Jean Gardès. Given the huge military effort in Algeria, they could not countenance being sold out by de Gaulle.⁴⁶ For them it was a matter of military honour. The settlers as well as the large numbers of Algerians recruited into the army as part of the counter-insurgency strategy had to be protected. This guarantee was why they worked to bring back de Gaulle in the first place.

For de Gaulle the calculation was different. More and more he was concerned that the Algerian War was holding back his wider plans for French political renewal. Furthermore, he was under pressure from the USA to find a solution because the conflict was potentially pushing large parts of Africa, the Middle East and Asia into the Soviet sphere.⁴⁷ He knew, therefore, that he was about to enter the endgame which meant that, in his eyes, the 1959 offensive was not about maintaining French Algeria but negotiating with the Algerian Provisional Government from a position of strength. This reasoning was the context for his televised speech on 16 September 1959, at just over twenty minutes de Gaulle's longest and most detailed intervention on the Algerian issue. The speech was recorded shortly after midday, following a cabinet meeting, and transmitted that evening at 8.01 pm. Dressed in a suit, underlining his status as a civilian political leader, de Gaulle set out three alternatives: integration, independence or association.⁴⁸ From his choice of words and gestures it was clear that his preferred solution was association. Furthermore, and even more significantly, de Gaulle emphasised that none of these alternatives could be imposed by violence. Algerians must express their preference through a free vote. In other words, de Gaulle was recognising the Algerian right to self-determination, although he clearly hoped that this would lead to association rather than independence.

This recognition was seen as a key step forward by France's allies. It was also supported by French mainland opinion and endorsed by an overwhelming majority in a vote in the National Assembly on 15 October 1959, 441 against 23. There were also positive sounds from Ferhat Abbas, the President of the Algerian Provisional Government, above all because de Gaulle was the first French politician to publically accept Algeria's right to self-determination.⁴⁹ The major exception was the settlers. Initially, the settler population did not react unfavourably. There was some reflection upon what was positive and reassuring in the speech. In an editorial in the *Echo d'Alger* entitled 'Calm, Sang-Froid, but Resolution', Alain

de Séigny welcomed the fact that de Gaulle had stated categorically for the record that he will never negotiate with the Algerian Provisional Government.⁵⁰ On the negative side, though, de Séigny warned that the speech lacked clarity. Even more alarmingly, he continued, the speech, by talking of self-determination, had opened up the possibility that part of the Republic could split away, thereby contradicting the principle of integration that was at the heart of May 1958. In the face of this confusion, de Séigny called upon pro-French Algerian supporters to remain emotionally calm and resolved. Rapidly, however, anger took hold in settler activist circles, reflecting a widespread mood. Led by Charles Martel, a landowner from the Mitidja area just outside of Algiers, the 'Popular Movement 13', an explicit reference to 13 May 1958, immediately denounced the speech as 'shameful' and an 'insult'.⁵¹ In the National Assembly Pierre Lagaille attacked de Gaulle head on:

We have just crossed a decisive step in the process of abandon. Parliament must choose between French Algeria and general de Gaulle. By recognising that Algeria could be become independent, the general de Gaulle has given the FLN a priceless moral victory.⁵²

Likewise for Joseph Ortiz, café owner from Algiers; the speech was a line in the sand. By talking of self-determination de Gaulle was threatening Algeria's status as an integral part of French national territory.⁵³ Ortiz could not accept that his status as a French national, rooted in his opinion in the way that the settler minority had transformed Algeria into a rich and prosperous country, would be determined by a once for all time self-determination vote. As a result Ortiz was determined to resist de Gaulle by all means necessary; an activism that left him and his supporters with a stark choice: 'For us, henceforth, it was the suitcase or the coffin.'⁵⁴

Martel, de Sérigny, Lagaillard and Ortiz were angry that de Gaulle had chosen association over integration and the root of this anger was a precise fear. De Gaulle's proposals were a tangible threat because in their eyes his speech was nothing short of renewed Paris reformism; one that was opening the backdoor to their worst nightmare: Algerian independence.

January 1960: The emotional turning point

On 16 January 1960, *Le Monde* outlined the forthcoming meeting on 22 January at the Elysée Palace.⁵⁵ Uniting all key ministers, civil servants and military leaders responsible for Algeria, *Le Monde* was in no doubt about the significance of the meeting. In advance of de Gaulle's planned visit to Algiers on 5 February, it was going to lead to a major announcement on how the government planned to apply the 16 September policy. As a result all the mounting settler fears were projected on to the meeting in the following days. There was widespread anxiety that de Gaulle was about to impose a formula which would represent the end of French Algeria.

In large part this anxiety was also a response to the resurgence of FLN violence in the area around Algiers, the fertile Mitidja area that was an epicentre of settler farming known as the country's bread basket. Since 1 December 1959, 22 people from the settler farmer community had been killed in attacks on their homes or while working in the fields. Such violence was psychologically unnerving because it was random. It could happen at any moment and anywhere. It was also unnerving because this was intimate violence. These were face-to-face attacks on settlers that showed there were no neat lines between the home front and the battle front. Clearly the settler community in the Mitidja was under siege, which produced a howl of anguish within the settler press. It was a measure of how the Mitidja

settlers were an emotive symbol: they were seen to encapsulate how France had made Algeria into a productive landscape. On 8 January, the *Écho d'Alger* headline was 'Farmers of the Algiers Region want Increased Protection'. The paper reported that a delegation of angry farmers met with Massu and the prefect Deugnier to demand protection.⁵⁶ On the following day a report by Marie Elbe entitled 'The Ferocious Tenacity of Those of the Bled' was couched in terms of a heroic, hard-working community resisting the continual drip-drip threat of FLN violence.⁵⁷ This story of the daily fear, stress and anxiety induced by violence was accompanied by news that an 82 year old had been killed at Ben-Chicao as well as that grenade attacks in the Belcourt and Kouba quartiers in Algiers had left seven dead. These were then followed by reports by Elbe from elsewhere in the region that used very graphic language – on 12 January her headline article carried the banner 'The Throat Cutters of Marengo Killed Yesterday' – designed to strike a fearful chord with the settler readership.⁵⁸

This fear was also captured in a series of eye-witness reports by Eugene Mannoni in *Le Monde* in mid-January.⁵⁹ He explained that many settlers on the ground interpreted this FLN violence as a sign of weakness. Defeated militarily by the offensive launched by General Challe in 1959, the FLN now had no alternative but to attack vulnerable civilians with a hit and run strategy.⁶⁰ This is why the FLN had honed in on the Mitidja settler community, killing, for example, Frappa on his tractor and Madame Ferranda in the courtyard of her farm. Mannoni reported how, in the face of this FLN violence, 'fear is growing and with it bitterness and anger'.⁶¹ Mannoni interviewed one farmer who always carried a revolver while his property was in effect a mini-fortress with barbed wire, mines and a fortified tower backed up by an arsenal of grenades and guns. His reportage also painted a portrait of Boufarik, the main settler town in the Mitidja; a bastion of French Algeria that contained a statue to Amdée Froger, the former mayor assassinated by the FLN in 1956, a further one to Blandon, soldier-hero of the original conquest, in addition to a monument to

‘French colonial genius’.⁶² And here the settlers of Boufarik were adamant that they had not stolen the land from the ‘Arabs’. Rather, they were the first to transform the marshland into flourishing farmland. As one settler explained: ‘Here, monsieur, we did not take the land from the Arabs, it was our grand-parents that made it. It belongs to us and we have the right to live here.’⁶³

The corollary of such fear was anger. According to Mannoni all the settlers he encountered in the Mitidja were strongly opposed to de Gaulle’s policy. This mood was clearly reflected on Tuesday 19 January in a meeting of the Federation of Mayors from the Algiers region in Algiers Town Hall. In advance of the Friday meeting, the Federation passed a motion that warned:

General de Gaulle is about to take some serious decisions. He must know that the wish of the people of Algeria is to remain French, and that they will express this by any method necessary, even taking up arms if this is needed.⁶⁴

Within this meeting the continual reference point was 13 May 1958. Again and again this was invoked as a moment of fraternal hope when, settler and Muslim alike, affirmed their desire for integration into the French Republic.⁶⁵ Likewise, it was seen as a moment that created an indissoluble bond between the army and the supporters of French Algeria. On this basis de Gaulle was now a traitor because, by advocating association, he was betraying the true meaning of 13 May 1958. This reasoning led to the resignation of two mayors from Algiers, Loffred and Pleiber from the Gaullist Party. It was also behind a tract signed by *SOS-Algérie*, formed on 7 January, and entitled ‘Frenchmen of Algeria We call Upon You to Resist’. Drawing explicitly upon the example of World War Two Gaullist Resistance, the tract called for new resistance movement to oppose de Gaulle:

Frenchmen of Algeria who want to remain, we call upon you to resist. We will obey the spirit of 18 June, against the crime of 16 September. Group yourselves around the authentic representatives of 13 May.⁶⁶

Settler anger deepened still further in the wake of de Gaulle's meeting on 19 January in Paris with Lauriol and Laradji, the deputies for Algiers and Blida respectfully. The meeting was widely reported in the Algerian press. Lauriol underlined the 'emotion which reigns in Algeria' and handed over the mayors' motion.⁶⁷ Both were emphatic that association was a chimera and that there are only two choices: integration or independence. De Gaulle was unmoved, telling them: 'You are wrong, it is me who is right.'⁶⁸

Laradji in particular was shocked by de Gaulle's emotional indifference to his own particular plight, given that many in his family had been killed by the FLN. In the face of de Gaulle's intransigence many settlers and pro-French Algeria supporters became all the more fearful that their future was being decided by Paris; a conclusion fuelled still further by the FLN response that seemed to suggest that the offer of self-determination did indeed open the way to independence. In response grass-roots settler organisations voiced these fears as in the case of the 'Action Committee of Railway Workers for the Defence of French Algeria' which passed the following motion:

The big hope of 13 May 1958 is dying in all our hearts. Uncertainty, suspicion, doubt poison our spirit and sap the courageous efforts of the army.⁶⁹

Other organisations went even further. Thus, a *Popular Movement 13* tract talked about de Gaulle as cover for the gravest threat to French Algeria: the Popular Front, which was planning to sell the settlers out to the FLN:

The Popular Front is at the gates of power...Under the shadow of the kepi has grown the worst enemy of France and French people...Come and fight with Martel and his companions in the MP [*Mouvement Populaire*] 13.⁷⁰

The settlers were awash with fear but this trepidation was brought to breaking point by the Jacques Massu Affair. As victor of the 'Battle of Algiers' General Massu was the darling of the Europeans. They knew that Massu was the only leading officer from May 1958 still in post in Algeria, the others had been transferred elsewhere, and this, the reasoning went, was because de Gaulle dared not remove him. De Gaulle knew that this would be too provocative, especially as settler mainstream opinion agreed with Ortiz when he proclaimed that as long as Massu was in Algeria they should feel protected.⁷¹ Massu himself was deeply unhappy with de Gaulle's 16 September speech, so much so that in an interview with the Munich daily *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, published on Monday 18 January, he did not hang back. Encouraged to comment on de Gaulle's policy he expressed his hostility, adding: 'So far [the army] has not shown its power ... At the right moment it can impose its will'.⁷² He even mused that bringing back de Gaulle, now revealing himself to be a man of the left, might have been a 'mistake'.⁷³

Published and reprinted across the world in the following days, the interview was headline news in *Le Monde* on Wednesday 20 January.⁷⁴ Extensively quoting Massu's words, readers were left in no doubt about his opposition to de Gaulle, thereby underlining the fissure that had opened between Paris and Algiers. The first page cover also ran an article by Mannoni, where he outlined the level discontent within the higher echelons of the army in Algeria, the vast majority of whom supported Massu's position.⁷⁵ Momentarily, on Thursday 21 January the *Le Monde* headline suggested that a line had been drawn under the affair.

Admittedly Massu had been summoned to Paris but in a communique he expressed confidence in de Gaulle's policy. Yet, this in turn explains why opinion in Algiers was so shocked at the 22 January meeting. Chaired by de Gaulle, furious at the way in which his authority had been challenged, Massu was immediately relieved of his post. Transferred to Paris he was ordered not to return to Algeria.

Given the emotional bond between Massu and the settlers this was the final insult for the Europeans, especially as the day before, in a meeting in central Algiers one orator, Jacques Susini, a student activist, had incited 2,000 members of the settler activist organisation led by Ortiz in the following terms: 'If necessary, we will go and find Massu in Paris.'⁷⁶ The emotion surrounding Massu was equally evident at the Friday meeting of settler farmers in Boufarik. At several points, mention of Massu produced huge cheers while in conclusion the meeting passed two motions: the first reiterating the Algiers Mayors' motion from three days earlier; the second registering their shock at how civil and military supporters of French Algeria such as Massu had been victimised by the government.⁷⁷ Warning that if such targeting continued it would lead to 'a popular reaction difficult to control', the meeting underlined the need to forge common cause with the army while repeating that 'we will remain against all the odds'.⁷⁸

Settler anger over the Massu Affair was evident on every page of the *Echo d'Alger*. So, although the paper had expressed the hope that Massu would be the spokesperson for settler fears at the Paris meeting, by Friday Alain de Sérigny was under no illusions.⁷⁹ In a front page editorial entitled 'Crime against the *Patrie*' he denounced de Gaulle as a traitor.⁸⁰ Now, according to Sérigny, the future of 55 million French people from Dunkirk to Tamanrasset was in jeopardy because of a policy that 'will lead directly to abandon'.⁸¹ On the following day, in the light of Massu's transfer, Sérigny was even more emphatic,

underlining that the very existence of French Algeria was under threat.⁸² It was clear, Sériigny continued, that an unbridgeable gap was opening up between Paris and Algiers:

It is certain that the gap is getting deeper and deeper between the Algerian policy outlined and put into practice by Paris and the opinion of Algerians from all the communities of this country, also that of the vast majority of the army, loyal to their oath of 13 May 1958.⁸³

Alongside the editorials, the 22 January and 23 January editions also contained extensive reporting on the building of barricades and the occupation of Algiers University by angry settler activists led by Ortiz and Lagaille. Claiming that these protests were recalling the heady fraternal atmosphere of May 1958, the front page carried a photograph of Muslim ex-servicemen at the barricades; a reflection of the way in which Sériigny sought to present his anti-Gaullist perspective as one that was uniting settler and Muslim alike.⁸⁴ Specifically, the paper presented these protests as a legitimate expression of settler fear and anger. In this way it focused not just upon the building of the barricades but on the symbols that were pinned to these barricades as well, such as the military medals, French flags and pictures of Massu, seen in the reports as measures of their emotional attachment to France and being French.

The stage was now set for a confrontation between the Algiers protestors and de Gaulle. As the mood became more confrontational, particularly because part of the army was clearly sympathetic to the insurgents, the Minister-Resident, Paul Delouvrier, intervened with a radio address on 23 January that was designed to reassure the settlers and calm emotions. In France, de Gaulle returned to Paris from his country home in the early hours of Sunday morning and, lacking the time to prepare a television speech, delivered a brief radio address at 2.40 am that was also dropped in leaflet form on the insurgents by helicopter. In the

meantime, there was the question of what to do about the armed insurgents. Here it was clear that the senior officers, including the commanders of the regiments of the Tenth Parachute Division, would not shoot on the insurgents.⁸⁵ As a result General Challe looked towards the Gendarmerie Nationale. However, as a company of armed police moved in to dismantle the barricades, settler insurgents opened fire leaving 24 officers dead and a further 140 wounded. One eye-witness, the journalist Edward Behr, subsequently described the shooting as a moment of physical and emotional cruelty:

During and after the firing, scenes of incredible brutality were witnessed by the gendarmerie survivors; at least one gendarmerie trooper was killed in cold blood by maddened European youths; others were paraded up and down lifts in neighbouring buildings. European women were seen pouring shot after shot on to the trapped security squad from the windows of the buildings surrounding the War Memorial.⁸⁶

At the subsequent trial over the 'Barricades Week' in autumn 1960, General Germain Costes, the Algiers Area Commander, conjured up the atmosphere in the following terms:

Algiers was against self-determination, guided by a thoroughly orchestrated movement. By whom? First by the local press, particularly *L'Echo d'Alger*, by student groups, ex-servicemen's organisations. By deputies, mayors, and councillors. Some published statements were a direct incitement to murder.⁸⁷

As a uniformed servant of the state he could not accept that Algiers could impose its will on Paris. This is why he sent in the gendarmerie. But at no point did he envisage French people firing on their own police and here Costes underlined the complicity of the Ten Parachute Division.⁸⁸ In his opinion the paratroopers, clearly sympathetic to the insurgents, deliberately hung back, thereby leaving the police company fatally exposed.

In this sense the shooting was a crucial moment. It showed that that elements of the army were willing to side with the insurgents in their conflict with de Gaulle. And, even more significantly, as French citizens fired upon their police, it showed the civil war implications of the unfolding situation. For this reason in his 25 January *Echo d'Alger* editorial, Sérigny studiously tried to find some unity in the bloodshed.⁸⁹ Describing the events as 'a tragic day in the struggle to maintain French Algeria', the editorial underlined that protestors immediately attended to the wounded gendarmes. However, in the following week the conflict between Algiers and Paris hardened. The paratroopers of the Tenth Division did nothing to clear the barricades, mingling with the insurgents and letting them come and go as they pleased. Indeed, at regular intervals Colonel Gardes met with Ortiz. The insurgents in turn received mass support from the settlers who kept them supplied with food, drink and ammunition.

How, however, were the Algiers events seen by settlers in the rest of the country? In terms of the press, in the east of the country, the major settler organ, *La Dépêche Constantinoise*, was full-square behind the Algiers protestors as the paper reported on the mounting tensions, even claiming that Muslims were supporting the rebellion.⁹⁰ Articles placed particular emphasis on settler meetings and demonstrations of support in the region and at no point was the logic of the Algiers protest called into question. In contrast, the largest selling daily newspaper in the western part of the country, the *Echo d'Oran*, adopted a slightly different tone. So, although Pierre Laffont, the local deputy and editorial writer, repeatedly shared the anger at the violence against settlers in the Mitidja, he also warned of the danger of rebelling against de Gaulle.⁹¹ In this respect he called upon the government to arrest and guillotine the FLN perpetrators who were acting in violation of the 'laws of war' because such resolute actions would calm settler fears. They had no desire to overthrow de

Gaulle, he claimed. Furthermore, he continued, this would disarm those settler extremists who are exploiting their worries to pursue their own political agenda:

Algeria, overall, understands the madness that would be revolt against the head of state, against metropolitan France which supports him. Our populations will only let themselves be lead there if they are persuaded that there remains no other solution to remain French, in order to live on this land that is theirs.⁹²

As such, he implied, settlers must take their lead from the more emotionally calmer Oran rather than hot headed Algiers. This tone was also present in the factual reporting on demonstrations of support in the region. These included the building of one barricade, as well as, on 24 January, car horns tapping out French Algeria, while several hundred demonstrators descended on the city centre to voice their support of Massu and denunciation of de Gaulle.⁹³ But in each case, the paper underlined, speakers called for calm.

In the meantime, as the implications of the Sunday violence sunk in, the Algiers protest movement still did not back down. On Tuesday morning, thousands of settlers marched from the Plateau de Glières in central Algiers to the Post Office before finishing in front of the Town Hall. Symbolically, during the march the crowd stopped and congregated around the statue of Joan of Arc. Oran witnessed a strike that was to last five days while Tuesday saw a 10,000 demonstration that repeatedly lionised the role of the army and Massu in defending French Algeria.⁹⁴ At the same time, every day the *Echo d'Oran* contained page after page on demonstrations proclaiming the region's determination to remain French right across the Oran region, putting particular stress on images of Franco-Muslim fraternisation.⁹⁵ These demonstrations, the articles underlined, were never violent. Rather, by focussing upon local war monuments, they were dignified, resolute and above all patriotic.⁹⁶ In this vein, the Thursday 28 January headline was about how, in the presence of 20,000 people, delegates of

the local Teachers Union had put flowers and a French flag on Oran's principal war monument in memory of the civilians and soldiers who had given their lives for French Algeria. The crowd then heard the local deputy, Sid Cara, proclaim:

I have come here to share your fate ... I am here to proclaim very loud our wish for total integration, French-Europeans and French-Muslims in the heart of the French Republic.⁹⁷

In the east *La Dépêche Constantinoise* pursued the same media campaign in favour of integration. Throughout the week the paper gave blanket coverage to meetings, strikes and demonstrations supporting the Algiers rebellion. Again the focus was on the role of war monuments as symbols of patriotic attachment to France, and on claims that the insurgents have received support from Muslim ex-servicemen and women.⁹⁸ The message, therefore, right across the settler press was one of patriotic unity; an outpouring of feeling, it was hoped, that would convince de Gaulle to turn back from his self-determination policy.

The speech

If settler opinion was fully behind the rebellion's sentiments, despite some reservations about the violent tactics, French mainland opinion was horrified. Photographs of the returning gendarmes' coffins and the sight of grieving relatives had a major impact on French public opinion. All the major newspapers were appalled by the shooting. *Le Monde's* editorial on Tuesday 26 January was entitled 'Criminal Madness' and over the following days the paper's columns registered overwhelming backing for de Gaulle. They took the form of telegrams which inundated the Elysée Palace, opinion polls, as well as messages of support from all the major political parties and trade unions.⁹⁹ In the meantime, Michel Debré went to Algiers to assess the situation see for himself, while Delouvrier moved his headquarters to the Reghaïa

air force camp, eighteen miles east of Algiers, in order to show that at least part of the Army was still loyal to de Gaulle.

De Gaulle did not respond by television immediately. He decided to wait until Friday 29 Jan at 8.00 pm. This scheduling created a sense of expectation that would ensure that his image, gestures and words, rather than those of the insurgents, occupied centre-stage. The speech was recorded live and broadcast on television and radio. The fact that the speech was delivered from the Elysée Palace and for the first time in uniform, thus symbolising de Gaulle's personal legitimacy as World War Two Resistance leader, meant that in visual terms the speech was an assertion of state authority by television. He wanted to demonstrate that he, not the rebels, was in command. The speech was just over 18 minutes long. Gradually becoming more self-assured, de Gaulle adopted a stern tone that was backed up by forceful body gestures. Carefully constructed, the speech sought to connect with different parts of his audience in a manner that was frank and unambiguous.

Firstly, de Gaulle underlined his personal and political authority:

If I have put on my uniform today to address you on television, it is in order to show that it is General de Gaulle who speaks, as well as the Head of State.¹⁰⁰

He then underlined that France wished to find a peaceful solution. This was because:

It is obvious that the unity, the progress and the prestige of the French people are at stake, and that the future of this people is blocked as long as the Algerian problem remains unsolved.¹⁰¹

Here de Gaulle reiterated that he would not be detracted from his self-determination policy.

There was no going back he underlined. Once a ceasefire had been established, Algerians had to be allowed to make a free choice:

This will not be dictated to them. For if their response was not really *their* response, then, while for a time there might be military victory, basically nothing would be settled. On the contrary, everything can be settled and, I believe, settled in France's favour, when the Algerians have had an opportunity to make known their will in all freedom, dignity and security. In short, self-determination is the only policy worthy of France. It is the only possible outcome.¹⁰²

This common sense middle-way solution 'defined by the President of the Republic, decided upon by the Government, approved by the Parliament, and adopted by the French nation' was, he continued, threatened by two emotional extremes who 'do not want any part of this free choice'.¹⁰³ On the one hand there was the FLN, simply referred to as 'the rebel organisation', which saw itself as a government in waiting, a legitimacy that he could never accept.¹⁰⁴ On the other were the rebels in Algiers who are trying 'to force their pretended claims on the nation, on the State, and on myself'.¹⁰⁵ These insurgents, de Gaulle underlined, have 'fired on the forces of law and order and killed fine soldiers'.¹⁰⁶ At this point de Gaulle made reference to 'the accommodating uncertainty of various military elements', accompanying this comment with a disparaging hand gesture, before talking of the 'fears and passions stirred up by the agitators' that had led to the Algiers rebellion.¹⁰⁷ However, the action of these settler insurgents is madness, he argued, and turned on the military officers that were complicit with the rebels.

Because of them, there is a danger that a disruption of the national unity may occur, to the indignation of the French nation and in the very midst of the struggle being waged against the rebels. There is not a man with any common sense who does not see what the inevitable consequences would be if this dreadful secession carried the day.¹⁰⁸

At this point de Gaulle reached out in an emotionally emphatic manner to ordinary settlers. His intention was to assuage their anxiety and to this end he reminded them of the exceptional bond that existed between him and their community, using an intimate language to emphasise this close and special relationship. He referred to his time as head of the Provisional Government during World War Two and his time there in May 1958; because of this history, there were 'very special ties that are very dear to me and very much alive'.¹⁰⁹ He stressed too their contribution to the liberation of France. On the basis of this special emotional bond he called on them not be lead astray by 'the liars and conspirators who tell you that in granting a free choice to the Algerians, France and de Gaulle want to abandon you, to pull out of Algeria and hand it over to the rebellion.'¹¹⁰ How, he tried to reassure them, could he be preparing to abandon them, given the presence of 500,000 troops, the economic investment in the Sahara, and the social transformation of the Muslim population. In this context, he continued, nothing would give him greater joy than if Algerians chose the most French solution.

Next de Gaulle spoke directly to the army. Congratulating the army on military victory, he underlined notions of loyalty, discipline, hierarchy. He warned against those soldiers who had come to believe that 'this war is their war, not that of France.'¹¹¹ He reiterated the nature of army's mission in Algeria:

You have to liquidate the rebel force that wants to chase France out of Algeria and rain down on this country its dictatorship of misery and sterility ... you have to contribute to the moral and material transformation of the Muslim population, in order to bring them onto the side of France through hearts and minds. When the moment comes to proceed to the consultation, you will have to guarantee its complete and sincere freedom.¹¹²

Now, with a tone of Olympian disdain, he warned that unless officers accepted this discipline then the army would disintegrate into ‘an anarchic and absurd conglomeration of military feudalisms’.¹¹³ Pointing his finger, he warned that:

no soldier, under the penalty of being guilty of a serious offence, may associate himself, may associate himself at any time, even passively, with the insurrection. In the last analysis, law and order must be re-established ... your duty is to bring this about. I have given, am giving, this order.¹¹⁴

By this point de Gaulle, visibly straining every sinew in his body to carry his television audience, returned to underline his personal legitimacy as the leader of the World War Two Resistance, speaking of his unique and intimate relationship between him, France and French people:

Finally, I speak to France. Well, my dear country, my old country, here we are together, once again, facing a harsh test. By virtue of the mandate that the people have given me and of the national legitimacy that I have embodied for twenty years, I ask all men and women to support me, no matter what happens.¹¹⁵

Then, as he moved towards his final climax, de Gaulle’s words and body language became all the more unflinching. He wanted to show to his audience that under no condition was he going to yield to Algiers. Otherwise, ‘France would become but a poor broken toy adrift on the sea of hazards’.¹¹⁶

On 31 January *Le Monde* praised de Gaulle’s speech as a brilliant television performance and in the following days the paper reflected mass metropolitan backing for de Gaulle. It reported on how the Elysée Palace was overwhelmed with messages of solidarity. It reported, too, on the millions who went on strike across France in support of his stance on Monday 1 February.¹¹⁷ With that one intervention he had defeated the insurgents, the daily claimed, and

on Tuesday *Le Monde*'s headline stated simply: 'The Insurrection has Ended in Algiers'.¹¹⁸

The rebellion, as the journalist Edward Behr later noted, was broken by de Gaulle's voice:

I happened to be inside the barricades when his 29 January broadcast came through [...] This, one of his finest speeches, including as it did a stigmatization of certain army elements 'accommodating uncertainty' had an immediate effect upon the insurgents and the army alike: as soon as the speech ended, I watched men and women break down and cry with impotent rage; within hours, the Tenth Parachutist Division cut off all contacts with the insurgents, and next day they allowed themselves to be relieved.¹¹⁹

Unlike the Tenth Division, the new forces, units of the Twenty-Fifth Parachute Division, had, Behr underlined, 'no sentimental ties with Algiers' and rapidly cordoned off the centre.¹²⁰

Seeing the writing on the wall, Lagailarde and Ortiz disbanded their armed camps and by midday on the Monday their rebellion was over.

Yet, if de Gaulle's televised speech was one decisive factor, the other was mass Muslim indifference. From beginning, as *Le Monde* reported, settlers in the armed Territorial Units had gone into the Muslim quarter to win their support for the rebellion.¹²¹ However, once it became clear that the overwhelming majority were emotionally unmoved by the revolt, these settlers tried to force them to shout anti-de Gaulle slogans, close shops and go on strike; intimidation that was met with a point blank refusal. Muslim gestures of support, although widely reported in the settler press, were small scale. At no point was there a repeat of the Franco-Muslim fraternisation that was an undeniable characteristic of May 1958 and this was a telling difference. No less importantly, de Gaulle received international support from France's NATO allies, most crucially Britain and the USA. Furthermore, all the leading press organs in both Britain and the USA welcomed de Gaulle's stance as a major

psychological turning point.¹²² Henceforth, they concluded, the settlers could no longer hold the French state to ransom.

In terms of support for de Gaulle, the one exception was the settler press. In the case of the *Echo d'Alger* on 30 January the paper accepted that de Gaulle had won with the headline 'General de Gaulle maintains the framework of his policy of 16 September', but nevertheless the editorial was still vehemently anti-Gaullist, which is why it was censored by the French authorities.¹²³ Likewise, *La Dépêche Constantinoise* also recognised that de Gaulle was the victor because he had not retreated one iota from his self-determination policy.¹²⁴ In contrast, the *Echo d'Oran* was more conciliatory. The paper accepted de Gaulle's victory with the headline 'De Gaulle shows himself to be inflexible on his Algerian policy'.¹²⁵ However, Pierre Laffont's editorial spoke of a province that was 'exhausted by emotion' while simultaneously recognising de Gaulle's authority.¹²⁶ In this respect, the editorial continued, de Gaulle needed to understand that the revolt was motivated by 'anguish' and 'desperation' resulting from the 'silences and reticence of the government'.¹²⁷ At the same time Laffont saw hope in de Gaulle's speech, which, in his view, stemmed from three key points: the rejection of any negotiations with the FLN; the role of the army in overseeing the self-determination process; and the sense that de Gaulle will support integration if he feels it corresponds to wishes of the majority'.¹²⁸ Now, the editorial concluded, everyone's duty was to build on these passages and work for this 'victory of France'.¹²⁹ Laffont, therefore, was doing his utmost to maintain bridges with de Gaulle by supporting the government backed integrationist policy to keep Algeria within the French Republic. To this end, all the paper's articles encapsulated a tone of reconciliation with the metropole with numerous reports and photographs on marches across the region to war monuments.¹³⁰ These, it was claimed, were conducted in an air of dignity, calm and self-restraint. In other words they were all a humble and sincere expression of the emotional

desire to remain French in a French province. They climaxed with a pilgrimage to Santa-Cruz, the Roman Catholic Church on the hill overlooking Oran, to pray for peace on 1 Feb 1960.¹³¹

The reality, though, was that the settler rebels were hopelessly isolated because they received no significant support from either the Muslim population, metropolitan France or international opinion. This isolation was at the root of their rapid defeat, which was further reinforced when, de Gaulle disbanded the settler Territorial Units, transferred disloyal officers, and put in place new institutions to carry through his self-determination policy. No less importantly, the ‘Barricades Week’ opened up the real possibility of negotiations with the FLN because now it was clear that de Gaulle, unlike his predecessors under the Fourth Republic, would not be dictated by the settlers or the army.

The emotional and political consequences

On 11 April 1961 de Gaulle gave a press conference at the Elysée Palace to 600 of the world’s journalists. Knowing that he had to relaunch the talks with the Algerian Provisional Government that had just stalled, de Gaulle cut through any emotion and made a hard-nosed economic assessment. When looked at objectively, he explained, it was obvious: ‘Algeria is costing us, this is the least one can say, much more than it brings to us.’¹³² Nor, he continued, did France have any objection to Algerians constructing an independent state that would be sovereign in respect to both internal and external relations: ‘It is a fact: decolonisation is in our interest and, consequently, our policy.’¹³³ With these words, de Gaulle was sending a clear signal to the Provisional Government. He was stating definitively that France wished to leave Algeria because the country no longer had political, economic or geo-strategic interests there. Disentangling France from Algeria was now in French national interests.

The speech reflected the way in which de Gaulle's reasoning had evolved since 1960 and hardened into a resolution to carry through a decolonisation process. This shift had become obvious in a series of televised addresses beginning with his speech of 14 June 1960, the first about Algeria since the 'Barricades Week'. He talked eloquently of the need to face the realities of the moment. Empire, de Gaulle explained, was over:

The spirit of the century ... leads us to bring an end to colonisation ... It is quite natural that one feels nostalgia for what was the Empire, just as one can regret the gentleness of oil lamps, the splendour of sailing ships ... But for what? No policy is worth anything outside of reality.¹³⁴

Then, on 4 November, de Gaulle went further than any previous French leader, recognising that the future lay with an Algerian Algeria, which would 'exist one day' with its own government.¹³⁵

As de Gaulle's decolonisation narrative took on a clear shape, it was moulded upon four emotional calculations, the first of which was the emotional othering of French Algeria. In 1956 the FLN had been the 'other'. It had been stigmatised as a minority that was being manipulated by Nasser's Egypt and ultimately the Soviet Union; a threat to France's strategic interests, which is why the Fourth Republic had committed so many resources to defending French sovereignty. By April 1961 a new 'other' had come into view. The first part of this 'other' were pro-French Algerian officers, while the second part were settlers who both rejected de Gaulle's attempt to reach out to them in the 29 January 1960 speech. Instead, they clung to the notion of French Algeria, which meant that in the eyes of de Gaulle and the mainland majority they were seen to be irresponsible, extremist and increasingly fascist. This perception reflected deeply rooted patterns of prejudice where the European settlers were viewed as highly emotional, that is aggressive, intransigent, hyper-masculine Mediterranean

types who thought with their hearts and not their minds. For de Gaulle, the settlers embodied an illegitimate street masculinity that by challenging his authority was threatening to lead France into chaos and disintegration. De Gaulle, therefore, used his carefully choreographed political masculinity to harness mainland support in a way that would allow him to exorcise French Algeria. Accordingly, the settlers became conflated into a generalised mainland view that saw Algeria as a shorthand for irrational, intractable violence; a ‘box of sorrows’ that must be finished with, as de Gaulle told one meeting of civil servants in 1961.¹³⁶ As such, the settlers were associated with long standing stereotypical images about North Africa as a place of unbelievable brutality and were ascribed the Arabo-Berber inherent predilection for violence. For de Gaulle the French future now lay in successfully uncoupling the hexagone from this quagmire. Such reasoning was at the core of de Gaulle’s decolonisation logic as he told Alain Peyrefitte, Gaullist deputy and part of the Gaullist inner circle, in December 1960. For de Gaulle the settlers were now the problem because they refused to accept reality. Rather than adapt to ‘Algerian Algeria’, they chose to still fight for French Algeria: ‘As if this magic formula is going to save them! But French Algeria is not the solution, it is the problem! It is not the remedy, it is the evil!’¹³⁷ This was because French Algeria, de Gaulle explained, underlining he saw this for himself during his time in Algiers during World War Two, was based upon an equation where the settlers treated the ‘Arabs’ like minions, while expecting the French state to prop up this system:

That is what French Algeria was. That is what we need to get away from, because that should never have existed, and today, in any case, that can no longer persist.¹³⁸

The second emotional calculation was the acceptance of the political strength of Algerian nationalism and here the final crystallising moment was the response to de Gaulle’s visit to Algeria in December 1960. When in Tlemcen, near the Moroccan border, he had plunged into the Muslim crowd and, as he shook hands and greeted people, their response was joyous.

They felt that de Gaulle was on their side with the result that his visit produced a dramatic and overwhelming outpouring of collective Algerian nationalist emotion. Footage and photographs, like those captured by the Magnum photographer Nicolas Tikhomiroff, showed thousands of Algerians acting in a manner that was fearless, spontaneous and self-confident, brandishing FLN flags while covering their quarters with graffiti such as 'Long Live Independent Muslim Algeria' 'Long Live GPRA' and Long Live the Algerian Republic'.¹³⁹ One official army report on 18 December 1960 in the Oran region also talked of this mass nationalist sentiment, underlining that most Algerians, putting their own emotional and political content into de Gaulle's words, now considered that independence was imminent:

But they give this formula the sense of 'Algeria is ours', or 'Algeria for the Arabs'. It seems that the step which separates this Algerian Algeria from independence is minimal and easily crossed, racial and religious fanaticism, the hatred of the 'Spanish', the desire to replace the Europeans in the public sector and the hope to take possession of their property are motors that are difficult to stop.¹⁴⁰

The same report emphasised that the settlers displayed no such connection with de Gaulle. On the contrary there was widespread hatred because he was now seen to have set irrevocably on a policy of abandon.

December 1960 was an emotional tipping point but one unexpected by the FLN, which also led to a shift to mass political action. Previously the FLN had always talked of the importance of popular action. Indeed the headline slogan of the FLN paper, *El Moudjahid*, was 'by the people, for the people'. Yet, in practice the FLN was reticent about mass action, preferring instead a strategy of violent terrorism carried out by a minority vanguard.¹⁴¹ Now, however, the FLN entered a new terrain: coordinated mass protest. Particular emphasis was

placed upon the management of emotions. Again and again, FLN documents stressed the need for dignified composure on the part of Algerians. So in the case of the FLN call for a general strike on 9 January 1961, clear guidelines for behaviour were set. FLN orders underlined that Algerians must respond to this call of ‘duty and honour’ with ‘calm and dignity’ also marking their grief at ‘our glorious dead’ with prayer.¹⁴² In this way the FLN wished to seize the moral high ground. Through a carefully choreographed display based upon purpose and self-discipline the FLN wanted to demonstrate to French and world opinion that Algerian nationalism was emotionally in control.

Such displays made it impossible to deny Algerian nationalism but this conclusion was coloured by de Gaulle’s third emotional calculation: the higher interests of the French state. His fundamental argument on 11 April 1961 was that French Algeria was no longer in the interest of the French state. In fact, on the contrary, it was doing untold damage. It was, as he explained to Peyrefitte, a drain on resources that was blocking modernisation. Once understood in this way, de Gaulle argued, it was clear that French Algeria had to be sacrificed for the long term good of the state. The French state had to be decolonised and reordered according to a different set of political and emotional priorities. But if for de Gaulle reordering was one part of the equation, the other was preservation of French national identity. Already in March 1959 de Gaulle had confided to Peyrefitte that he did not see how France could absorb 10 million Muslims who would become 20 million and then 40 million. For him this would mean that France would no longer be France, that is ‘a European people of a white race, Greek and Latin culture and Christian religion’.¹⁴³ For him, therefore, assimilation was a chimera. In his eyes, the Algerian majority were not French and never could be and this is why France had to leave.

Part of this third emotional calculation was the question of metropolitan opinion. By 1959 there was a war weariness on the mainland that was reflected in the opinion polls with

58% already favouring ceasefire negotiations with the FLN in January 1958, which rose to 63% one year later and 71% in March in 1959.¹⁴⁴ Concerned about the fate of the conscripts, metropolitan opinion wanted some sort of honourable exit and they were looking to de Gaulle to provide a palatable solution. He was increasingly perturbed by the impact of the conflict on the young generation.¹⁴⁵ The emotional priorities of the settlers and the French mainland were increasingly divergent; a divergence that was solidified still further by the 'Week of the Barricades' as Maurice Duverger, writing in *Le Monde* in the midst of the January 1960 crisis, underlined.¹⁴⁶ For him, the interests of the metropole and French Algerian were no longer the same. What was needed according to Duverger was a referendum process that would allow the mainland majority to express this difference and thereby empower de Gaulle to carry through decolonisation. As such, it was an uncannily accurate description of what transpired over the following two and half years, when the mainland majority expressed its emphatic endorsement of decolonisation through two processes: the ballot box and its reactions to de Gaulle's television performances.

In assessing the exact interests of the French state, de Gaulle's final emotional calculation was the international one. By 1960 de Gaulle was under intense pressure from Britain and the USA to end the Algerian crisis, principally because it was stirring up anti-Western feeling across world in the context of the Cold War. He was also painfully aware that Algeria was dangerously isolating France at the UN. Then, finally, there was the broader decolonisation process. The British Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan, had recognised the reality of this process with his 'Wind of Change' speech in South Africa on 3 February 1960, while de Gaulle himself had accepted the break-up of the Franco-African community, as all members acceded to full blown independence between January and December 1960.¹⁴⁷ In this context to refuse Algerian independence stood out even more so as an anomaly. For de Gaulle, looked at from whatever angle, Algeria was clearly harming France's image on the

world stage, preventing, as de Gaulle so clearly wanted, the country from taking a leading role in global affairs.

Such an emotional reordering was not easy, especially for a man of de Gaulle's generation. This was clear from a conversation with Peyrefitte at the Elysée Palace on 19 November 1961 on the subject of the possible partition of Algeria where the settlers would be grouped together onto a French protected territory. Peyrefitte, on de Gaulle's orders, had explored the possibilities of such a solution, arguing forcefully that France could not abandon the settlers and hand over the entirety of Algeria to the FLN. However, at this point de Gaulle replied vehemently:

And me, do you believe that this gives me a happy heart? Me who was brought up in the religion of the flag, of French Algeria and French Africa, of the army as the guarantor of the Empire? Do you believe that it is not painful? Do you believe that it is not painful for me to lower the colours, wherever that is in the world?¹⁴⁸

It was a telling exchange; one that underlined just how much decolonisation and the end of French Algeria was an emotionally painful process for de Gaulle, even if he believed that it was now in French interests.

Moreover, this emotional outburst returns us to the model of 'emotional nexus' outlined at the beginning of the article. Undoubtedly, as de Gaulle's words show, coming to terms with decolonisation was difficult. Yet, he also saw it as absolutely necessary and in this respect he constructed his 'emotional nexus' in terms of detachment, distance and rational assessment. In short, decolonisation was about standing back as a leader and assuming a long-term perspective on the future of France. In contrast, he argued, the settlers were emotionally incapable of performing this mental feat because their lives were hopelessly bound up with French Algeria. For de Gaulle, their own 'emotional nexus' meant that they

were too close to the object to act rationally. Crucially, he reasoned, this proximity meant that they could not see that French Algeria, based as it was on Muslim exclusion and the denial of Algerian nationalism, no longer had the capacity to survive in a new world of human rights.

The end of a colonial settler society

De Gaulle's 11 April 1961 speech, signalling his readiness to accept the prospect of a fully sovereign Algerian nation state, was the final spark for the leading officers who on 21 April led a putsch. Horrified by the manner in which de Gaulle had reduced French Algeria to a cold-hearted financial calculation, the putsch was commanded by Generals Challe, Jouhaud, Salan and Zeller. Their aim, though, was not some form of independent settler state but a swift three month campaign that would destroy the FLN militarily, thus presenting the government with a *fait accompli* which would ensure that Algeria remained as a French province. The whole operation was poorly planned and began to unravel as it started. However, here, as in January 1960, the decisive factor was de Gaulle's television intervention at 8.00 pm on Sunday 23 April. Wearing his general's uniform for the second and last time, de Gaulle was utterly contemptuous of the four leaders and what they represented. They were, he told his audience, utterly detached from the realities of the modern world and he ordered the conscripts not to follow their orders. It was another example of plebiscite by television, as mainland France overwhelmingly backed de Gaulle's performance.¹⁴⁹

Ironically, the putsch accelerated the decolonisation process as metropolitan opinion now looked to de Gaulle to provide a rapid exit strategy. They wanted him to combat settler violence and the *Organisation de l'Armée Secrète* (OAS), formed in Madrid in January 1961, and produce some sort of acceptable negotiated withdrawal that was premised upon the emotional and political priorities of the metropole. This logic meant that France must leave

no matter what, which is why in a televised press conference on 5 September 1961 de Gaulle, in an effort to restart the stalled negotiations, accepted that the Sahara was territorially part of Algeria, thereupon overturning all French attempts to present the Sahara and its attendant oil and gas resources as a separate French controlled entity. It meant also that France must not be dragged into back into Algeria once any ceasefire had been concluded. The page needed to be turned and this is why mainland French people greeted the final peace agreement on 19 March 1962 with relief, even if they recognised that this agreement was ‘disadvantageous’ to the settlers.¹⁵⁰

With the calendar for independence in place, the final process was then about calming emotions. So, in advance of referendum, the French government tried to convince the settlers that this agreement contained clear guarantees, which meant they could remain; a message of peace and reconciliation between the communities reflected in a series of films, posters and official pronouncements. However, once it became clear that the settlers were leaving en masse, de Gaulle imposed a set of priorities. He made it clear that while these settlers could be absorbed into France because they were French, this was not the case for the *harkis*, those Algerians who had been recruited into the anti-FLN militias.¹⁵¹ For de Gaulle, they were ethnically and culturally not French and this emotional indifference to suffering, necessary, he believed, for French interests, was why so many were left to be massacred in Algeria. The result was a violent and long term reordering of France, whereby the national territory now became resolutely hexagonal. In this context, French Algeria became a focus of official amnesia as Gaullist France sought to channel the nation’s emotional energy elsewhere, above all into the construction of a new forward looking society based upon modernisation and consumerism.

Conclusion

In early 1962 Nelson Mandela visited FLN bases in Morocco.¹⁵² Peering through his binoculars he saw Algeria as the closest example to what he was confronted with in South Africa, principally because of the presence of a settler population. This was a fascinating insight, especially given how Lorenzo Veracini has come to see South Africa as the archetypal settler society alongside Australia, Canada, the USA and New Zealand as well as Israel/Palestine. How does the end of French Algeria fit with the Veracini model? In general terms, it shows that, even though undoubtedly the triangular relationships between metropolitan, settler and indigenous agencies is a key to understanding the dynamics of French Algeria, this triangular relationship must be nuanced much further. The model must recognise that these agencies are not blocs. There was, for example, a hierarchy amongst the settlers. Furthermore, this model must be expanded to a four-way relationship that includes the shifting and multi-faceted international context. Finally, it must also integrate the history of emotions because these relationships comprised of an ‘emotional nexus’. They were always talked about and experienced in emotional terms.

Specifically, though, French Algeria displays a number of striking similarities with Veracini’s largely Anglophone examples. As in Australia and South Africa, the settlers moved into a new space and established their ascendancy upon violent displacement and unequal relations. Consequently, in the same way, the pillars of French Algeria were based upon the idea that the ‘natives’ could be eliminated, absorbed or at least pushed to the margins. In the same way too the settlers displayed a strong strain of what Veracini has termed ‘indigenisation’ and a strong sense of a distinctive identity and hostility to Paris. The metropole/French Algeria dichotomy was deeply ingrained and in this context the settlers resented Parisian interference in a manner very similar to Veracini’s model.¹⁵³ Veracini talks about how in the unfolding relationships between ‘the settler coloniser, the indigenous

colonised and a variety of differently categorised subaltern exogenous alterities' the role of the metropolitan imperial state resembles that of an adjudicator.¹⁵⁴ Here, Veracini continues, indigenous and subaltern exogenous others appeal to the European sovereign to articulate grievances emanating from settler abuse. However, as the metropolitan agency interposes its sovereignty between settler and indigenous or subaltern exogenous communities this interference is resented by the settlers. They insist on their capacity to control indigenous policy because their eventual goal is to assert their sovereignty against both the metropole and 'indigenous residues'. Nascent settler rule is thus pitted both against that of the imperial metropole and what remains of the indigenous community; a dynamic that was certainly present in French Algeria, in particular in the way in which, as this article shows, the settler political elites always tried to block reforms emanating from Paris. They were always interpreted as being 'pro-Arab'.

Nevertheless this last point underlines how, for all these similarities to Australia and South Africa, French Algeria was also fundamentally different. In terms of the British Empire, the formalisation of Dominion status in 1931 opened the path to independence, whereupon Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa became in effect emerging states with their own armies and police forces. This was never the case with French Algeria. Colonial and settler colonialism were never disentangled there. French Algeria never ended in an unchallenged state and people. Instead, French Algeria used the threat of separatism to extract concessions from the metropole, as in 1901 when it achieved a measure of budgetary independence. However, by the mid-1950s most settlers saw their future in terms of an unbreakable bond with France, which is why the settler standard call in January 1960s was integration not independence.

As such French Algeria never became, in Veracini's model, a fully-fledged settler colonial society. As the experience of the OAS showed, it did not have the resources to

mirror the South African Apartheid regime in 1960, which broke away from Britain and the Commonwealth and declared itself an independent republic. It always needed the protection of the French state, which is why once de Gaulle accepted withdrawal French Algeria was finished. In short this was a settler society that experienced decolonisation.

¹ On the workings of the colonial lobby see Stuart Michael Persell, *The French Colonial Lobby 1889-1938* (Stanford: Hoover Institute Press, 1983).

² On the relationship between subjectivity, emotion and gender see Michael Roper, 'Slipping Out of View: Subjectivity and Emotion in Gender History', *History Workshop Journal*, 2005, 59:1, pp.57-72.

³ Henry Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy* (Paris: Seuil, 1987).

⁴ Benjamin Stora, *La Gangrène et l'Oubli: la Mémoire de la Guerre d'Algérie* (Paris: La Découverte, 1991).

⁵ Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010).

⁶ On this see Martin Evans, *Algeria: France's Undeclared War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), and Benjamin Stora, *Le Mystère de Gaulle. Son Choix pour l'Algérie* (Paris: Laffont, 2009).

⁷ On this see Maurice Vaïsse (ed), *De Gaulle et l'Algérie* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2012).

⁸ Charles de Gaulle, *Discours et Messages: Avec le Renouveau (mai 1958 – juillet 1962)* (Paris: Plon, III, 1970), p.15.

⁹ *Ibid*, pp.15-16.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p.16.

¹¹ *Ibid*.

¹² *Ibid*.

¹³ *Ibid*.

¹⁴ *Ibid*.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, pp.15-16.

¹⁶ This presidential principle was first outlined in a speech at Bayeux on 1946, given shortly after his resignation as head of the government.

¹⁷ For an excellent history of Gaullist foreign policy see Maurice Vaïsse, *La Grandeur: Politique Étrangère du Général de Gaulle, 1958-1969* (Paris: Fayard, 1998).

¹⁸ On this international context see Matthew Connelly, *A Diplomatic Revolution: Algeria's Fight for Independence and the Origins of the Cold War Era* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), and Irwin Wall, *France, the United State and the Algerian War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

¹⁹ Martin Thomas, *The French North African Crisis: Colonial Breakdown and Anglo-French Relations, 1945-1962* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000).

²⁰ On this, see Evans, *Algeria: France's Undeclared War*, pp.148-189.

²¹ *Ibid*.

²² Linda Amiri, *La Bataille de France. La Guerre d'Algérie en Métropole* (Paris: Laffont, 2004); Raphaëlle Branche and Sylvie Thénault (eds), *La France en Guerre 1954-1962. Expériences métropolitaines de la Guerre d'Indépendance Algérienne* (Paris: Autrement, 2008).

²³ Martin Evans, *The Memory of Resistance: French Opposition to the Algerian War 1954-1962* (Oxford: Berg, 1997).

²⁴ Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Face à la Raison d'État. Un Historien dans la Guerre d'Algérie* (Paris: La Découverte, 1989).

²⁵ Étienne Maquin, *Le Parti Socialiste et la Guerre* (Paris: Harmattan, 1990); François Lafon, *Guy Mollet* (Paris: Plon, 2006).

²⁶ Jean-Charles Jauffret, *Soldats en Algérie. Expériences contrastées des hommes du contingent* (Paris: Autrement, 2000).

²⁷ On changing public opinion, see Charles-Robert Ageron. 'Opinion française à travers les sondages' in Jean-Pierre Rioux (ed), *La Guerre d'Algérie et les Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1990).

-
- ²⁸ This took place in the forum and also involved settler women lifting the veils of some Algerian women. In public, the FLN denounced this fraternisation as a colonial manipulation.
- ²⁹ On this see Martin Evans, *Algeria: France's Undeclared War*, pp.328-333.
- ³⁰ Nedjib Sidi Moussa and Jacques Simon (eds), *Le Mouvement National Algérien* (Paris: Harmattan, 2008).
- ³¹ François-Xavier Hautreux, *La Guerre d'Algérie des Harkis* (Paris: Perrin, 2013).
- ³² Mohammed Harbi, *Le FLN: Mirage et Réalité* (Paris: Jeune Afrique, 1980).
- ³³ Bachaga Boualam, *Mon Pays la France* (Paris: Éditions France-Empire, 1962).
- ³⁴ Here the most famous example is the couple Pierre and Claudine Chaulet who joined the FLN and saw themselves as Algerian. On this see Claudine and Pierre Chaulet, *Le Choix de l'Algérie: Deux Voix, Une Mémoire* (Algiers:Barzakh, 2012).
- ³⁵ Albert Camus, *Chroniques Algériennes 1939-1958* (Paris: Gallimard, 1958).
- ³⁶ It is estimated that between 1830 and 1871 the native population fell from 3 million to 2 million due French violence that also, by destroying indigenous structures, induced a series of devastating famines.
- ³⁷ Part of this demographic surge can be explained by the impact of French medical practices which lessened infant mortality.
- ³⁸ The demographic imbalance was particularly acute in the eastern part of the country.
- ³⁹ This becomes very apparent in 1937 and 1938 when famine conditions in the countryside drive large numbers of hungry Algerians to seek food and shelter in the cities.
- ⁴⁰ This is most obvious with Louis Bertrand's *Le Sang des Races* (1889), *La Cina* (1901) or *Pépète et Balthasar* (1904). On this see the article by David Cummings in the special issue.
- ⁴¹ Raymond Kuhn, *The Media in France* (London: Routledge, 1995); Jean K. Chalaby, *The de Gaulle Presidency and the Media* (London: Palgrave, 2002); Aude Vassallo, *La Télévision sous de Gaulle* (Brussels: De Boeck, 2005).
- ⁴² Kuhn, *The Media in France*, p.107.
- ⁴³ Marcel Bleustein-Blanchet, *Mémoires d'un Lion* (Paris: Perrin, 1988).
- ⁴⁴ This was clear in his offer of the 'Peace of the Brave' where de Gaulle underlined that, if they laid down their arms, the FLN would be treated with respect and invited to help build a new Algeria.
- ⁴⁵ Jean Lacouture, *De Gaulle, III: Le Souverain* (Paris: Seuil,1986), p.60.
- ⁴⁶ Since early 1959 the French Army had launched a huge offensive to finally destroy the FLN militarily in Algeria.
- ⁴⁷ On this see Irwin Wall, *France, the United State and the Algerian War*.
- ⁴⁸ Charles de Gaulle, *Discours et Messages: Avec le Renouveau (mai 1958 – juillet 1962)*, p.117.
- ⁴⁹ Ferhat Abbas did not give a public response until 28 September because at this point the FLN was riven with in-fighting that made an immediate reaction impossible.
- ⁵⁰ Alain de Sérigny, *L'Écho d'Alger*, 17 September 1959, p.1.
- ⁵¹ Benjamin Stora, *De Gaulle et la Guerre d'Algérie*, p.134.
- ⁵² Pierre Lagaillarde in Benjamin Stora, *De Gaulle et la Guerre d'Algérie*, p.136
- ⁵³ Joseph Ortiz, *Mon Combat pour l'Algérie française* (Paris: Curutchet, 1998), p.116.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵⁵ *Le Monde*, 16 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁵⁶ 'Les agriculteurs de l'Algérois réclament protection accrue', *L'Écho d'Alger*, 8 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁵⁷ Marie Elbe, 'La farouche ténacité de ceux du bled', *L'Écho d'Alger*, 9 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁵⁸ Marie Elbe, 'Les égorgeurs de Marengo ont été abattus hier', *L'Echo d'Alger*, 12 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁵⁹ Eugene Mannoni, *Le Monde*, 19 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid.
- ⁶¹ Ibid.
- ⁶² Ibid.
- ⁶³ Ibid.
- ⁶⁴ Eugene Mannoni, *Le Monde*, 20 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶ 'SOS-Algérie: Français d'Algérie nous vous convions à la résistance', *Le Monde*, 20 January 1960, p.2.
- ⁶⁷ 'Recevant des élus d'Algérie: le general de Gaulle confirme sa volonté de poursuivre la politique du 16 septembre', *Le Monde*, 21 January 1960, p.2.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid. The exchange is summarised in Claude Paillat, *Dossier Secret de l'Algérie* (Paris: Le Livre Contemporain, 1961), pp335-38.
- ⁶⁹ 'Comité d'action des cheminots pour la défense de l'Algérie française', *Le Monde*, 21 January 1960, p.3.
- ⁷⁰ *Le Monde*, 21 January 1960, p.2.
- ⁷¹ Claude Paillat, *Dossier Secret de l'Algérie*, p.333.
- ⁷² 'Les propos prêtés au general Massu', *L'Écho d'Alger*, 20 January 1960, p.2.
- ⁷³ Ibid.

-
- ⁷⁴ ‘Les Propos prêtés au general Massu accentuent les divergences entre Alger et Paris’, *Le Monde*, 20 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁷⁵ Eugene Mannoni, ‘Malaise au sein de l’armée’, *Le Monde*, 20 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁷⁶ Eugene Mannoni, ‘Le rappel du general Massu a provoqué peu de remous dans l’armée, mais a été mal accueilli par la population européenne’, *Le Monde*, 23 January 1960, p.5.
- ⁷⁷ ‘Les ruraux de l’Algérois’, *Le Monde*, 23 January 1960, p.2
- ⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ⁷⁹ Le general Massu apparaît à Paris comme le porte-parole des inquiétudes algériennes, *L’Echo d’Alger*, 20 January 1960, p.2.
- ⁸⁰ Alain de Sérigny, ‘Crime contre la Patrie’, *L’Écho d’Alger*, 22 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁸¹ Ibid.
- ⁸² Alain de Sérigny, ‘Le ciel est sombre au-dessus de nos têtes’, *L’Écho d’Alger*, 23 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁸³ Ibid.
- ⁸⁴ ‘Européens et musulmans ont ravataillé, hier ceux des barricades’, *L’Écho d’Alger*, 22 January 1960, p.2.
- ⁸⁵ Edward Behr, *The Algerian Problem* (London: Penguin, 1961), p.165.
- ⁸⁶ Ibid, p.164.
- ⁸⁷ Ibid, p.166.
- ⁸⁸ Ibid, 167.
- ⁸⁹ Alain de Sérigny, ‘Nos morts tous nos morts’, *L’Écho d’Alger*, 25 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁹⁰ *La Dépêche Constantinoise*, 23 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁹¹ Pierre Laffont, ‘Un dialogue renoué’, *L’Écho d’Oran*, 23 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁹² Ibid.
- ⁹³ ‘Les manifestations n’ont donné lieu à Oran, à aucun incident grave’, *L’Écho d’Oran*, 25 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁹⁴ ‘Deuxième jour de grève hier à travers Oran’, *L’Écho d’Oran*, 27 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁹⁵ ‘Les manifestations dans l’Oranie pour que l’Algérie reste française’, *L’Écho d’Oran*, 29 January 1960, p.8.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid.
- ⁹⁷ ‘Le Dr Sid Cara aux manifestants: Je viens partager ici votre sort qu’il soit’, *L’Écho d’Oran*, 28 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁹⁸ *La Dépêche Constantinoise*, 29 January 1960, p.1.
- ⁹⁹ ‘Criminelle folie’, *Le Monde*, 25 January 1960, p.1.
- ¹⁰⁰ ‘General de Gaulle’s 29 January 1960 Address to the European Insurgents and the French Army in Algeria’ in Edward Behr, *The Algerian Problem*, p.247.
- ¹⁰¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁰² Ibid, pp247-248.
- ¹⁰³ Ibid, p.248.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid, p.249.
- ¹¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹¹² Ibid, p.250.
- ¹¹³ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁵ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁶ Ibid, p.251.
- ¹¹⁷ ‘L’Insurrection a cessé à Alger’, *Le Monde*, 2 February 1960, p.1.
- ¹¹⁸ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁹ Edward Behr, *The Algerian Question*, pp.170-171.
- ¹²⁰ Ibid, p.171.
- ¹²¹ ‘L’Opposition des musulmans a été un élément déterminant de l’échec des émeutiers’, *Le Monde*, 2 February 1960, p.3.
- ¹²² ‘Réaction internationale’, *Le Monde*, 1 February 1960, p.2.
- ¹²³ ‘Le general de Gaulle maintient le cadre de sa politique du 16 septembre’. *L’Écho d’Alger*, 30 January 1960, p.1.
- ¹²⁴ *La Dépêche Constantinoise*, 30 January 1960, p.1.
- ¹²⁵ ‘De Gaulle s’est montré inflexible sur sa politique algérienne’, *L’Echo d’Oran*, 30 January 1960, p.1.
- ¹²⁶ Pierre Laffont, ‘L’Autorité de la France’, *L’Écho d’Oran*, 30 January 1960, p.1.

-
- ¹²⁷ Ibid.
- ¹²⁸ Ibid.
- ¹²⁹ Ibid.
- ¹³⁰ ‘Des villes et villages nombreux d’Oranie ont fait connaître au général de Gaulle leur profonde ferveur nationale’, *L’Écho d’Oran*, 30 January 1960, p.8.
- ¹³¹ ‘Un nombreux pèlerinage est monté hier à Santa-Cruz prier pour la paix’, *L’Écho d’Oran*, 1 February 1960, p. 1.
- ¹³² Charles de Gaulle, *Discours et Messages: Avec le Renouveau (mai 1958 – juillet 1962)*, p.288.
- ¹³³ Ibid, p. 292.
- ¹³⁴ Ibid, p. 228.
- ¹³⁵ Ibid, p.260.
- ¹³⁶ Jean Lacouture, *De Gaulle, III; Le Souverain* (Paris: Seuil, 1986), p.203.
- ¹³⁷ Alain Peyrefitte, *C’était de Gaulle*, I (Paris: Fayard, 1994), p.96.
- ¹³⁸ Ibid, pp.97-98.
- ¹³⁹ To see a selection of these photographs go to www.magnumphotos.com.
- ¹⁴⁰ ‘Archives Nationales, Service Historique de l’Armée de Terre (SHAT), ‘Analyse des causes et répercussions de la crise du 9 au 13 décembre’, 18 December 1960, Vincennes, Série H La XIème Région Militaire et la Guerre d’Algérie, 1945-1962, 1H2467.
- ¹⁴¹ On the political culture of the FLN see Gilbert Meynier, *Histoire intérieure du FLN, 1954-1962* (Paris: Fayard, 2002).
- ¹⁴² ‘Archives Nationales, Service Historique de l’Armée de Terre (SHAT), ‘Analyse des causes et répercussions de la crise du 9 au 13 décembre’, 18 December 1960, Vincennes, Série H La XIème Région Militaire et la Guerre d’Algérie, 1945-1962, 1H2467.
- ¹⁴³ Alain Peyrefitte, *C’était de Gaulle*, I, p. 68.
- ¹⁴⁴ Charles-Robert Ageron. ‘Opinion française à travers les sondages’ in Jean-Pierre Rioux (ed), *La Guerre d’Algérie et les Français*, p. 37.
- ¹⁴⁵ Alain Peyrefitte, *C’était de Gaulle*, I, p. 117.
- ¹⁴⁶ Maurice Duverger, ‘L’Appel du Peuple’, *Le Monde*, 28 January 1960, p.1.
- ¹⁴⁷ Harold Macmillan, ‘The Wind of Change’ in Simon Heffer (ed), *Great British Speeches* (Chester: Quercus Publishing, 2001), pp.214-218.
- ¹⁴⁸ Alain Peyrefitte, *C’était de Gaulle*, I, p. 119.
- ¹⁴⁹ On the putsch see Maurice Vaïsse, *1961, Alger, le Putsch* (Brussels: Éditions Complexe, 1983).
- ¹⁵⁰ Charles-Robert Ageron. ‘Opinion française à travers les sondages’ in Jean-Pierre Rioux (ed), *La Guerre d’Algérie et les Français*, p.39. According to opinion polls by January 1962 53 per cent of people in the French metropole no longer felt solidarity with the European settlers.
- ¹⁵¹ Martin Evans, ‘Reprisal Violence and the Harkis in French Algeria, 1962’, *International History Review*, 2016: 38, pp.1-18.
- ¹⁵² Nelson Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom* (London: Little Brown, 1994), p.286.
- ¹⁵³ Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*.
- ¹⁵⁴ Ibid, p.16.