

Bulletin of Francophone Postcolonial Studies

A Biannual Publication



Editor's Note

SARAH ARENS 2

Articles

DAVID MURPHY, *La Première Guerre Mondiale comme 'massacre colonial':* 3

Lamine Senghor et les polémiques anticolonialistes dans les années 1920

CHRIS REYNOLDS, *État présent: Mai 68 at 50: Beyond the doxa* 10

Book Reviews

Jean Beaman, *Citizen Outsider: Children of North African Immigrants in France* 17

ELLEN DAVIS-WALKER

Patricia Caillé and Claude Forest (eds.), *Regarder des films en Afrique* 18

SHEILA PETTY

Christopher M. Church, *Paradise Destroyed: Catastrophe and Citizenship in the French Caribbean* 19

SHANAAZ MOHAMMED

Yasser Elhariry, *Pacifist Invasions: Arabic, Translation, and the Postfrancophone Lyric* 21

JANE HIDDLESTON

Emmanuel Jean-François, *Poétique de la violence et récits francophones contemporains* 22

AUBREY GABEL

Mathilde Kang, *Francophonie en Orient. Aux Croisements France-Asie (1840-1940)* 24

FAY WANRUG SUWANWATTANA

David Marriott, *Whither Fanon? Studies in the Blackness of Being* 26

JANE HIDDLESTON

Babacar M'Baye, *Black Cosmopolitanism and Anticolonialism: Pivotal Moments* 27

DAVID MURPHY

Richard C. Parks, *Medical Imperialism in French North Africa: Regenerating the Jewish Community of Colonial Tunis* 29

REBEKAH VINCE

Conference report

BETHANY MASON AND ABDELBAQI GHORAB, SFPS PG Study Day 2018: 31

Negotiating Borders in the Francophone World, University of Birmingham

Editor's note

Big shoes to fill. Those were my first thoughts when, at the AGM at the Society's annual conference in 2017, I took over the editorship of the *Bulletin* from Kate Marsh. With big shoes come bigger footprints, and tracks, within Francophone Postcolonial Studies. Kate is the founding editor of the *Bulletin of Francophone Postcolonial Studies* and, in the words of Charles Forsdick, we are all in her debt for launching such an important publication. Over the past eight years, Kate has established *BFPS* as a significant medium of dissemination in the field. It is due to her thorough editing and rigorous peer-review process that the *Bulletin* continues to publish articles and reviews written by high-profile voices and postgraduate students alike, providing an ever-relevant reflection of Francophone Postcolonial Studies.

Kate's tireless support of the new generations of SFPS is not limited to the Society's publication. Passionate about sharing practical knowledge, she led the first early-career workshop at last year's conference on 'Navigating the REF' and gave another talk on academic publishing at this year's Postgraduate Study Day in Birmingham. Many of us, including myself, have benefitted from her support over the years, not only through the publishing of our work, but also by Kate involving us in the work of the *Bulletin* itself, as postgraduate guest editors and book reviews editors.

I hope to carry on Kate's work and to continue publishing cutting-edge articles, interviews with writers, artists, and filmmakers from the Francophone world, and a wide range of well-informed book reviews that reflect the new developments in the field. My aim for *BFPS* is to continue to:

- Transnationalize the field: further raising the *Bulletin*'s profile, broadening its readership and being more actively inclusive of transcultural and translingual approaches, while continuing to publish articles and book reviews in both French and English
- Support postgraduate and early-career research
- Open access: not only for the sake of national funding bodies, but also as to make research accessible to everyone by further developing the online archive of past *Bulletin* issues.

I want *BFPS* to remain open to suggestion, dialogue and change. Please do not hesitate to get in touch with me if you have any questions or comments.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank our outgoing book reviews editor Khalid Lyamlahy, who is off to pastures new, for all his work. This issue will be remembered as having been entirely put together by *BFPS*'s first transnational Maghrebi editorial team, a tiny Francophone postcolonial story itself in the history of the *Bulletin*.

SARAH ARENS
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

La Première Guerre Mondiale comme ‘massacre colonial’: Lamine Senghor et les polémiques anticolonialistes dans les années 1920

Les événements organisés et les écrits publiés en France autour du centenaire de la Première Guerre Mondiale semblent enfin nous révéler l'avènement d'une reconnaissance officielle, mais aussi populaire, de la contribution des troupes coloniales à ce conflit résolument global que les grands pays européens ont persisté à voir à travers un prisme résolument national. Pour ne citer que deux exemples, en 2013, une bande dessinée dans la série populaire, *L'Homme de l'année*, place un tirailleur au cœur de son intrigue qui tourne autour du choix du soldat inconnu pour la cérémonie officielle sous l'Arc de triomphe en novembre 1920.¹ Puis, une exposition sur les tirailleurs sénégalais et la Grande Guerre a été inaugurée à l'Institut Français de Dakar en novembre 2014.² Or, si l'on ne peut que célébrer cette reconnaissance du sacrifice des colonisés qui ont servi la France (de force ou de gré) pendant la guerre, qu'en est-il de ceux qui ont répondu à l'appel de la patrie en danger mais qui, par la suite, sont devenus des militants du mouvement anticolonialiste qui est né dans l'entre-deux-guerres ? Pour le moment, leur histoire reste beaucoup moins connue et beaucoup plus difficile à intégrer dans une histoire nationale en France.

Notre but ici n'est pas de prétendre qu'un militant comme Lamine Senghor ou son adjoint Tiémoko Garan Kouyaté ‘appartiennent’ uniquement à l'histoire nationale de la France. Même au Sénégal, Lamine Senghor, grand anticolonialiste, reste largement inconnu, tandis que le nom de Blaise Diagne, son ennemi irréductible, perçu par certains (comme nous le verrons plus loin) comme pilier de l'édifice colonial, a orné dans sa patrie, à différents moments depuis l'indépendance, de grands axes de la capitale et le nouvel aéroport ouvert à la fin 2017. Il est donc clair que le Sénégal doit lui aussi trouver une place dans son histoire nationale pour le personnage problématique de Lamine Senghor. Mais nous partons du constat que le colonialisme fut un phénomène résolument transnational et ce qui nous intéresse le plus ici c'est la position de Senghor par rapport aux débats sur la première guerre mondiale en France dans l'entre-deux-guerres. De plus, il ne s'agit pas ici de créer une opposition binaire entre les tirailleurs qui ont servi loyalement la France jusqu'au bout et ceux qui se sont révoltés contre elle puisque la réalité des deux côtés est beaucoup plus complexe. Mais c'est cette histoire ‘oubliée’ des révoltés que nous cherchons à ‘redécouvrir’ dans cet article à travers une interrogation des archives sur les mouvements anticolonialistes de cette période.

Entre 1924 et sa mort prématurée en 1927, à l'âge de 38 ans, le Sénégalais Lamine Senghor fut le plus important des militants anticolonialistes africains. Lamine Senghor sert la France loyalement pendant la guerre de 1914-18 et il reçoit la Croix de Guerre pour son courage dans les combats féroces dans la Somme en 1916. Après un bref retour au Sénégal entre 1919-21, il revient en France, se marie avec une Française, Eugénie Comont, et travaille aux PTT (le Service des Postes, Télégraphes et Téléphones qui offre des postes réservés aux anciens combattants).³ Or pourquoi devient-il militant de la cause anticolonialiste? La réponse se trouverait, paraît-il, dans une prise de conscience politique au milieu des années 1920: il avait servi la France mais la patrie n'a pas tenu ses promesses envers lui et les autres soldats africains. Le militant qui inquiétait tant le Ministère des Colonies était aussi un homme tuberculeux, de santé très fragile depuis que son bataillon avait été gazé à Verdun en 1917. Gravement atteint aux poumons, Senghor survit mais sa santé est affaiblie. C'est cette expérience personnelle qui inspire son combat contre l'injustice des autorités françaises qui utilisent deux poids et deux mesures quand il s'agit de peser les

¹ Fred Duval, Jean-Pierre Pécau et Mr Fab, *L'Homme de l'année, 1917* (Paris: Delcourt, 2013).

² On pourrait évoquer aussi *Les Tirailleurs sénégalais vus par les Blancs: anthologie d'écrits de la 1^{re} moitié du XX^e siècle*, choix et présentation de Roger Little (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2016). La majeure partie est consacrée aux Tirailleurs de la Grande Guerre.

³ Pour les sources de plusieurs idées dans cet article, et aussi pour de plus amples détails sur la vie de ce militant, voir mon introduction aux écrits de Lamine Senghor, *La Violation d'un pays et autres écrits anticolonialistes*, présentation de David Murphy (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2012), et David Murphy, ‘Tirailleur, facteur, anticolonialiste: la courte vie militante de Lamine Senghor (1924-27)’, *Cahiers d'histoire*, 126 (2015), pp. 55–72.

pensions à attribuer aux anciens combattants.

Or, cent ans après la fin de la guerre, cet article vise à examiner le discours autour de la fameuse ‘dette du sang’ de la France envers ses troupes coloniales qui aidèrent à sauver la patrie entre 1914 et 1918, et son rôle dans le développement d’un discours anticolonialiste dans les années 1920. Pour Lamine Senghor et les autres militants de l’entre-deux-guerres, la Première Guerre Mondiale est bel et bien un ‘massacre colonial’, un prolongement de la politique coloniale qui met peu de valeur sur la vie des colonisés. Les écrits de la période après la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale d’un Aimé Césaire ou d’un Frantz Fanon sur la nature sanguinaire du colonialisme sont bien connus, mais nous espérons démontrer que Lamine Senghor et d’autres militants avaient déjà jeté les bases d’un discours anticolonialiste dans l’entre-deux-guerres.⁴

Le Procès Diagne-*Les Continents*: la naissance d’un militant

Le 24 novembre 1924, Lamine Senghor fait une entrée remarquée sur la scène politique française. Simple facteur, jusqu’alors inconnu en dehors du milieu des militants anticolonialistes, il paraît comme témoin pour la défense au Tribunal de Paris lors d’un procès pour diffamation intenté au journal ‘noir’ *Les Continents*, organe de la Ligue Universelle de défense de la race nègre, par Blaise Diagne, député du Sénégal à l’Assemblée nationale.⁵

Le procès Diagne-*Les Continents* oppose les deux hommes noirs les plus connus en France. D’un côté, on retrouve Blaise Diagne, sans doute le personnage noir français le plus éminent et le plus puissant de l’époque. Premier député noir du Sénégal, il est chargé fin 1917 par le gouvernement français de recruter des tirailleurs en Afrique Occidentale Française, mission qui lui gagne une grande réputation et en France et en Afrique où, pour la première fois, un homme noir occupe une position égale et parfois supérieure aux blancs. En face de lui se retrouve le romancier franco-antillais, René Maran, lauréat du Prix Goncourt en 1921 pour son roman *Batouala* qui a fait scandale avec sa préface dénonçant les injustices du colonialisme français en Afrique Centrale. En réalité, peu sépare Diagne et Maran en termes de leur foi en la ‘mission civilisatrice’ de la France et la nécessité de l’assimilation des peuples noirs à la culture française. Mais, le rôle de l’homme politique dans le recrutement de soldats africains pour servir dans les tranchées de la Première Guerre Mondiale lui crée des ennemis intarissables parmi une frange de la communauté noire en France. Les promesses non tenues par rapport à l’élargissement des droits et l’accès à la citoyenneté pour les ‘sujets’ africains, ainsi que le rapprochement, en 1923, de Diagne avec le parti colonial pour des raisons électorales, sont autant de signes pour ses ennemis de la mauvaise foi de sa campagne de recrutement au début 1918. Or, c’est dans ce contexte que Diagne est accusé dans un article non signé des *Continents* (mais revendiqué plus tard par Maran) du 15 octobre 1924 d’avoir reçu ‘une certaine commission par soldat recruté’ (cité dans Senghor, p. 109). De telles accusations avaient déjà paru dans divers journaux français, mais Diagne, indigné, semble voir dans les déclarations d’un journal ‘noir’ un danger pour sa réputation de défenseur des peuples noirs, ce qui l’incite à traîner *Les Continents* devant les tribunaux.

Le procès constitue un moment clé dans l’évolution du débat ‘noir’ en France dans l’entre-deux-guerres, avec à son cœur la fameuse ‘dette du sang’ contractée par la France à l’égard de ses troupes coloniales qui ont joué un si grand rôle dans la guerre. Plus de 130.000 soldats de l’Afrique noire ont participé à la guerre, avec plus de 30.000 morts.⁶ Dans l’absence de chiffres précis sur ces questions dans les années 1920, les critiques surestiment le nombre de morts: Lamine Senghor et d’autres parlent souvent de 500.000 soldats africains et de 100.000 morts. De nos jours, les

⁴ Aimé Césaire, *Discours sur le colonialisme* (Paris: Réclame, 1950); Frantz Fanon, *Les Damnés de la terre* (Paris: Maspéro, 1961).

⁵ Cf. Alice L. Conklin, ‘Who Speaks for Africa? The René Maran-Blaise Diagne Trial in 1920s Paris’, in *The Colour of Liberty: Histories of Race in France*, édité par Sue Peabody et Tyler Stovall (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), pp. 302–37.

⁶ Sur le rôle des tirailleurs sénégalais pendant la guerre, voir Marc Michel, *Les Africains et la grande guerre: l’appel à l’Afrique (1914-1918)*, 2^e édition (Paris: Karthala, 2003).

historiens s'accordent sur le nombre de décès mais un débat hargneux rage toujours pour ou contre l'affirmation que les tirailleurs sénégalais servirent de troupes de choc.⁷ Ce débat dépasse le cadre de cet article mais nous trouvons convaincante l'interprétation des chiffres proposée par Pap Ndiaye qui s'appuie sur les travaux de l'historien américain Joe Lunn:

[L]es pertes françaises furent les plus terribles lors des vingt-deux premiers mois de la guerre, puis elles déclinèrent globalement, tandis que celles des tirailleurs suivirent une trajectoire inverse pour atteindre leur maximum en 1918. A ce moment, l'utilisation des tirailleurs avait clairement pour objectif de sauver les vies françaises.⁸

Le Général Mangin avait prôné dans sa *Force noire* (1910) la mobilisation massive des troupes africaines pour contrer la puissance militaire et démographique allemande, mais ce n'est qu'à partir de 1916 que les grands chefs de l'armée française acceptent les arguments de Mangin.⁹ Or, dans les combats pour reprendre le Fort de Douaumont à Verdun en 1916 et pendant l'offensive Nivelle en 1917, les tirailleurs sénégalais sont au cœur des combats et subissent des pertes sévères.

En cette fin 1924, Lamine Senghor est militant depuis à peine deux mois au sein de l'Union Intercoloniale (UIC), organisme créé en 1921 par le Parti Communiste Français (PCF). L'UIC dénonce le colonialisme avec une violence peu commune pour l'époque dans les colonnes du *Paria*, son journal, sur lequel nous reviendrons ci-dessous. Quelques semaines après le procès, Senghor écrit un compte rendu dans son premier article pour *Le Paria*. D'après lui, Diagne serait un 'commis recruteur, l'agent de liaison entre le vendeur d'esclaves (les chefs indigènes de l'A.O.F.) et l'acheteur (la France impérialiste): marché de chair à canon pour la guerre de la civilisation' (Senghor, p. 33). À cette analyse d'inspiration communiste, il faut ajouter un humanisme antimilitariste. En effet, pendant sa courte carrière de militant, Lamine Senghor soulignera à tous les pas son expérience traumatisante pendant la guerre et le fait d'avoir combattu pour la France rend plus difficile des tentatives officielles de faire de lui un 'subversif'. Ici le militant sénégalais rejoint des figures de proue du communisme français tels que Paul Vaillant-Couturier, rédacteur en chef de *L'Humanité* (il écrira plus tard la préface à *La Violation d'un pays* de Senghor) et le romancier Henri Barbusse, qui militaient d'abord au sein de l'Association Républicaine des Anciens Combattants (ARAC), organisme féroce et antimilitariste (et étroitement lié au PCF), avant d'exprimer ses mêmes sentiments à travers le communisme. Dans son article, Senghor critique vivement Blaise Diagne:

Au lieu de s'attarder à prouver à combien de centimes près le grand négrier touche par tête de Sénégalais qu'il recruta, il aurait fallu faire passer devant lui toute une procession d'aveugle[s], de mutilés. [...] Toutes ces victimes lui auraient craché à la face toute l'infamie de la mission qu'il avait accomplie (Senghor, pp. 33-34).

L'historien sénégalais Olivier Sagna prétend que dans le témoignage de Senghor lors du procès, '[p]lus que le militant de l'Union Intercoloniale, c'est le grand blessé de guerre dont on a réveillé les blessures qui parle'.¹⁰ Dans une inversion des rôles, c'est Diagne qui est présenté comme l'accusé qui échappe à la justice—'Le complice des assassins capitalistes fut absous'—mais il n'est que le représentant d'un vaste système: 'à travers l'immonde marchand de chair noire c'est l'impérialisme français qu'il aurait fallu traîner aux assises' (Senghor, p. 34). La victoire du député sénégalais au procès serait emblématique de la domination impérialiste.

La vision de l'Africain s'était transformée pendant la guerre: le bon tirailleur, ce 'grand enfant' a remplacé le 'sauvage' dans l'imaginaire français. Mais Lamine Senghor révèle un nouveau visage

⁷ Pour Marc Michel, les pertes globales souffertes par les tirailleurs n'étaient pas plus élevées que celles des autres troupes. Cf. Michel, *Les Africains et la Grande Guerre*.

⁸ Pap Ndiaye, *La Condition noire: essai sur une minorité française* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 2008), p. 133. Joe Lunn, *Memoirs of the Maelstrom: A Senegalese Oral History of World War One* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann; Oxford: James Currey, 1993).

⁹ Charles Mangin, *La Force noire* (Paris: Hachette, 1910).

¹⁰ Olivier Sagna, *Des Pionniers méconnus de l'indépendance: Africains, Antillais et luttes anticolonialistes dans la France de l'entre-deux-guerres (1919-39)*, Thèse de doctorat, Paris 7 (1986), p. 311.

au public français, celui du tirailleur radicalisé par ses expériences qui se lance dans un combat contre les injustices du système colonial. Pendant les années qui ont suivi le procès, Senghor et d'autres militants écrivaient maints articles pour la presse anticolonialiste (et surtout pour *Le Paria*) dans lesquels l'image des *tirailleurs* comme 'chair à canon' serait systématiquement évoquée à côté de massacres coloniaux et d'autres exemples de la barbarie de l'empire français. Or, dans la deuxième partie de cet article, nous examinerons quelques exemples de ces écrits, surtout ceux de Lamine Senghor pour les journaux, *Le Paria* et *La Voix des Nègres*, ainsi que son discours au Congrès de la Ligue contre l'Impérialisme.

Créer un front 'transcolonial': Lamine Senghor et l'Union Intercoloniale

Lamine Senghor intègre l'Union Intercoloniale à un moment où l'orientation de l'organisme est en train d'évoluer. Dominé dès le début par des Indochinois, dont Nguyen ai Quoc, mieux connu plus tard sous son nom de guerre de Ho Chi Minh, et ensuite par des Nord-Africains, l'organisme peine à intégrer des militants noirs. L'ascension rapide de Lamine Senghor—intégré dans l'exécutif de l'UIC dès la fin de 1924—est donc sans doute liée au besoin ressenti par le PCF de mieux représenter la diversité du monde colonial français.

Tandis que d'autres critiques de la violence coloniale mobilisent les bavures et les massacres dans les colonies comme illustrations de la nécessité de la réforme du système colonial, l'Union Intercoloniale y voit la preuve que la violence est au cœur de tout système colonial et que la réforme est impossible. On voit clairement à travers le discours de l'UIC une stratégie qui tente de démontrer un lien étroit entre la violence de la guerre de 14-18 et la violence et l'exploitation dans les colonies:

Au peuple de Paris! L'Union Intercoloniale, Association des originaires de toutes les Colonies, sans distinction d'opinions politiques ou religieuses, fait appel à votre esprit de générosité et de justice contre les crimes sans nombre qui sont perpétrés dans les possessions lointaines de la France. Ils salissent celles-ci, discréditent la République et vous déshonoreraient si vous n'aidiez pas à y mettre un terme, car ils sont commis, ne l'oubliez pas, en votre nom comme au nom de la nation toute entière.

Aux coloniaux! Sénégalais, Dahoméens! Pendant la guerre, on a broyé du noir tant et plus. Aujourd'hui on continue à exploiter vos frères au profit des cotonniers du Niger. Ce sont les travaux forcés.¹¹

Pour l'UIC, le service militaire pendant la guerre et les travaux forcés dans les colonies ne seraient que deux faces du même système oppresseur.

Dans ses articles pour *Le Paria* au cours de l'année 1925, Lamine Senghor soutient un front transcolonial pour combattre l'impérialisme européen. Dans ses écrits, Senghor traite d'une grève qui avait réuni Européens et Africains dans un front commun contre les employeurs. Il dénonce les travaux forcés comme forme 'moderne' de l'esclavagisme et, thème récurrent dans ses écrits, il évoque la 'dette du sang' envers les tirailleurs sénégalais de la Grande Guerre. Dans un article sur le travail forcé, Senghor dénonce les tentatives de réformer ce qui est au fond un 'système esclavagiste'. En dehors des quatre communes du Sénégal, dont les habitants sont citoyens français, le régime de l'indigénat gère les relations entre colonisateurs et colonisés, et le travail forcé est une menace permanente pour tout sujet colonisé. En dénonçant cette injustice, l'ancien tirailleur ne manque pas de rappeler à son lectorat la 'dette du sang' et les promesses non tenues aux peuples colonisés. Le sacrifice des tirailleurs qui ont participé à la guerre devait mettre fin au travail forcé et d'autres injustices sociales:

¹¹ Notice de l'UIC pour une réunion publique en mars 1925: Archives Nationales d'Outre-Mer (ANOM) Slotfom 3, Carton 3.

C'est ça la reconnaissance de 'la Mère patrie' envers ses enfants 'chair à canon' de 1914 à 1918, ça, sous le règne Painlevé, en souvenir des 6.000 nègres sacrifiés en 3 jours; les 16, 17 et 18 avril 1917 au Chemin des Dames! C'est ça la réalisation des promesses prodiguées par les recruteurs Diagne et Angoulvant en 1917-18? (Senghor, p. 40)

De plus, au lieu de récompenser les soldats africains pour leurs sacrifices pendant la Guerre de 1914-18, on les envoie se battre dans des guerres coloniales au Maroc et en Syrie 'où l'armée française est composée de 75% de nègres' et pour 'ceux qui échapperont à la mort' on ne prépare que 'cet honteux esclavage [sic!]', c'est-à-dire le travail forcé (Senghor, p. 40).

L'année 1925 marque l'apogée du soutien du PCF à la cause anti-impérialiste et le soutien au peuple rifain exprimé à l'Assemblée nationale par Doriot est un moment fort symbolique. Malgré cette importance symbolique, il ne faut pas oublier que le PCF se lasse vite d'une campagne qui plaît au Komintern mais qui est loin d'être au cœur des intérêts des ouvriers français. Senghor n'est pas dupe et commence à chercher d'autres moyens de soutenir la cause de son peuple. Il se rend compte également que le PCF se sert de lui comme 'faire-valoir' et 'caution nègre'.¹² La goutte d'eau qui fait déborder le vase arrive quand le PCF est invité à envoyer deux représentants au Congrès des travailleurs nègres à Chicago en octobre 1925. Le PCF choisit Senghor et l'Antillais Max Bloncourt mais à la dernière minute on leur demande de payer le voyage eux-mêmes. Quand Senghor objecte, on lui conseille de se faire embaucher comme navigateur ou de s'embarquer clandestinement pour l'Amérique: il refuse. Or, il décide que pour promouvoir les intérêts des peuples noirs, il faut créer des organisations noires. L'Union Intercoloniale continue de vivoter pendant quelque temps mais finira par éclater en différents mouvements nationalistes: le rêve du front 'transcolonial' s'éloigne.

La création des premiers mouvements 'nègres'

Le 26 mars 1926, Lamine Senghor lance le 'Comité de Défense de la Race Nègre' (CDRN). Le CDRN se veut une organisation raisonnable, prête à travailler avec les autorités françaises pour améliorer le sort de la communauté noire. Si l'Union Intercoloniale représentait les franges de l'extrême-gauche, Senghor s'associe maintenant avec des piliers d'un Republicanisme modéré. Les appels du Comité utilisent un langage proche des critiques des méfaits de la colonisation qui émanent de la Ligue des Droits de l'Homme et d'une partie de la gauche socialiste. Senghor lui-même se présente d'abord comme 'mutilé de guerre' pour souligner le service rendu à la patrie. Le 4 octobre 1926, Joseph Gothon-Lunion, le Secrétaire-Général du CDRN, écrit au Président de la République pour lui demander de venir en aide aux noirs qui ont tant aidé la France pendant la guerre:

[N]ous demandons d'une manière toute particulière des faveurs à la France (nous disons à chaque Français), un appui même, en reconnaissance du sang nègre versé sur les champs de bataille... Ce n'est pas faire de la politique que de parler des droits des Nègres que la République Française a réclamés la première et qu'elle doit s'efforcer de maintenir (cité dans Senghor, p. 92).

Contacté par la présidence pour des renseignements sur le Comité, le Ministre de l'Intérieur l'informe que le CDRN est un nid de communistes et d'anticolonialistes. La lettre de Gothon-Lunion ne reçoit pas de réponse.

Après la création du CDRN, Lamine Senghor se lance dans une tournée de propagande et de recrutement à travers les grandes villes portuaires de France—Toulon, Marseille, Bordeaux, Le Havre—ainsi que dans le grand camp des tirailleurs sénégalais à Fréjus (dans l'entre-deux-guerres, c'est à Fréjus que se trouve la plus grande concentration d'hommes noirs en France). Dans les bars

¹² Voir Philippe Dewitte, *Les Mouvements nègres en France 1919-39* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1985), p. 109.

et les cafés des ports, il va à la rencontre des ‘nègres’; sa passion et son ardeur sont convaincantes et beaucoup d’ouvriers noirs sont heureux de voir un des leurs défendre les intérêts de la race. Il connaît un franc succès, recrutant des centaines d’adhérents à une époque où la population noire de France se limite à peut-être 15.000 à 20.000 personnes (voir Senghor, p. xli).

Dans le premier numéro du journal du CDRN, *La Voix des Nègres*, un article non signé revient sur une des questions les plus chères à Lamine Senghor, les pensions des anciens tirailleurs sénégalais. Dans une litanie de questions purement rhétoriques—commençant avec le titre de l’article, ‘Pourquoi sommes-nous infériorisés?’—l’auteur (qui pourrait bien être Senghor) expose l’hypocrisie de la France devant la ‘dette du sang’ qu’elle doit aux tirailleurs: ‘Pourquoi un tirailleur Sénégalais, mutilé de la “Grande Guerre”, domicilié en France, reçoit-il une pension 6 à 8 fois moins forte que celle payée à un Français de la métropole de la même mutilation et du même pourcentage d’invalidité?’; ‘[l]e sang d’un nègre ne vaut-il pas celui d’un blanc?’; ‘[p]ourquoi y avait-il égalité devant le devoir, puis deux poids et deux mesures devant les droits?’ (Senghor, p. 53). Et il finit, comme il a dû l’apprendre pendant sa période au *Paria*, avec une table qui compare les pensions des tirailleurs et des anciens combattants français (l’anticolonialisme cherche toujours à utiliser des chiffres et les renseignements fournis par le système colonial pour dénoncer celui-ci).¹³

Si la création du CDRN semble annoncer un reniement du communisme, il ne faut pas oublier que l’annonce de sa création paraît dans *Le Paria*, organe indirectement lié au PCF. C’est donc difficile de parler d’une rupture totale entre Senghor et les communistes. Les rapports des agents du CAI, le système de surveillance du Ministère des Colonies, signalent sans cesse que le CDRN n’est qu’un front pour cacher les sympathies communistes du mouvement, ce qui n’est pas loin de la vérité. Pendant un an, Lamine Senghor maintient un équilibre fragile entre les différents groupes au sein de son mouvement mais, en janvier 1927, il arrive un schisme irréparable entre assimilationnistes et communistes, ce qui mènera à l’éclatement du mouvement noir.

La Ligue contre l’Impérialisme

En février 1927, au milieu du tumulte de la scission du CDRN, Lamine Senghor connaît le moment de gloire qui contribue à solder sa réputation à la tête du mouvement anticolonialiste quand il est invité à représenter le CDRN lors du Congrès inaugural de la Ligue contre l’impérialisme et l’oppression coloniale à Bruxelles. La Ligue est une initiative d’inspiration communiste qui cherche à réunir le front le plus large que possible contre les puissances impérialistes européennes. A Bruxelles, Senghor partage la scène politique avec les chefs des grands mouvements nationalistes, tels que l’Indien Jawaharlal Nehru et l’Indonésien Mohammed Hatta. Son discours rencontre un énorme succès non seulement dans la salle mais aussi à travers le monde: on le fait tout de suite traduire en anglais et il est publié dans plusieurs revues aux Etats-Unis. Dans un article paru quelques mois après le Congrès sur les exilés politiques à Paris dans les années 1920, le directeur de l’American Civil Liberties Union, Roger Baldwin situe Lamine Senghor parmi les plus éminents des ‘hommes sans patrie’.¹⁴

À la tribune, Senghor, libéré des contraintes de l’apaisement des modérés du CDRN, pousse encore plus loin ses critiques de l’impérialisme: la défense de la race ‘nègre’ passe obligatoirement par la défaite des impérialistes. L’impérialisme ne saurait apporter la civilisation aux colonies puisqu’il s’agit d’un système de domination. Il dénonce les sévices infligés aux colonisés, les travaux forcés et, bien sûr, le ‘massacre’ des soldats africains pendant la guerre et l’iniquité des pensions attribuées aux anciens tirailleurs:

¹³ Un article dans le premier numéro de *La Race Nègre* (juin 1927), ‘Réponse d’un ancien tirailleur sénégalais à M. Paul Boncour’ utilise une autre méthode pour donner voix aux exigences des anciens combattants: écrit à la première personne dans le ‘petit nègre’ enseigné aux tirailleurs par l’armée française, l’article permet à un tirailleur (réel ou imaginé?) de raconter son histoire dans ses propres termes (Senghor, *La Violation d’un pays*, pp. 104–05).

¹⁴ Roger Baldwin, ‘The Capital of the Men without a Country’, *The Survey* (1 août 1927), pp. 460–68. Un long extrait du discours de Senghor est publié sous le titre ‘A Black Man’s Protest’, *The Living Age*, 332.4306 (15 mai 1927), pp. 866–68.

Vous avez vu que, pendant la guerre, on a recruté autant que possible des nègres, pour les emmener se faire tuer (Senghor, p. 61).

La jeunesse nègre commence maintenant à voir clair. Nous savons et nous constatons que, lorsqu'on a besoin de nous, pour nous faire tuer ou pour nous faire travailler, nous sommes des Français; mais quand il s'agit de nous donner les droits, nous ne sommes plus des Français, nous sommes des nègres (Senghor, p. 63).

La 'tuerie' de la guerre de 14-18 est un refrain qui revient dans pratiquement tous les écrits et tous les discours de Lamine Senghor. Sa personne même rappelle au public les sacrifices de la guerre, puisque cet homme grand et droit qui fait vibrer la foule depuis la tribune est aussi visiblement fragile, de plus en plus maigre, son corps réduit par la tuberculose qui le tuera avant la fin de l'année 1927.¹⁵

Conclusion

A partir de novembre 1924, Lamine Senghor entame une carrière de militant qu'il poursuit corps et âme pendant trois ans, mais le désir de rentrer au pays natal ne le quitte jamais. Le 9 mars 1925, quand il est engagé complètement, paraît-il, dans les activités de l'UIC, Senghor écrit au Gouverneur Général de l'Afrique Occidentale Française (AOF) pour lui demander très humblement de le faire rapatrier (cité dans Senghor, pp. 79-80). Les autorités coloniales décident qu'ils peuvent mieux le contrôler en Afrique qu'en France et accèdent à sa requête mais entretemps le militant se ravise, craignant qu'une répression brutale ne l'attende à son éventuel retour à Dakar. Il ne reverra plus le Sénégal.

En juillet 1927, quelques mois après son moment de gloire à Bruxelles, il commence à perdre la bataille contre les infections qui le rongent et, en même temps, le mouvement qu'il a construit commence à s'écrouler. Il meurt le 25 novembre 1927 à Fréjus, loin de ses camarades noirs et abandonné par sa femme. Après sa mort, il tombe dans l'oubli et malgré les efforts de grands historiens et critiques comme Olivier Sagna, Christopher Miller et Brent Hayes Edwards, il reste très mal connu.¹⁶ Cependant, l'histoire de Lamine Senghor, c'est aussi l'histoire d'une interprétation alternative de la participation des tirailleurs sénégalais à la guerre de 14-18, l'histoire d'un sacrifice perçu plutôt comme un massacre des innocents. Bien avant l'avènement de la Négritude, la pensée noire francophone avait commencé à remettre en cause les principes du colonialisme français et c'est pour cette raison que nous cherchons à intégrer Lamine Senghor dans une généalogie de l'anticolonialisme aux côtés de Césaire et de Fanon.

DAVID MURPHY
UNIVERSITY OF STIRLING

¹⁵ En juin 1927, Senghor publie *La Violation d'un pays*, texte dans lequel il se moque violemment encore une fois de Blaise Diagne.

¹⁶ Sagna, *Des pionniers méconnus*; Christopher L. Miller, *Nationalists and Nomads: Essays on Francophone African Literature and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); Brent Hayes Edwards, *The Practice of Diaspora: Literature, Translation and the Rise of Black Internationalism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

État présent: **Mai 68 at 50: Beyond the doxa**

In what Pierre Nora has described as an ‘era of commemoration’, the last thirty years or so have been characterised by a very noticeable ‘turn to the past’.¹⁷ There is growing recognition of the importance of confronting head-on what are described as ‘difficult pasts’ in order to better equip us for the challenges of the future.¹⁸ This ‘mnemonic age’ has not only seen an explosion in the commemorative industry, it has also spawned a whole plethora of public and academic interest in the notion of ‘memory’.¹⁹

The great interest in the events of 1968, and in particular those in France, provide a particularly potent example of this ‘turn to the past’ and the complexities associated with the construction of ‘collective memory’.²⁰ Over the course of the last 50 years, the attention afforded to making sense of the iconic *mai 68* has converged with this increasing fascination with the past. Until 2018, the decennial commemorations had been the focus of increasingly intense debate and attention that have been pivotal in laying the foundations for, shaping of, and consolidating a dominant perspective on these seminal events. This *état présent* sets out the characteristics of this doxa before demonstrating how, despite seeing the continuation of the veritable industry that now accompanies these milestones, the fiftieth anniversary provides hope that the narrow perspective that is the ‘convenient consensus’ on the French events is ripe for a challenge.²¹ Particular focus is concentrated on the relatively recent development in ‘1968 studies’ that has seen increasing attention afforded to experiences in France’s overseas territories and its former colonies. It is argued that such a trend is indicative of the fertile terrain of this half-century milestone, enabling a serious challenge to the dominant narrative of the events. The effectiveness of such a broadened perspective is not limited to the obvious consequences of the widened geographical optic. In fact, such a shift in perspective also forces a reconsideration of the dominant temporal framework and expands our understanding of the ‘cast’ of 1968. As such it is amongst the most potent of means through which the inadequacies of the *mai 68* doxa can be exposed.

In the half century since 1968, the decennial anniversaries have been crucial in moulding the dominant narrative.²² 1978 saw the laying of the foundations, 1988 witnessed the emergence of discussions around the notion of ‘génération’, 1998 confirmed the commemorative industry that 1968 had become, and 2008 was characterised by those responding to Nicolas Sarkozy’s call for the liquidation of the spirit of 68. Whilst the commemorations have seen debates develop and change, there has nevertheless been an underpinning set of characteristics, which have come to dominate the way in which these events are remembered in France today and can be summarised by three terms: ‘May’, ‘Students’, and ‘Paris’.²³

That what happened in France in 1968 is commonly condensed into the term ‘mai 68’, is not as trivial as it first appears. There is no doubt that this particular month was the temporal epicentre of the French revolt. However, that the dominant narrative so often begins with the police intervention in the courtyard of the Sorbonne on 3 May and then progresses through a set of iconic moments (10 May: *Nuit des Barricades*; 13 May: nationwide demonstrations and beginning of strike; 24 May: night of intense violence in Paris; 27 May: the *Grenelle* negotiations and their

¹⁷ Pierre Nora, *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), p. 611.

¹⁸ Sharon Macdonald, *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond* (London: Routledge, 2008).

¹⁹ Duncan Bell, ‘Agonistic Democracy and the Politics of Memory’, *Constellations*, 15.1 (2008): pp. 48–166; James V. Wertsch, *Voices of Collective Remembering* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 30; Jay Winter, ‘The Generation of Memory: Reflections on the “Memory Boom”’, *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute*, 27 (2000): pp. 69–92.

²⁰ Maurice Halbwachs, *La Mémoire Collective* (Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 1950).

²¹ Chris Reynolds, *Memories of May '68: France's Convenient Consensus* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2011).

²² Jean-Pierre Rioux, ‘L’événement-mémoire. Quarante ans de commémorations’, *Le Débat*, 149 (2008): pp. 49–58.

²³ Isabelle Sommier, ‘Mai 68: Sous les pavés d’une page officielle’, *Sociétés Contemporaines*, 20 (1994): pp. 63–82 (p. 65).

rejection; 29 May: de Gaulle's mysterious disappearance) before concluding on 30 May with the General's return and radio address, is just the first strand of the limited perspective that has come to prevail.²⁴ Such a telescopic focus on *mai 68* marginalises an appreciation of what happened in the run-up to 1968, the significant events of June and how the medium-term implications were played out. The emphasis on the spectacular, four-week period is perhaps unsurprising but, alongside the over-emphasis on the role of students in this brief period, does very little to help us fully appreciate the magnitude, depth and potency of these seminal events in France and the Francophone world.

The limitations produced by the restrictive temporal framework are exacerbated by the fact that *mai 68* is more often than not popularly perceived as a student revolt.²⁵ There is no denying that students were an essential part of what happened, and it could be reasonably argued that without their contribution, France may not have experienced such an exceptional and important period of revolt. Students triggered the events and it was often their actions throughout the course of *mai-juin 68* that kept the momentum going. However, this obfuscates the widespread nature and spread of participation right across French society. Furthermore, it is the participation of elements beyond the university milieu that arguably represents the genuine significance of what happened. For example, the 1968 events witnessed the greatest strike ever in French history with a reported 10 million people from right across French society downing tools and, in many cases, occupying their place of work.²⁶

The 'student revolt of May 68' is also erroneously dominated by its emphasis on events in Paris. When one considers the plethora of academic publications, media attention and popular debate afforded to this period over the years, one would be forgiven for believing that nothing much happened beyond the capital.²⁷ There are of course good reasons to explain why this is the case (for example, the heavily centralised nature of France has historically seen Paris become the principal site of protest as all the seats of power are located there including, and vitally important for the construction of 1968's dominant narrative, all major media outlets). As was the case with the role of students, it is important to avoid undermining the importance of Paris in triggering and inspiring a much broader revolt. However, the events of 1968 were not limited to the capital; this was not only a nationwide revolt but one, as we shall see below, that had important reverberations beyond metropolitan France and around the Francophone world. It is true that some of the iterations of 1968 simply followed the capital's lead. However, there were many others that were experiencing specific problems related to their own particular context. It was indeed such issues that underpinned and conditioned these revolts that consequently bore little or no resemblance to the characteristics that have come to dominate how this period is commonly remembered and understood.²⁸

This doxa has assisted the dilution of the 1968 events to nothing more than a student-based, Parisian revolt that took place over a very brief period before being brought under control and whose consequences have been minimal but largely positive for all concerned. In the period 1968-2008, an 'unlikely tango' between *soixantehuitard* 'memory barons' and successive governments has ensured that this sanitised version is that which dominates the French collective memory of these events that in fact were a much more important, widespread and potent example of the ongoing power of the people and the street in contemporary France.²⁹ Furthermore, through the marginalisation of events beyond Paris and in particular beyond metropolitan France, such a

²⁴ Reynolds, *Memories of May '68*, pp. 36–52.

²⁵ Such over-emphasis is evident in prominent studies such as Jean-Pierre le Goff, *Mai 68, l'héritage impossible* (Paris: La Découverte, 1998) or Hervé Hamon and Patrick Rotman, *Génération: Les Années de rêve*, 2 vols (Paris: Seuil, 1987), I. For a broader discussion on the construction of this element of the convenient consensus see Reynolds, *Memories of May '68*, pp. 11–35.

²⁶ Xavier Vigna, *L'Insubordination ouvrière dans les années 68. Essai d'histoire politique des usines* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2007).

²⁷ Kristin Ross, *May '68 and its Afterlives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); Sommier, pp. 63–82.

²⁸ Chris Reynolds, 'Understanding 1968: The Case of Brest', *Modern and Contemporary France*, 16 (2008): pp. 209–22.

²⁹ Reynolds, *Memories of May '68*, p. 33.

narrative has effectively side-lined how these seminal events are to be understood in the context of France's very recent status as a postcolonial nation, thus further complicating a genuinely fulsome understanding.

1968 at 50

Whilst Sarkozy's attack on the legacy of 1968 and the subsequent reaction to it could be held up as one of the defining themes of the fortieth anniversary of 1968, the presidential candidate's remarks only served to trigger an early start to the traditional commemorative fervour that would consolidate the now firmly ensconced dominant narrative.³⁰ However, if one carefully sifts through the plethora of material produced, it is possible to discern the early signs of a challenge to the doxa.³¹ In terms of the temporal framework, certain studies started to employ a much wider optic; the over-emphasis on students remained, but there was evidence of a shift beyond the university milieu; and whilst the capital continued to monopolise perspectives, some evidence of a broader geographical approach was apparent.³² The endurance and strengthening of the '68 industry in 2018, it could be argued, helped consolidate the maintenance of the prevailing story that has come to dominate the memory of these events. However, the early signs of a shift that were just about perceptible in 2008 were delivered upon in 2018 with a direct and significant challenge to the three pillars of the convenient consensus. Not only has it become more common to see the period referred to as 'mai-juin 68', there has been general acceptance that an even broader perspective is required—exemplified by the increasingly common term 'les années 68' used to capture a period stretching from the mid-to-late 1960s to the early-to-mid 1970s.³³ Such a broader perspective has been equally apparent in terms of the protagonists of the revolt and a widening of the geographical lens.

Transnationalizing 1968

The term '1968' has become a byword for what was an exceptional period of international upheaval with a wave of rebellion sweeping the globe. From China to Cuba, Japan to the US, Britain to Czechoslovakia; almost everywhere, it seems, experienced a '68'. At the time, there was clearly an awareness of the interconnectedness of movements all over the world.³⁴ This was enhanced by

³⁰ Nicolas Sarkozy. 'Déclaration [...] sur le bilan de quatre mois de campagne électorale', Meeting at Bercy, 29 April 2007 <http://discours.vie-publique.fr/notices/073001622.html> [accessed 24 September 2018].

³¹ Reynolds, *Memories of May '68*, pp. 123–37.

³² Examples include: Antoine Artous, Didier Epsztajn and Patrick Silberstein, *La France des années 1968* (Paris: Syllepse, 2008); Geneviève Dreyfus-Armand, *Les Années 68, un monde en mouvement: nouveaux regards sur une histoire plurielle* (Paris: Syllepse, 2008); Jean-Pierre Filiu, *Mai 68 à l'ORTF* (Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2008); Etienne Fouilloux, *Les chrétiens français entre guerre d'Algérie et mai 68* (Lyon: Paroles et Silence, 2008); *Les Années 68 au cinéma*, ed. by Sébastien Layerle, Sylvie Dreyfus-Alphandéry and Manée Teyssandier (Paris: Autour du 1er mai, 2008); Gisèle Lougart, *Pays Basque nord: Mai 68 en mémoires* (Bayonne: Elkar, 2008); Faouzi Mahjoub, Alain Leibling and François-René Simon, *Les Enragés du football: L'autre mai 68* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 2008); Vincent Porhel, *Ouvriers Bretons: Conflits d'usines, conflits identitaires en Bretagne dans les années 68* (Rennes: Presses Universitaire de Rennes, 2008); Jean Ragueneau, *De mai 68 à LIP—Un dominicain au cœur des luttes* (Paris: Karthala, 2008); Pierre Robin, *Mai 68 en Lot-et-Garonne* (Narrosse: Albret, 2008); Patrick and Charlotte Rotman, *Les années 68* (Paris: Seuil, 2008).

³³ Olivier Fillieule and Sophie Bérourd, *Changer le monde, changer sa vie: enquête sur les militantes et les militants des annexes 1968 en France* (Arles: Actes Sud, 2018); Jean-Philippe Legois, *33 jours qui ébranlèrent la Sorbonne: Les années 68* (Paris: Syllepse, 2018); Didier Leschi and Robi Morder, *Quand les lycéens prenaient la parole: Les années 68* (Paris: Syllepse, 2018); Charlotte Rotman and Patrick Rotman, *Les Années 68* (Paris: Seuil, 2018).

³⁴ There has been some debate as to what extent such interconnectedness was real or imagined with general acceptance that both existed. Real interconnectedness was present with those involved who actively sought out international contacts and participated in transnational gatherings and discussions. Imagined interconnectedness explains a prevalent desire amongst activists to feel as though they were plugged into some form of transnational movement or *zeitgeist* without any tangible evidence of this actually taking place. See for example, *Europe's 1968:*

developments in communications and media (and in particular television) that meant that young people could draw inspiration from each other in their respective quests for change. Since 1968, there has been a genuine desire to make sense of how it was that so many people in so many different national contexts took part in revolts that shared strong similarities in and around the same, relatively brief period.³⁵ Interest in the transnational nature of 1968 reached a high point in 2008 with it featuring as one of the predominant themes of studies to coincide with the fortieth anniversary.³⁶ There appeared to be a growing consensus that a genuine understanding of any one national, regional or local '68 was predicated on a consideration of the rather exceptional international context and influence of the time.

Within this emergent transnational narrative, it is possible to delineate a certain hierarchy with some '68s' occupying more space and acquiring more importance than others. This is particularly true of *mai 68* that has arguably acquired the position of the 68 *par excellence*.³⁷ There are of course a number of reasons to explain why the French events have been placed on the '68 pedestal. However, just as it is the case at national level, such an over-emphasis on one manifestation of this transnational revolt, has had for consequence the marginalisation of 'other 68s' that do not sit comfortably within the dominant paradigm. The focus on what could be described as 'peripheral 1968s' in places that one would not normally associate with this period has helped to raise awareness of the international spread and divergence of the revolt. Studies into experiences of 1968 right across the globe have stretched the optic into new areas.³⁸ What could be described as 'minor' European 1968s (for example, in Iceland, Portugal or Denmark) have increasingly found their place in the narrative, helping to illustrate the fragmented nature of experiences.³⁹ 'Difficult 1968s' in Europe and beyond, such as that of Northern Ireland or Mexico, which, until now, scholars have found difficult to integrate within the broadly positive perspective of this period, are starting to carve out their place, despite the problematic questions they raise.⁴⁰ The level of violence and the divergent post-68 trajectories of such examples certainly offer alternative narratives to the one dominated by the example of France's Parisian events.

It is, however, the recent trend that has seen the '68' optic widened to consider events in some of France's overseas territories and former colonies that not only is of most interest to the current readership but also offers one of the most potent examples of the necessity to break the 'Paris, May, Student' triptych. Over the years, there has been some focus of course on France's former colonial territories. However, attention has traditionally remained heavily concentrated on the impact of the Algerian War.⁴¹ When one considers the extent to which this most problematic and protracted decolonization process conditioned the political and intellectual circumstances of

Voices of Revolt, ed. by Robert Gildea, James Mark and Anette Warring (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 326–38.

³⁵ David Caute, *Sixty-Eight: The Year of the Barricades* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1988); George Katsiaficas, *The Imagination of the New Left: A Global Analysis of 1968* (Boston: South End Press, 1987); Ronald Fraser, *1968: A Student Generation in Revolt* (New York: Pantheon, 1988).

³⁶ Cathy Crane and Nicholas Muellner, *(1968): Episodes of Culture in Contest* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Publishing, 2008); Gerard de Groot, *The Sixties Unplugged* (London: Pan Books, 2008); Nora Farik, *1968 Revisited: 40 Years of Protest Movements* (Brussels: Heinrich Böll Foundation, 2008); 'Special issue on 1968', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 33.4 (2008) ed. by Egil Førland; Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth, *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

³⁷ Chris Reynolds, *Sous les pavés...the Troubles. Northern Ireland, France and the European Collective Memory of 1968* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2015), pp. 19–48.

³⁸ For example, see <http://wp.nyu.edu/shanghai-1968/program-2016/> [accessed 24 September 2018]. Cf. *The Routledge Handbook of the Global Sixties: Between Protest and Nation-Building*, ed. by Chen Jian and others (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018).

³⁹ George Katsiaficas, *The Global Imagination of 1968: Revolution and Counterrevolution* (Oakland: PM Press, 2018); Gildea, Mark, and Warring, *Europe's 1968*.

⁴⁰ Susan Draper, *1968 Mexico: Constellations of Freedom and Democracy* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018); Chris Reynolds, *Sous les pavés...the Troubles*.

⁴¹ For example, Reynolds, *Sous les pavés...the Troubles*, pp. 19–22; Todd Shephard, 'Algerian Reveries on the Far Right: Thinking about Algeria to Change France in 1968', in *May 68: Rethinking France's Last Revolution*, ed. by Julian Jackson, Anna-Louise Milne and James S. Williams (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011), pp. 76–92.

late 1950s to early 1960s France, the emphasis on Algeria is perfectly understandable. However, this emphasis on the Algerian conflict has traditionally been framed within the ‘Paris, May, Student’ paradigm; that is, the extent to which Algeria was influential for the Parisian students that determined the events of *mai 68*. Nonetheless, a notable shift that shines a light on experiences outside the capital and beyond the metropole into former colonial territories and ‘les confettis de l’empire’ has indeed become discernible.⁴² The exposure of the limitations of the dominant Paris-centric narrative through such work is patently obvious, demonstrating the extent of the reach of these events far beyond the cobblestoned streets of the capital’s Latin Quarter. However, whilst clearly highlighting the inadequacy of one of the three pillars of the dominant narrative, such a challenge is not restricted to only geographical considerations. In fact, one of the resulting consequences is the importance of also breaking out of the restrictive temporal framework of *mai 68*.

Michelle Zancarini-Fournel’s inclusion of unrest in Martinique in the late 1950s, the disquiet of 1960s Réunion and the 1967 rebellion and violence in Guadeloupe all as part and parcel of ‘le moment 68’ is a compelling example of how such stories are essential considerations in the ongoing process of fleshing out a better understanding of these events that were simply not restricted to Paris nor May 1968.⁴³ The 1963 events in Congo-Brazzaville known as ‘Les Trois Glorieuses’ are also increasingly recognised as part of this narrative. As Françoise Blum argues, they are part of a broader movement that is often airbrushed from the dominant narrative of 1968: ‘on oublie généralement qu’il y eut en Afrique même, au vingtième siècle, des révolutions qui participent d’une manière ou d’une autre à la vague mondiale de révoltes de ce que l’on a pu appeler, en une référence assez franco-centrée, les “années 68”.’⁴⁴ In another example, as argued by Omar Gueye, making sense of the events of May-June 1968 in Senegal is not only predicated on taking into consideration specific local circumstances. The temporal overlap with the wave of revolt sweeping France and beyond is by no means coincidental: ‘Mai 68 au Sénégal coïncidait avec la vague de contestations estudiantines et/ou révolutionnaires qui bouleversaient le monde, dans un contexte de guerre froide et de contradictions idéologiques.’⁴⁵ Finally, Burleigh Hendrickson’s study of Tunisia and in particular his quest to find Tunisia in the ‘Global 1960s’ through a consideration of ‘local, national and postcolonial dimensions’ that spills into the early 1970s further underscores the necessity to see beyond the dominant perspective.⁴⁶

A consideration of such events through the prism of 1968 adds further weight to the need to broaden the prevailing temporal framework to take into consideration a wider timeframe that starts well in advance of 1968 and continues for some time after. Moreover, the socio-economic issues that underpinned such disquiet and upheaval went far beyond the concerns of the Parisian university milieu and subsequently saw the involvement and contribution of a much broader constituency of participants, both in France and beyond.⁴⁷

⁴² Examples include: Françoise Blum; ‘Années 68 postcoloniales ? : “Mai” de France et d’Afrique’, *French Historical Studies*, 41.2 (2018): pp. 193–218; Pierre Odin, ‘Les différents impacts de Mai 68 aux Antilles françaises: trajectoires et circulations des militants antillais au sein des gauches révolutionnaires et anticolonialistes’, Congrès AFSP Aix 2015 <http://www.afsp.info/archives/congres/congres2015/st/st13/st13odin.pdf> [accessed 24 September 2018]; Andy Stafford, ‘Senegal: May 1968, Africa’s Revolt’, *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute Supplement*, 6 (2009): pp. 129–135. Also noteworthy is the place afforded to such areas in a number of 2018 conferences, for example, the seminar series ‘Mai 68 vu des Suds’ (2 March–14 April 2018) <http://imaf.cnrs.fr/IMG/pdf/suds68.pdf> [accessed 24 September 2018] and the conference ‘Empreintes étudiantes des années 1968 dans le monde’ (2–4 May 2018) <http://www.germe-inform.fr/?p=3129> [accessed 24 September 2018].

⁴³ Michelle Zancarini-Fournel, *Les luttes et les rêves: Une histoire populaire de la France de 1685 à nos jours* (Paris: Zones, 2016), pp. 778–865.

⁴⁴ Françoise Blum, *Révolutions africaines: Congo-Brazzaville, Sénégal, Madagascar, années 1960-1970* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2014), p. 9.

⁴⁵ Omar Gueye, ‘Mai 1968 au Sénégal: Dakar dans le mouvement social mondial’, *Socio* 10 (2018): pp. 121–136 (p. 122).

⁴⁶ Burleigh Hendrickson, ‘Finding Tunisia in the Global 1960s’, *Monde(s)*, 11.1 (2017): pp. 61–78.

⁴⁷ Burleigh Hendrickson, ‘From the Archives to the Streets: Listening to the Global 1960s in the Former French Empire’, *French Historical Studies*, 40.2 (2017): pp. 319–342; Françoise Blum, ‘1968—a post-colonial phenomenon? The “Mays” of France and Africa’, in *The Routledge Handbook of the Global Sixties*, ed. by Chen Jian and others (Abingdon:

The potency of this recent shift in 1968 studies to take into consideration what happened in France's overseas territories and former colonies during *les années 68* is one of the most significant developments in the ongoing and growing challenge to the dominant narrative on this era. It is precisely the manner with which such studies are able to articulate the interconnected shortcomings of each element of the dominant triptych that demonstrates just why this is an essential and fruitful new direction for research into these seminal, national and global events. However, if such extra-territorial elements can be stitched into *les années 68* paradigm, it is not only because of the crossover in terms of the inherent interconnectedness, the idea that these were early warning signs for France, or the similarities in terms of the frustrations being voiced and the forms of actions deployed. They also merit attention in debates about 1968 because such events at this time are not only to be understood through the prism of what was happening in France, but, interestingly, what was taking place in France was influenced from such external occurrences.

That a number of overseas territories and former colonies kept a close eye on events in France during the heady days of May-June 1968 leading to their own similar-type revolts is hardly surprising.⁴⁸ The close links between such territories and metropolitan France can only have made the actions of French protestors an even more potent source of inspiration for those agitating for change. However, a closer look at France before, during and after the 1968 events uncovers considerable influence moving in the opposite direction. For example, there was increasing and instrumental activism by 'colonial' students in metropolitan France before, during and after the events of 1968. Françoise Blum's work on La Fédération des étudiants d'Afrique noire en France (FEANF) exposes the militancy of such students and argues that 'l'effet diaspora' was a significant contributing factor to this exceptional period of revolt.⁴⁹ Felix Germain's study on African and Caribbean migrants in postwar Paris contains a chapter entitled 'May 68 in Black' which seeks to emphasize 'the presence and meaning of the events for radicalized minorities in France' with the objective of challenging their absence from the dominant narrative by bringing them 'out of the realm of invisibility'.⁵⁰ There has also been a growing body of literature exposing the importance of the role of immigrants beyond the student body, many of whom arrived in France from overseas territories and former colonies. For example, Daniel Gordon argues for the need to challenge the 'curious omission' of students *and* workers of immigrant background from the story of 1968. Importantly, as well as his call to put 'Immigration back into the History of 1968', Gordon also argues for the need to put '1968 back into the History of Immigration', for, as he contends, 'the "68 years" were also the "immigrant years"'.⁵¹ Such a focus on how a consideration of the 1968 events is a vital element of debates around immigration more generally is supported by Yvan Gastaut for whom 'Mai 1968 a marqué un tournant majeur dans l'évolution de l'image des étrangers en France'.⁵² Finally, Xavier Vigna's seminal work on the role of the working class in 1968 goes a long way towards turning the spotlight on the oft-forgotten role of immigrant workers during France's greatest ever general strike, arguing that the 'participation des ouvriers immigrés aux mouvements de grèves, fut plus forte que l'historiographie de la considère'.⁵³ These recent examples of studies that have widened the optic are part of growing trend that will ultimately deepen our appreciation of the events from without and within, underlining the importance of making this an important element of how we understand '1968'.

Routledge, 2018), pp. 333–343.

⁴⁸ Cf. for example, Bocar Niang and Pascal Scallon-Chouinard, "'Mai 68" au Sénégal et les médias: une mémoire en questions', *Le Temps des médias*, 26.1 (2016): pp. 163–180.

⁴⁹ Françoise Blum, 'L'indépendance sera révolutionnaire ou ne sera pas. Étudiants africains en France contre l'ordre colonial', *Cahiers d'histoire. Revue d'histoire critique*, 126 (2015): pp. 119–138 (p. 119).

⁵⁰ Felix F. Germain, *Decolonizing the Republic: African and Caribbean Migrants in Postwar Paris, (1946-1974)* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2016), p. 141.

⁵¹ Daniel Gordon, *Immigrants and Intellectuals. May'68 and the Rise of Anti-Racism in France* (Pontypool: Merlin Press, 2012), pp. 1–18.

⁵² Yvan Gastaut, 'Quand Mai 1968 rencontre l'immigration: un moment de l'opinion française', *Hommes & Migrations*, 1321.2 (2018) : pp.152–160 (p. 160).

⁵³ Vigna, p. 48.

Conclusion

The convergence between the ‘turn to the past’ and the construction of the dominant narrative of 1968 only partly explains the significance of this period of revolt in terms of debates around memory. The French events of 1968 provide a very rich and potent case study of the complexities and challenges in making sense of how and why we collectively remember things in the way we do. The pivotal role of commemorations in this process is particularly significant. Firstly, the increasingly intense commemorative enthusiasm of the ‘68 industry’ that has built up over the last 50 years is confirmation of our enduring obsession with the past. Secondly, such periodic reassessments have provided us with very useful plotting points to map out how the memory has developed over the years. Finally, the way the dominant narrative has changed is an excellent example of the fluidity of memory. Maurice Halbwachs argued how our understanding of the past is determined by the needs of our present.⁵⁴ As the years have unfolded and contexts have changed, so too has our understanding of 1968. However, as has been argued in this *état présent*, despite this fluidity, a certain ‘convenient consensus’ based around the three notions of ‘May’, ‘Students’, and ‘Paris’ has become anchored in the how the events are remembered and recounted today. Undoing the work of this restrictive doxa is not something that can be achieved overnight and is not without its challenges. However, amidst the white noise of the now traditional commemorative zeal that accompanied the 50th anniversary of 1968, and arguably most effectively through an examination of how *les années 68* were experienced in France’s overseas territories and former colonies, there are signs that a challenge to the ‘Parisian student revolt of May 1968’ is both possible and under way. Next stop...2028.

CHRIS REYNOLDS
NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY

⁵⁴ Maurice Halbwachs, *Les Cadres Sociaux de la Mémoire* (Paris: Alcan, 1925).

BOOK REVIEWS

Citizen Outsider: Children of North African Immigrants in France. By JEAN BEAMAN. Oakland: University of California Press, 2017. 170pp. Pb £27. ISBN: 9780520294264

Jean Beaman's *Citizen Outsider: Children of North African Immigrants in France* opens with the paradox that 'France does not acknowledge racial minorities yet marks those individuals as different' (p. 18). Under the republican model, Beaman suggests, racial and ethnic minorities 'can feel as French as anyone else, but still not be treated as such or accepted as French by others' (p. 20). *Citizen Outsider's* timely investigation into questions of France's exceptionalism regarding race, religion and cultural difference adds an innovative sociological lens to long-established theoretical concerns in the field of Francophone postcolonial studies. *Citizen Outsider* derives the majority of its focus from the forty-five fieldwork interviews Beaman conducted in 2008-9 with second-generation, middle-class Maghrebi immigrants from Parisian *banlieues* as part of her doctoral research. *Citizen Outsider* uses its five chapters (and separate methodological appendix) to unpack how questions of belonging are still 'inextricably linked to boundaries around French identity marked by race and ethnicity' (p. 6), and how respondents, in turn, 'frame and make sense of experiences and perceptions of discrimination and marginalization across different domains' (p. 22). Beaman extends her analysis in interesting directions by simultaneously drawing on her own experiences 'not only as a researcher but as a native-born American and a black woman' (p. 23). Her affinity with her respondents who, as she reminds us, are 'not treated as full citizens because of their assigned otherness' (p. 4) is clearly strong, with accounts of candid conversations in cafes, apartments and community centres providing a structuring arc throughout the text.

Citizen Outsider opens with an exploration of respondents' experiences growing up with immigrant parents and how respondents 'learn to navigate the different and cultural worlds of home and school' (p. 27). The second chapter extends this notion of opposing cultural spheres, examining 'experiences of being marked as different across the different domains of Islam, the workplace, the place of residence, and the public sphere' (p. 45), before taking a closer look at what Beaman describes as 'the boundaries of French and Maghrebin identity' (p. 69) in Chapter 3. Overall, these interventions would have been stronger for a more careful, contextualized discussion of forms of space—and the historical context of enduring forms of discrimination—that are implicitly referenced but never clearly defined. A more detailed interrogation of Beaman's assertion that 'complexities of and citizenship status in France are crucial to understanding how postcolonial immigrants and their descendants were left out of social and symbolic boundaries' (p. 10) would have allowed *Citizen Outsider* move beyond its overly simplistic definition of the *banlieue* (singular) as a 'site of racial and ethnic otherness where children of North African immigrants live' (p. 56). Moreover, the lack of clear distinction between the terms 'North African', 'Algerian' and 'Maghrebin', which are used interchangeably at different intervals, undermines both the precision of analysis and clarity of expression.

In the final chapter, Beaman sets out her conceptualization of 'transnational blackness' (p. 88). She suggests that 'North African second-generation's connection to blackness is an expression of their position at the bottom of the ethnoracial hierarchy: without a language or discourse to discuss it, they look elsewhere to make sense of their lives' (pp. 88–89). Although this transnational optic opens up interesting grounds for further research, it should not come at the expense of an arguably indispensable Francophone context. Indeed, *Citizen Outsider's* lack of engagement with the legacies of the *Négritude* movement in France, or with scholars such as Charles Forsdick, Alan Rice, Nicola Firth and Françoise Vergès, who have all explored the enduring legacies of slavery in the French Caribbean and Sub-Saharan Africa, feels like a missed opportunity. Whilst Beaman claims to have not imposed 'an American style understanding of race and ethnicity on the French context' (p. 110), her propensity to 'see race and racism through [her] own filter' (p. 111), detracts from much of the strength of her research findings.

Although *Citizen Outsider's* skillful oscillation between first-hand account and cross-border analysis provides an innovative perspective on life in contemporary France, it would have benefited from a closer engagement with Francophone postcolonial theory, literature, music or cinema. Doing so might ultimately have helped to dispel Beaman's conviction that 'members of the North African second generation do not cultivate an oppositional consciousness or identity' (p. 83). Rather than conflating questions of French cultural citizenship with the 'xenophobic sentiment, heightened Islamophobia, and rise of far right' that led to the UK Brexit Vote in 2016 (a phenomenon Beaman suggests was 'a response to the Syrian refugee crises'), this text would have been much stronger for narrowing its geo-political focus, and giving its first-hand testimonies the careful framing, and exploration, they deserve. Ultimately, *Citizen Outsider* is perhaps too confident in its assertion that 'researchers should not fear the implications of their identities and social locations for research process' (p. 111) and in the tacit assumption that we can ever truly claim to 'understand the totality of individuals' lives' (p. 111).

ELLEN DAVIS-WALKER
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Regarder des films en Afriques. Edited by PATRICIA CAILLÉ and CLAUDE FOREST.
Villeneuve d'Ascq, France: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 2017. 352 pp. Pb 28€. ISBN:
9782757417249

Patricia Caillé and Claude Forest's impressive edited volume is the fruit of several fieldwork projects and colloquia during the past few years focussing on film spectatorship in Africa. Caillé makes it clear in the introduction that the goal of the volume is to shift the focus (or lens, as she puts it) away from an examination of African cinema as cultural artefact toward an investigation of African film spectator practices from the colonial period to the present day. She is correct in underscoring the paucity of scholarship in this area and the need to 'retourner le regard' (p. 21) in order to understand the various ways in which African cinema spectators engage with films from around the world. This is not a book about film spectatorship and identity construction but is about histories of viewing practices and 'la constitution des cultures de cinéma' (p. 40) in a continent that has endured colonialism, liberation struggles, structural adjustment programmes and the domination of African screens by Western images.

Gauging contexts of reception in the African continent is a monumental objective, which the editors set out to achieve through sixteen essays by researchers involved in the fieldwork projects or who presented at the colloquia held recently in Strasbourg and Marrakech. Their 'démarche réflexive' (p. 22) attempts to move away from current trends of considering African film as a body of work to be analysed primarily through content and form, as though divorced from larger cultural contexts in which technical developments impact production in regions largely dominated by Western media. This is really the first volume in its field to attempt such breadth of topic on the history and context of viewing practices in Africa since the birth of cinema. Its case study approach allows each contributor to focus on a local or national industry or a comparative analysis of one or two national contexts. A major strength of this volume is its archival documentation of the history of film distribution and exhibition, and numbers and types of cinemas and spectators in African regions. Organized into three thematic sections (history, contemporary viewing practices, and access) the volume's first three essays detail spectatorship in West Africa and the Maghreb during the colonial period and Madagascar during independence and post-independence. The opening essay by Odile Goerg combines archival documentation with testimonies from renowned African authors such as Birago Diop, Bernard Dadié and Amadou Hampaté Bâ. It immediately draws the reader into a fascinating analysis of how cinema during the colonial era could simultaneously function as both site of spectacle and site of resistance to racism depicted in films screened and to racist practices on the parts of the colonial authorities. Nolwenn

Mingant's contribution on Maghrebi spectatorship during the colonial era shows how film publics were shaped by US distribution and exhibition of film between 1925 and 1945. For example, class and social division were further reinforced through type of film screened in urban or rural cinemas, choice of language through French dubbing or subtitles, and even spectator behaviour during screenings. Mingant argues that in the eyes of the colonial authorities, cinema was a site and space in which they could exercise their Western education and superiority.

Throughout the rest of the volume, the essays demonstrate the various ways in which African spectators take back their screens and their images. For example, Vincent Bouchard describes how, in Senegal and in Burkina Faso, films in foreign languages are narrated by *griottes* who mediate the experience for film-goers by blending traditional forms of storytelling with newer technologies. In a similar vein, F. Fronty's essay asks how expanded cinema practices will impact African spectators. Karine Blanchon outlines how going to the cinema in Madagascar, where the level of illiteracy is high, functions as a way of parading one's social status because the price of the ticket determines which section one is seated in. Several essays use quantitative data and surveys to identify and categorize viewing practices in Morocco, Tunisia, Togo and Chad. Justin Ouoro interviewed actors and directors in Ouagadougou and then distributed questionnaires to moviegoers exiting cinemas to analyse how contemporary filmmakers in Burkina Faso capitalize on the 'Nollywood' phenomenon to make video films that appeal to 'Ouagawood' audiences. Lamina Belkaied-Guiga discusses video clubs in Tunisia and Honoré Fouhba analyses how video clubs proliferated in Northern Cameroon in the 1990s as traditional cinemas began shutting down. Alessandro Jedlowski's presents a fascinating essay on Nollywood video films dubbed into French for Ivory Coast audiences, and Claude Forest and Juliette Akouvi Founou's study of travelling cinemas in rural Togo and audience reaction to film genres all add to the fascinating topics offered by this volume.

If the volume has a slight patchwork feel to it, it is because of its scope. The volume's title promises a continental overview, yet the focus ultimately is very much on 'Francophone' or nations with a history of French colonialism. The editors address this in the introduction and explain that in the case of Nigerian cinema and in particular, Nollywood, these industries have been extensively analysed elsewhere. It would have been interesting, however, to see an analysis of how the Nigerian state attempted to 'indigenize', through a 1972 decree, its cinematic infrastructure and 'take back' their cinemas from foreign ownership. The editors make it clear that the current volume is a first step and that much work remains to be done in terms of understanding the multiple parameters of African film spectatorship. This aside, the essays are meticulously researched and are rich in historical and cultural detail, foregrounding important questions about the evolving nature of spectatorship in the continent.

SHEILA PETTY
UNIVERSITY OF REGINA

Paradise Destroyed: Catastrophe and Citizenship in the French Caribbean. By CHRISTOPHER M. CHURCH. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2017. 324 pp. Hb \$65.00. ISBN: 978-0-8032-9099-0

From hurricanes and earthquakes to active volcanoes and fires, natural disasters have been and continue to be an unfortunate reality of French Antillean history. With the abolition of slavery in 1848, the islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe, which were previously considered primarily as extractive colonies and whose value hinged on their economic utility for France, became settlement colonies. As natural disasters struck and decimated these tropical lands, their populace, and infrastructure, French West Indians—now governed by metropolitan law and entitled to French citizenship—turned to France for assistance. Christopher Church's new work, *Paradise Destroyed: Catastrophe and Citizenship in the French Caribbean*, constitutes a valuable addition to considerations

on the history of disasters, both natural and man-made, in the French Antilles during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Published in the 'France Overseas: Studies in Empire and Decolonization' series, this critical study moves beyond inquiries into French Antilleans' assimilation in France's politico-cultural spheres during the Third Republic. Rather, Church makes a compelling case for the role the French Antilles played in challenging and shaping France's ideological convictions rooted in a culture that advocated for an all-encompassing equality at the turn of the century.

Enhanced with relevant and informative illustrations, maps, and tables, this work comprises seven chapters. Its fairly concise introduction begins with an anecdote that recounts a schoolteacher, Roger Portel's deadly encounter with Mount Pelée's eruption. This curt narrative, with its vivid descriptions of the chaos that ensued under Saint Pierre's blackened sky in 1902, transports the reader back to the catastrophe that claimed the lives of 30,000 Martinicans. Following this account, Church eases into his preliminary discussion on the natural disasters, the effects of which were compounded by civil unrest, a declining sugar economy, and political corruption. He provides a solid historical framework that contextualizes his exploration of these crises that called into question the French Republic's core ideologies and its relationship with its old colonies and their citizenry. Although the Law of 8 January 1877 replaced the colonial penal code with metropolitan law and afforded, in theory, equality to all French citizens, the application of this equality fell apart in reality (p. 7). The ensuing environmental disasters exposed, as Church's meticulous research shows, the racial and social tensions that underpinned these disparities, challenged the application of contemporary French universal values, and gave the non-white French Antilleans the opportunity to lobby for their right to inclusion as French citizens.

This work has a vast scope, which gives the author ample material to explore the effects of the disruptive events in the French Antilles on the conceptualization of French national integration and identity. Chapter one highlights that the French Caribbean served as a space that provided an ideological impetus for France's 'civilizing' mission. In this environment considered as 'un-French', the French Antilleans, especially the middle-class mulattoes, came to embody a tropical French identity as they defended French values and, ultimately, represented the success of French universalism. To enrich his study, Church, in his second chapter, examines France's disaster relief politics not only in the French Antilles but also in France, turning specifically to the Great Fires of Port Louis and Fort-de-France and the Saint-Étienne mine collapse. He indicates that the victims of both catastrophes held similar places in the French imaginary (pp. 107–08). Recognized as French citizens, and therefore compatriots, the French Republic honoured its financial responsibility to the French Antilleans in the face of this misfortune. Church's analysis additionally emphasizes that national integration was not solely a colonial issue. By comparing metropolitan reactions to the Great Fires with those to the mine collapse, he convincingly suggests that race was inevitably mapped onto class. This mapping reveals the problematic dynamics of colonial citizenship that leads Church to refer to the miners as 'metropolitan colonials' (p. 97). Turning to the 1891 Hurricane, Chapter three centres on the systemic racism that French officials shrouded as effective budgeting practices to justify diminished financial assistance. Chapter four discusses incendiarism and civil disorder that compelled officials to move beyond their coded rhetoric and deal pointedly with racism and classism in the Antilles.

Church leaves his discussion on the indelible 1902 eruption of Mount Pelée for his penultimate chapter. Treated as a national emergency, this violent eruption, on the one hand, solidified the French Antilles as a fully integrated part of French civilisation in a hostile environment. On the other hand, disaster relief efforts burdened the French economy (p. 230). What makes this chapter particularly engaging is the detailed analysis of three images published in response to the eruption that add visual appeal and expand the author's inquiry into the relationship between France and Martinique (pp. 223–25). In lieu of a traditional conclusion, Church ends his work with an enlightening epilogue that switches gears from natural disasters to the violence resulting from World War I. This change in focus allows him to consider the French West Indians' involvement in this war as a reflection of their patriotism to France, which integrated

them into the French nation and substantiated their French identity. However, as Church rightly points out at the close of his work, the reality stood in stark contrast to these idealistic ambitions that were, and still are, thwarted by geographic, racial, and climatic differences (p. 246).

Thanks to Church's original, insightful, and well-argued new work, researchers can now consider France's old colonies in the Caribbean, with their environmental disasters, civil discord, and political intrigue, as influencing factors in historical and ideological developments within the metropole. With its Francophone focus, this new work situates itself as an innovative contribution to the burgeoning field of Postcolonial Ecocriticism, which has, heretofore, concentrated primarily on an Anglophone context. While not hampering overall comprehension, there are a few minor solecisms that detract slightly from Church's otherwise sophisticated and articulate style. Though thorough, complex, and multidisciplinary in its approach, Church keeps his content clear and coherent, making it accessible to scholars in a broad range of fields, including Caribbean History, Environmental Studies, Francophone Postcolonial Studies, and Political Science.

SHANAAZ MOHAMMED
DAVIDSON COLLEGE

Pacifist Invasions: Arabic, Translation, and the Postfrancophone Lyric. By YASSER ELHARIRY. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2017. 304 pp. Hb £85. ISBN: 9781786940407

Yasser Elhariry's *Pacifist Invasions* sets out no less than to augur a new era in the critical study of 'Francophone' literature, characterized not by embeddedness in postcolonial politics but by 'translingualism'. Elhariry's main focus is on the connections between Francophone poetry and the rich history of classical Arabic letters, and on the 'translational' and bilingual poetics of five poets who all artfully draw on, translate, and remodel a range of Arabic sources in their own ostensibly Francophone writing. The bulk of the book is taken up with intricate readings of works by Habib Tengour, Edmond Jabès, Salah Stétié, Abdelwahab Meddeb and Ryoko Sekiguchi, prefaced or juxtaposed with explanation of the various Arabic traditions from which they borrow. Yet the polemical and theoretical drive of the discussion is ambitious and consequential: these writers' translational and translingual poetics signal the end of the reign of French nevertheless championed, for example, still recently by the proponents of 'littérature-monde en français'. If, moreover, the poets examined by Elhariry can be associated with the dynamic and relational movements of what Jean-Marie Gleize has dubbed 'postpoésie', they also help to usher in what Elhariry calls the 'postfrancophone' condition. The movement beyond that the 'post' promises at the same time not so much a rupture, as 'a linguistic predicament across languages, no longer dominated by postcolonialism defining the francophone' (p. 202). This is also a movement that must be less preoccupied, according to Elhariry, with 'socioliterary identity polemics or writing as action' (p. 207), than with the complex forms of connectivity that can be traced in these artful performances of 'translanguaging'.

The concept of linguistic transfer is articulated in the book by the evocative metaphor of its title, *Pacifist Invasions*. Elhariry explains that he derives the notion first from Saussure, who indeed spoke of 'pénétrations pacifiques' in the context of colonialism and its attendant intercultural permeation (p. 16). It is Salah Stétié who provides the inspiration for the title's precise wording, however, when he writes, in *Le Français, l'autre langue* (2001), of his relationship to the French language that he too will 'envahir à mon tour pacifiquement' (p. 113). *Pacifist Invasions* takes this concept as a starting-point, then, on one level for a vision of Franco-Arabic connectivity that eschews the conflictual dynamic of colonial history. At the same time, Elhariry's frame also captures the deep love his poets and he share for Arabic cultural and literary history and the ethics of devotion and respect that the poetry enacts. Once again, the book in this way offers a completely new model for reading poetry between languages and cultures, one much more dedicated to

attending to the sharing and transfer of sound, image, and tradition than to the dynamics of power. As Elhariry insists at the end of his preface, ‘the empire does not write back. It writes over and beneath. It writes through and across’ (p. 6).

The five main chapters consist of intricate readings of Francophone poetry interwoven with references to and reflections on a range of classical Arabic works. In the chapter on Habib Tengour, for example, Elhariry shows how the volume ‘Césure’ directly translates the idiom of early Arabic lyric, though he is also interested in the ways in which Pierre Joris’s translations of Tengour into English negotiate these translated idioms in his highly allusive, often hermetic, palimpsestic English renderings. The ensuing readings of Jabès, however, are more concerned with the traces of the Arabic that is for the most part missing from the poet’s Cairene work. Elhariry’s readings of Salah Stétié then trace elements of Sufism in his lyric, as well as revealing the threads linking the poet’s concept of ‘dhikr’ (which he translates as evocation, remembrance, or vocalization) with his praising of the benefits of wine, nodding at the same time to Baudelaire. Abdelwahab Meddeb’s dense intertextual engagement with Qu’ranic verses, Sufi poetry and with Ibn ‘Arabi are then read as instances of a connectivity Elhariry dubs ‘infralangagière’, while in the book’s conclusion, he also takes the lack of critical attention to Meddeb (after an initial wave of interest) as emblematic of the short-sightedness he perceives in Francophone studies more broadly. Finally, the Japanese writer Ryoko Sekiguchi’s *Héliotropes* is read so as to expose its underpinning by the medieval Andalusian *mumashshah*.

Elhariry’s readings are both erudite and elegantly presented, and his theoretical premise is bold and insightful. The style of the writing is itself sometimes lyrical, and the work manages to shift deftly between theoretical argument and a more allusive style when engaging more closely with the poetry. The readings take the form of suggestive juxtapositions, though at times it would have been helpful to offer clearer conclusions or at least to finish chapters by associating the commentaries with the theory of the ‘postfrancophone’ lyric. Elhariry’s keenness to reach beyond the conflictual dynamics of the postcolonial context might also be perceived by some readers to be optimistic, since while the poets he analyses are more interested in aesthetic connections than in cultural conflict, in many other instances the relationship between Francophone and Arabophone cultures remains a difficult one. The volume is nevertheless original, important, and at times beautiful in its attentiveness to poetic allusion and to a literary history whose subtlety is often unfamiliar to Francophone readers and critics. It offers itself as a compelling example of patient intercultural reading immersed in literary history and respectful of textual subtlety.

JANE HIDDLESTON
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Poétique de la violence et récits francophones contemporains. EMMANUEL JEAN-FRANÇOIS. Leiden and Boston: Brill-Rodopi, 2017. 300 pp. Hb £65.43. ISBN: 9004336737

Poétique de la violence et récits francophones contemporains opens with the not uncommon observation that we have, for some time now, been immersed in a ‘culture of violence’ (p. 1). Violent imagery of all kinds—from domestic abuse to war, genocide, and state-sponsored violence—inundates our day-to-day lives and the ‘systematic representation of violence’ (p. 1) now saturates global news. This endless stream of violent imagery is not only mundane, but dangerously myopic; the selective diffusion and relentless mediatization of specific violent events—like the bombing of the World Trade Center—influence what we represent and how we understand violence. In this volume, Jean-François explores how contemporary Francophone authors respond to this global culture of violence by creating a new poetics. In other words, Jean-François analyses how these authors ‘represent violence’ through the ‘violence of representation’ (p. 272).

As a scholar of contemporary Francophone literature, Jean-François’s point of departure is unusual: he does not situate his work within a particular subfield (like Postcolonial or Memory

Studies), but rather within the critical study of representations of violence at large. He cites a diverse array of influences, including Walter Benjamin, Wolfgang Iser, Franz Fanon, Yves Michaud, Debarati Sanyal, and others. While some might be wary of such a broad theoretical framework, Jean-François argues that we must interrogate the equivalence between 'literature of violence' and 'postcolonial studies' (p. 13); he claims that an 'anti-colonial' perspective is sometimes 'incomplete, even inept when facing the complexity or the circulation of violence in the contemporary world' (p. 13). While Jean-François explores representations of very different kinds of violence (in act, scale, and context), his interests lie particularly in 'raw, brutal, and degrading' violence (p. 10) and the crisis of representation that it provokes. The result is that the volume's corpus is unusually rich, a transnational body of prose Francophone literature, which Jean-François examines through an innovative interdisciplinary approach informed by psychoanalysis, philosophy, and sociology.

Jean-François loosely identifies not a movement, nor a generation, but a 'tribe' of contemporary authors (p. 10). Among this 'tribe', one finds both well-established writers (Tahar Ben Jelloun, Yasmina Khadra, Véronique Tadjo, and Ahmadou Kourouma) and relatively understudied figures, notably writers hailing from Iran (Fariba Hachtroudi) and Martinique (Alfred Alexandre). He also includes several Western writers (like Canadian author Lise Blouin and Belgian author Amélie Nothomb) who are not often read alongside their Caribbean, Sub-Saharan, and Maghrebi peers. In spite of their diverse backgrounds, these authors are united by the emergence of a 'shared aesthetic code', which is marked by formal experimentation and presupposes an 'often subversive or ironic ethical engagement' (p. 10). While these authors make up the same chronological generation (most were born in the '50s and '60s), Jean-François acknowledges that many other contemporary Francophone authors could have been included, and this is only a representative sample (p. 11).

The volume opens with three chapters that offer a thorough descriptive catalogue of the kinds of spectacularized violence represented in the corpus and the structures that govern these representations. Chapter one uses sociology and ethnography to analyse violence on the scale of social groups; Jean-François investigates how ethnographic markers (like gender, race, or ethnicity) and spatial characteristics are interrogated in these texts. For example, Jean-François draws attention to ethnicity as an ambivalent identity marker, central to discourses of hegemony. He likewise highlights the way in which these authors reconfigure the notion of 'territory', by representing decentralized spaces, dominated by war, totalitarian regimes, genocide, or urban crime. Chapter two examines the kinds of violence that appear, their sociohistorical contexts, and variable psychoanalytic causes. Chapter three continues in this psychoanalytic vein, but on a smaller scale, examining how violence is experienced by the individual human subject, particularly with relationship to desire and power. While the scope of this analysis is impressive, such an expansive catalog sometimes belies a cursory overview of the sociohistorical contexts that come to bear on each novel; it sometimes treats acts that are not obviously included within the category of violence. In these chapters, the writers themselves can appear somewhat secondary: symptoms of (or reactions to) our collective culture of violence. The analysis of violence that intersects with sexual, scatological, and bodily taboos (pp. 72–84) nevertheless unearths fertile paths for future research. Jean-François's discussion of poverty as violence also showcases the benefits of this broad approach; it forces us to rethink our conceptual scheme, highlighting a form of violence that is so overrepresented and undervalued as to have become banal.

The second half of the volume ventures into more familiar territory for literary scholars. Chapter four provides an overview of this literature as 'counter-violence', or a representation of violence that acts as a political commitment. These texts consider testimony as an ethical engagement ('un devoir de mémoire'), actively taking the position of the victims, denouncing and resisting power. The discussion of aesthetics is mainly relegated to the final two chapters, where Jean-François analyses the linguistic practices of these authors, as well as their poetics of the extreme or 'écriture des limites'. The volume's organization can have the effect of dissociating violence represented from the form of its representation. Nonetheless, Jean-François compellingly

describes this liminal aesthetics as two-fold: first, it involves writing about extreme or excessive, almost intolerable, violence; second, the writing itself does violence to a proscriptive use of the French language, through heteroglossia and linguistic and generic hybridity. Jean-François understands this hybrid French not so much as a desire for realism as an aesthetic necessity. True, these texts represent multilingual, transnational, and diasporic subjects, whose relationship to French complicates any notion of a linguistic or cultural standard. Speaking 'between' languages, or even speaking French 'badly' (as Kourouma would say), however, is a necessity for the subaltern and her political commitment. This recalibrating of language habits allows new voices to emerge, voices that by virtue of being implicated in transcultural violence, necessarily speak to a readerly public with global sensibilities.

Poétique de la violence et récits francophones contemporains is an excellent primer for studying contemporary Francophone writers invested in the representation of violence. Jean-François's interdisciplinary, comparative approach makes a strong claim not only for the global frameworks inherent in representing violence in the modern era, but the global implications of Francophone literature. When faced with the problem of representing violence as an ethical problem in and of itself, Jean-François makes a strong case for these Francophone authors and their attempt to 'understand violence, its parameters, forms, causes, and consequences' (p. 277).

AUBREY GABEL
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Francophonie en Orient. Aux Croisements France-Asie (1840-1940). By MATHILDE KANG. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018. 222 pp. Hb 89€. ISBN: 9789462985148

Mathilde Kang's ambitious monograph is a welcome initiative within the context of ongoing interrogations of the concept of *francophonie* by scholars working on postcolonial studies and 'world literature'. *Francophonie en Orient* argues for a theoretical re-configuration of the concept of *francophonie*, the one that includes within its boundaries the region of East Asia, which is usually considered non-Francophone. Despite the rather ambitious title announcing the scope of the study as taking in all of Asia, Kang's project focuses mainly on Francophone phenomena in China (with supplementary considerations looking at Japan and Korea). The term 'L'Orient' adopted by Kang to denote East Asia is problematic as it is at once vague and historically charged. Often associated with exoticism and colonialism, its use in European texts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries refers primarily to today's Turkey and the Middle East rather than Far East Asia. The period examined, from the 1840s to the 1940s, coincided with the height of modern Western colonialism in Asia as elsewhere, but Kang aims to challenge the 'équation entre "colonisation et francophonie"' (p. 9). In fact, she stakes out a rather daring claim to overshadow the scholarship of Francophone studies, which traditionally limits *francophonie* in Asia solely to the study of French Indochina.

To do so, the author sets out, in the first two chapters, to discuss the history of French presence and influence in Asia, focusing on the French concessions in China (particularly Shanghai and Guangzhouwan). While pointing out China's, as well as Japan's and Korea's, sovereignty in contrast to the situation in France's colonies, Kang insists on the complexity and heterogeneity of the French domination in the region ('comptoir', concessions, 'territoire à bail').

The third and fourth chapters are by far the most interesting for they foreground the transnational network of translation, publication and circulation of French ideas and literature between China and France (often through the mediation of Japan). Along with the first two chapters, they provide a clear picture of how *francophonie* in China emerges and develops within the context of more or less successful French imperialist attempts to penetrate commercially and militarily, then culturally, in Far East Asia. Kang develops the concept of 'francophonie de cohabitation' to denote the nature of *francophonie* in non-Francophone sovereign regions where

French language and its cultural influence seemingly ‘co-habit’ with indigenous languages without imposing itself as the official language. Consequently, a literature written in Chinese by Francophone writers emerged, according to Kang, as a ‘littérature de cohabitation’. These literary works range from direct pastiche of the French canon to writing influenced by the aesthetics of ‘l’école française’ (p. 127).

This discussion of transnational literary connections in the Far East contributes to an ongoing debate on ‘world literature’, particularly as defined by David Damrosch as the circulation of works ‘beyond their culture of origin’ (although the American theorist is not mentioned). It nevertheless falls short of providing a satisfactorily engaged interrogation concerning the politics of transnational ‘transfert’. Although the first two chapters examine France’s imperialist ambitions in the region and the ‘cypto-colonial’ nature (although Michael Hertzfeld’s term is not used) of the French occupation of the Chinese lands, Kang rarely addresses the issue again in her subsequent chapters. Framed through the theory of ‘transfert littéraire’ (p. 136), without addressing the question of power relations, Kang’s concept of ‘littérature de cohabitation’ is problematic. It removes the process of ‘worlding’ (Gayatri Spivak’s notion to describe the ways in which neo-colonial power is wielded through the universalization of the particular) from her discussion of the expansion and appropriation of French culture and language in this non-colonized region. Consequently, this apolitical concept of ‘cohabitation’ reduces Chinese literature under French influence into a mere testimony of ‘l’héritage français’ (p. 121).

This blind spot is linked to the initial premise on which this study builds its argument. Adhering to a fixed binary opposition between ‘traditional’ *francophonie* (which, in her view, is exclusively seen as arising with colonization) and Asian *francophonie* (applied to non-colonized and sovereign East Asia), her study is rigidly constrained by its own terms. Hence, this over-simplified categorization: ‘Dans la perspective des études francophones, la littérature est appréhendée en littérature francophone vs. littérature non-francophone. Cette division repose sur le fait que la première relève de la littérature des anciennes colonies et la seconde, de la littérature des pays non-colonisés [sic].’ (p. 121). The assertion that such a definition of *francophonie* is inflexibly adopted by scholars in the area is misleading, if not false. On the contrary, recent works on Francophone Postcolonial Studies (for example, those by Charles Forsdick, David Murphy, Dominique Combe and Jacqueline Bardolph), have moved beyond this outdated definition of *francophonie* and undertaken critical inquiry into not only the monolingualism of the notion of Francophone literature, but also the monocultural, metropolitan-centred aspect of publishing, reading, and literary prizes.

The last chapter moves away from the Chinese corpus to examine French canonical literature either inspired by the Far East and/or written during the author’s stay in the region. By a method akin to *études génétiques*, Kang explores the Chinese sources as well as the author’s biography to pin down the Oriental inspiration in the conception of these texts. While this is informative, the ‘transnational’ approach deployed in the discussion is once again polemical as it is, unexpectedly, positioned in opposition to Edward Said’s concept of Orientalism. The latter is rejected as an ‘étiquette’ (p. 165) that has hegemonized scholarship in the West and generated ‘les typologies occidentales de l’Orient’ which neglects, according to Kang, to see these texts as indicating the ‘évolution du Levant dans l’imaginaire français [qui] témoigne de la pénétration de l’Orient dans l’esprit européen’ (p. 190). The concept of the transnational does help to bring out the circulation of ideas and aesthetics across the globe. But looking at transnationalism *without* any consideration of Orientalism—namely without a critical examination of the ways in which French texts exoticize the Orient and produce problematic discourse about it—runs the risk of feeding into a Franco-centric position that validates a neo-imperialist discourse about the ‘expansion’ of French culture and language into the rest of the world.

Despite these limitations, *Francophonie en Orient* poses a legitimate and timely question concerning the Francophone phenomenon in the Far East. As one of the first book-length studies on *francophonie* in China (and to some extent, Japan and Korea), this monograph builds on previous studies on particular authors and movements such as those by Muriel Détrie and Yinde Zhang

(although the latter, surprisingly, does not figure in Kang's bibliography despite his pioneering works on Chinese *francophonie*).

FAY WANRUG SUWANWATTANA
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Whither Fanon? Studies in the Blackness of Being. By DAVID MARRIOTT. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018. 432 pp. Pb \$29.95. ISBN: 9781503605725

The work of Frantz Fanon has over the years generated an extraordinary number of re-readings, not to say reinventions. Several critical volumes and anthologies have opened with affirmations that it is time to return to Fanon, now with a new context or a new set of preoccupations in mind, as if Fanon is uniquely able to respond to multiple and evolving situations of oppression, inequality, and struggle. Henry Louis Gates Jr's much cited 'Critical Fanonism' essay, published in *Critical Inquiry* in 1992, outlines the ways in which critics have recreated or even appropriated Fanon's thought to suit various critical agendas, and indeed, since the publication of Gates's essay this trend in revivifying Fanon to speak to a new era has continued. Stuart Hall's incisive opening to the 1996 volume *The Fact of Blackness: Fanon and Visual Representation* considers the 'after-life of Frantz Fanon' in relation to recent interest in poststructuralism and the scopophilic drive, for example, while a 2002 volume of *New Formations* entitled 'After Fanon' tends to focus on his ongoing political significance. Immanuel Wallerstein's article 'Reading Fanon in the Twenty-first Century', published in *New Left Review* in 2009, is perhaps most explicit in its insistence on the importance of the rebirth of Fanon studies in the recent period, citing key dilemmas around the use of violence, nationalism, and class struggle as questions with which contemporary political thought continues to grapple.

The return to Fanon has perhaps become more pressing, however, since the publication in 2015 of Jean Khalfa and Robert Young's superb volume *Écrits sur l'aliénation et la liberté* gathering Fanon's so far unpublished psychiatric and political writings, as well as his plays. Khalfa's own discussions of Fanon have for some time insisted, moreover, on the importance of understanding the connections between Fanon's psychiatric and political work. It is a thoroughgoing analysis of these connections that Marriott undertakes in his ambitious and erudite study *Whither Fanon?* Starting with a reflection on Fanon's *socialthérapie*, Marriott examines how Fanon's clinical practice formed the basis of his political thought, as well as the ways in which colonial war in turn impacted on his clinic, on his patients and treatment methods. The study not only reflects on Fanon's work in Algeria, but contains detailed philosophical analyses of 'blackness' and 'negrophobia', and insists that the racial imaginary remains both deeply internalised by the black subject, and intractable. In so doing, Marriott offers various sharp correctives to the readings of several other major Fanon scholars (the introduction takes the form of a series of critiques to Sekyi-Otu, Gordon, Scott, and Mbembe). The promise issued by the title to address the question of where Fanon studies may now be headed is deliberately never fulfilled. Marriott owns at the end that the writing of the book revealed to him not so much a particular goal or endpoint for Fanonian thought but rather its intractable irresoluteness (p. 366). If there is an answer to the question 'whither Fanon?', then, Marriott argues that it lies in the acceptance that we read him without looking for a telos or destination.

Marriott's book analyses phenomena such as 'negrophobia', colonial law, and *Négritude* while all the time keeping this deferral of telos in mind. The *tabula rasa* that Fanon conceives to be the starting point for decolonization, for example, is according to Marriott itself not so much a new liberated order as a more radical interruption to the political itself. The notion that what is needed is a radical decolonial break is then associated in Marriott's study with a deeper conception of the neuroses created by colonialism and racism, as their violence operates not only upon but within the colonized and within black subjectivity. From this perspective, alienation is not quite

the right term to describe the Fanonian subject, since this would imply a mismatch between an image imposed from the outside and the subject's own self-image. Rather, Fanon's subject has no being, it struggles with its own vertiginous absence. Concomitantly, Fanon can imagine no redemptive liberation, because 'decolonial politics arises from but can never overcome the subject's *unknown* relation to itself in the histories and mediations of its desires and resistances' (p. 49). Turning to *Peau noire, masques blancs*, Marriott theorizes the unknown, the 'abyssal', through the notion of 'that within', a term taken from Rosenberg's reading of *Hamlet* and woven into Fanon's own reading of René Maran's *Un homme pareil aux autres*. The notion is precisely a designation for what is elusive and indefinable, 'a kind of vanishing point or ghost within the black corporeal imago' (pp. 107–8). This in turn leads to a reflection on 'invention' not as a straightforward overturning of racial discourse, which would result in a new determinism, but again as a more radical 'saut'. If the colonized is 'haunted by its own incertitude' (p. 236), invention implies a transformation so radical that it cannot be known or understood. Finally, Marriott brings together this conception of the 'vertiginous absence' of the subject with its intractable reinvention through an examination of the 'abyssal' in Césaire and Fanon—a way to conceive 'both the summit of what is known and a path into the unknown' (p. 315).

Marriott's study offers a rich, voracious reading of Fanon, uncovering not so much his uses for contemporary thought as his extraordinary difficulty, as well as the importance of embracing that difficulty if we are to do justice to the nuances of his work. Marriott is deeply immersed in Fanon, and his writing itself is a continuation and development of his work more than it is a textual engagement. Yet the imbrication of psychiatry and politics demonstrated by Marriott's study allows for a uniquely thorough and profound understanding of core Fanonian concepts. The book's argument is original in its critical probing of what have been seen as key issues in Fanon, such as alienation, freedom, and resistance, and in its insistence that racism and its overthrow are yet more deep-seated and difficult than many critics may have suggested. It also stresses not only the challenges and unresolved questions of Fanon's work, but also its exceptional ambition: 'to invent, theoretically, a new poetry, a new praxis of thought, capable of negating colonialism's limits in the service of revolution' (p. 363). Instead of alienation and freedom, these indeterminate notions of 'invention', the 'abyssal', and *tabula rasa* are upheld as those most pivotal for Fanon studies. And these, like Marriott's study, demonstrate the necessity of ongoing critical engagement, as well as the continuing provocativeness of Fanon's own unfinished questioning.

JANE HIDDLESTON
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Black Cosmopolitanism and Anticolonialism: Pivotal Moments. By BABACAR M'BAYE.
London & New York: Routledge, 2017. 244pp. Hb £98.99. ISBN: 9781138281011

Over the past decade or so, there has been a major resurgence of interest in black writing, thought and activism of the interwar period: from Brent Hayes Edwards' work on the transnational and translational dialogue between Africans and members of the diaspora, to Gary Wilder's meticulous research on the writings of Senghor and Césaire and what he sees as a necessary reevaluation of *Négritude* as a political philosophy. Babacar M'Baye's *Black Cosmopolitanism and Anticolonialism* is a very fine addition to this body of research. The book analyses the writings and activism of seven key 'Black Atlantic' figures: Blaise Diagne, W.E.B. DuBois, Marcus Garvey, Kojo Touvalou-Houénou, Lamine Senghor, George Padmore and Léopold Sédar Senghor. Indeed, the very choice of these individuals is reflective of the scope and range of the scholarship of the past two decades, drawing together figures from both sides of the Atlantic and combining illustrious names (e.g. DuBois, L.S. Senghor) alongside those who have been given greater prominence in recent research (e.g. Touvalou-Houénou, Lamine Senghor).

M'Baye's introduction is wide-ranging intellectually and it boldly stakes out the author's

position. The ‘black cosmopolitanism’ that is central to his project is a concept borrowed from Ifeoma Kiddoe Nwankwo and M’Baye defines it as ‘a broad form of black unity that refuses dogmatism’ (p. 4). It is this protean, fluid black cosmopolitanism that binds his seven figures together, while other scholars, he argues, have often divided them into binary categories as either apologists for, or staunch critics of, empire. M’Baye claims that, on the contrary, pro- and anti-colonialism were never fixed positions on their part; rather, they ‘reflect all of these different patterns at different times and in different contexts’ (p. 4). Blaise Diagne emerges as the original polarizing figure whose cosmopolitanism is generally perceived as a ‘cover’ for the exploitation at the heart of French colonialism. For M’Baye, such an approach is too dismissive not only of Diagne’s ideas, but of what he sees as the more widespread efforts to imagine a black cosmopolitanism in the first half of the twentieth century. The terms ‘cosmopolitanism’ and ‘anticolonialism’ are given equal weighting in the book’s title, but it soon becomes evident that it is the former term that drives M’Baye’s comparative approach to his corpus.

Two other ideas from the book’s introduction are particularly noteworthy: firstly, M’Baye challenges the ongoing marginalization of Africans in academic accounts of the Black Atlantic (p. 9); and, secondly, he underlines the significance of the ‘tirailleurs sénégalais’ and their sacrifice for France during the First World War in the writings of all his chosen figures (p. 3). While I find it hard to agree with M’Baye’s claim that the tirailleurs’ wartime experience has been neglected in the scholarship (there is a significant and growing body of work on these colonial soldiers, including the work of Joe Lunn and Richard Fogarty), I do think he is correct in arguing that the shared fascination of all seven authors with the ‘tirailleurs’ is a pattern that has not been identified and explored in a systematic way by previous scholarship. One hopes that M’Baye’s volume will pave the way for further research on the fascination with the ‘tirailleur’ in black writings of this period.

The book is organized in a straightforward fashion with individual chapters on each of the seven figures, but there is also a sustained dialogue between the chapters, not least between those on Diagne and DuBois who initially enjoyed a fruitful partnership but whose relationship later soured in large part over the former’s reluctance to criticize French colonialism. M’Baye is an insightful analyst, parsing speeches, essays and private letters to track the development of his authors’ evolving positions on race, black identity, and empire. All of the chapters are extensively researched and the author is particularly well versed in critical debates about race and identity. By comparison, the engagement with the historical and political literature is less wide-ranging, and M’Baye seems less sure-footed in his engagement with the political positions adopted by his chosen figures. For instance, the equation of Touvalou-Houénou’s radicalism with that of Garvey (p. 114) is, to my mind, somewhat misguided. As Brent Hayes Edwards has shown, Touvalou-Houénou consistently ‘translated’ Garvey’s political thought in complex ways that expressed admiration for the Jamaican’s radicalism, while consistently rejecting the necessity for such radicalism in the French colonial context.

This should not lead us to conclude, however, that the book provides excellent textual analysis and poor history. Although the richness of M’Baye’s volume lies in the depth of its engagement with the published writings of the seven authors, the book is sprinkled with fascinating historical detail. In particular, M’Baye is very interesting on the existence of branches of Garvey’s United Negro Improvement Association in early 1920s Senegal. The spread of Garvey’s ideas to French West Africa is a neglected area in research on the interwar period and M’Baye’s chapter provides an excellent basis for a more sustained consideration of Garveyism’s influence on black thought in the region. Equally, the book provides a very balanced and thoughtful account of the complex political and personal relationship between Diagne and DuBois.

At the risk of sounding like even more of an old fogey than usual, I cannot conclude this review without commenting on certain paratextual issues and in particular what appears to be a distinct absence of any rigorous form of copy-editing. There are moments of problematic expression sprinkled across each of the chapters and the chapter headings—‘Blaise Diagne’s cosmopolitanism and views on French colonialism’; ‘W.E.B DuBois’s cosmopolitanism, anticolonialism, and responses to Blaise Diagne’—appear more like an author’s notes to self from

a work in progress than actual finished chapter titles. One would expect more editorial input from a major publisher, but the very lack of this on the part of some major commercial academic publishers in English sadly appears to be a growing norm.

This should not detract, however, from the intellectual contribution of this fine piece of scholarship by a young scholar who has produced an original and incisive study of his chosen corpus. It poses many questions for research in this area and draws together figures often treated in isolation from one another. All scholars interested in the black thought of the interwar period should engage with it.

DAVID MURPHY
UNIVERSITY OF STIRLING

Medical Imperialism in French North Africa: Regenerating the Jewish Community of Colonial Tunis. By RICHARD C. PARKS. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2017. 216 pp. Hb \$55.00. ISBN: 9780803268456

Un pas en avant
deux pas en arrière
Deux pas en avant
un pas en arrière
Telle est ma philosophie

En somme vous n'avancez pas

Non, mais je danse¹

Richard Parks' *Medical Imperialism in French North Africa: Regenerating the Jewish Community of Colonial Tunis* explores colonial identity politics in relation to the concept of imperial regeneration disguised as medical advancement in the French protectorate of Tunisia. Jewish Tunisian writer Albert Memmi, who wrote the above poem, frames this scholarly work; each chapter begins with a quote from Memmi's *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, a familiar reference point for scholars of (Francophone) postcolonial studies.²

As part of the recent dialogue between Postcolonial Studies and Jewish Studies, there has been a surge of interest in the Jews of North Africa, specifically in relation to French colonization and how this has affected Jewish-Muslim interactions. A few influential studies follow Jewish migration from North Africa to France during decolonization alongside Jewish-Muslim relations on both sides of the Mediterranean (Ethan Katz, Maud Mandel, Colette Zytnicki). Particular attention has been given to Jews of colonial Algeria or 'l'Algérie française' (Joshua Schreier, Sarah Abrevaya Stein, Benjamin Stora) within the wider context of the Maghreb. As a historian of science and medicine, Parks comes at the debate from a different angle, adopting an interdisciplinary socio-cultural-historical approach and honing in on Jewish life under colonial rule in the French protectorate of Tunisia, making for compelling reading.

Alongside detailed close analysis arising from micro-historical case studies of Jews in colonial Tunis, Parks touches on a vast array of interrelated themes including religious coexistence, colonial identity politics, and Orientalist concepts of modernizing progress versus backward tradition (p. 18). He explains how quasi-scientific theories of degeneration stemmed from an invented notion of 'racial purity' versus 'racial contamination', arising from theories of social Darwinism, which in turn led to what Parks calls 'the regenerationist crusade' in colonial Tunis (p. 14). This 'mission to civilize or regenerate' (p. 21) specifically targeted the Jewish inhabitants of the city through acculturation, while the Muslim population was abandoned to the Orientalist

⁺ Albert Memmi, *Le Mirliton du ciel* (Paris: Chemins de tr@verse, 2011), p. 49.

¹ Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, trans. by Howard Greenfeld (London: Souvenir Press, 2016).

imagination, which continued to exoticize and dehumanize them. Specific examples—relating to sewers, water supply, or ‘bad air’ (pp. 36–45)—illustrate the broad themes of degeneration and regeneration central to the wider critical analysis of medical imperialism and systematic Orientalism in colonial Tunis, an analysis which is at once meticulous and accessible. The methodological framework combines the social and cultural history of medicine to analyze micro-historical primary material (pp. 22–23), providing a rich picture of the diverse Jewish community subject to French colonial policies of regeneration, with varying levels of resistance to and complicity in this acculturation process. Alongside French colonialism, Parks interrogates the conflicting voices of the Alliance Israélite Universelle seeking to westernize ‘Oriental Jews’ (pp. 96–101) and Zionist ideals advancing ‘muscular Judaism’ (pp. 101–6) within an ethno-nationalist movement.

As the title suggests, *Medical Imperialism in French North Africa: Regenerating the Jewish Community of Colonial Tunis* has a spatial and temporal focus, zooming in on Tunis under French colonial rule, and specifically the Jewish community living in the city’s *hara* (ghetto). Parks begins the book with an introductory chapter situating regeneration in the context of medicine and science as developed within the framework of ‘the social positivism of the nineteenth century’ (p. 17), and relating this to the shift of emphasis from religious difference to racial difference when it came to Jews in France and ‘Tunisian Jewish colonial identity’ (pp. 9–14). ‘Taken as a whole,’ Parks writes, ‘this book describes the ideological, scientific, and cultural exchanges between the metropole and the Tunisian Jewish community and the way the community influenced, changed, and reinterpreted the messages of regeneration and modernity in unforeseen ways’ (p. 25). Following this absorbing introduction, Park dedicates two chapters to the theory and practice of regenerating space, looking firstly at divided religious communities in the French protectorate of Tunisia (pp. 29–61), and secondly at the floating signifier of the ghetto in both Paris (pp. 68–74) and Tunis (pp. 74–87). The remaining chapters focus on regenerating youth—specifically in relation to the Alliance Israélite Universelle and the rise of Zionism (pp. 95–113)—and women, who were both subjected to and engaged in discourse surrounding reproductive control and ‘medicalized maternity’ (pp. 115–37). Drawing these themes together, the book ends with a brief reflection on identity (pp. 139–41), concluding with an open-ended summary reminiscent of Memmi’s evocative poem: ‘Extending the French discourses of acculturation, modernization, and regeneration to Jews in the Tunisian protectorate demonstrates that cultural group-identity and expression—what it means to be a Jew, French, native, or metropolitan—was a contentious, ever-changing, and elaborate dance’ (p. 141).

Medical Imperialism in French North Africa makes for a fascinating if disturbing read as it traces colonial practices of segregation and regeneration among Jews and Muslims in colonial Tunis, within the broader framework of Orientalist discourse and ‘race science’ (p. 14). Somewhat frustratingly, however, Parks does not explicitly define ‘medical imperialism’, though he implicitly connects it to notions of ethnic essentialism, racial purity, and regeneration in colonial thought and practice within this specific context. The book might benefit from a more critical reading of the contested term ‘medical imperialism’, which is never fully unpacked, despite having a history of its own.³

REBEKAH VINCE
UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

² See William Gallois, ‘On the Idea of Medical Imperialism’, in *The Administration of Sickness: Medicine and Ethics in Nineteenth-Century Algeria* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 29–65; and Simon J. Williams, ‘Sociological Imperialism and the Profession of Medicine Revisited: Where Are We Now?’, *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 23 (2001), 135–58.

SFPS PG Study Day 2018: Negotiating Borders in the Francophone World University of Birmingham, 1 June 2018

The Society for Francophone Postcolonial Studies Postgraduate Study Day was held at the University of Birmingham again this year, generously sponsored by SFPS and the University's Postgraduate Research Development Fund, and following on from the success of the event held there in 2016. Continuing the momentum of the Study Day held at Lancaster University last year, this postgraduate conference aimed to bring researchers together from across the UK to increase postgraduate engagement with Francophone Postcolonial Studies. Co-organised by Abdelbaqi Ghorab, Ally Lee, and Bethany Mason, the event brought together postgraduate students at various stages of research to present their work on the different metaphorical and physical borders that can be found in the Francophone world. The papers interpreted the theme in a variety of ways, addressing topics as diverse as radicalisation, trauma theory relating to the collective and individual, the crossing of physical land borders, and the binaries of gender representation.

The event began with a fascinating talk by Dr Charlotte Hammond (Leverhulme Early Career Fellow at Cardiff University), entitled 'The Embroidery of Everyday Exchanges in the Northern Borderlands of Haiti', which focused on border communities and exchanges on the Haitian-Dominican border and an exploration of resistance through creation by women factory workers in the region. Dr Hammond's talk was followed by the first panel, which explored trauma and reconstructive memory concerning the daughters of *harkis* (Cliona Hensey, NUI Galway) and questioned the boundaries of individual and collective experience. The panel concluded with a presentation on the complex representation of female radicalisation in contemporary Francophone films, which explored veiling and unveiling as representative of boundaries (Fraser McQueen, University of Stirling).

The second panel addressed the 'violent "othering" of ethnic minority women in contemporary France' through literary analysis of Marie NDiaye and Linda Lê's work, concentrating on the representation of the 'siren' as a figure of otherness and the multiple layers of violence that can be found in such representations (Alison Marmont, University of Southampton). The next presentation considered how Fanon and Glissant's theories of inferiority and *relation* show the importance of dialogue across boundaries, with a focus on their different approaches to language (Dyhia Bia, University of Stirling).

Following the lunch break, SFPS president Professor Kate Marsh held an insightful and engaging workshop about academic publishing and the Research Excellence Framework (REF) with a focus on the importance of originality, impact, and rigor. After a short break, we were delighted to welcome Professor Charles Forsdick to conclude the Study Day with our second keynote speech. Professor Forsdick provided a thought-provoking paper entitled '*Littérature voyageuse, littérature-monde, littérature migrante: Negotiating Mobility and the Borders of Literary Production*'. The talk was followed by a group discussion about the progression of *littérature-monde*, the role of publishers in the exoticisation of postcolonial authors and topics, and the convergence of migration studies, global history, and human rights. The day concluded with a drinks reception, which allowed further discussion and connections to be made between researchers working on a range of different projects in Francophone Postcolonial Studies. The format of the Study day was successful and we hope that this will be replicated at next year's event.

BETHANY MASON AND ABDELBAQI GHORAB
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Bulletin of Francophone Postcolonial Studies

Contributions on any topic related to Francophone Postcolonial Studies are invited for inclusion in future issues. Authors should submit electronically two copies of their article, 4,000 words maximum, in English or French to a member of the editorial team. Articles should conform in presentation to the guidelines in the *MHRA Stylebook*, providing references in footnotes, rather than the author-date system. All articles submitted to the *BFPS* will be refereed by two scholars of international reputation, drawn from the advisory and editorial boards. To facilitate the anonymity of the refereeing process, authors are asked that their manuscript (other than the title page) contains no clue as to their identity. Book reviews (between 600 and 1000 words in length) and conference reports (500 words max.) should also be sent to the editorial team.

The deadline for the receipt of articles to be included in the spring 2018 issue is 15 August 2018.

Editorial Team

Editors: Sarah Arens

E-mail: sa245@st-andrews.ac.uk

Book Reviews: Khalid Lyamlahy

E-mail: khalid.lyamlahy@st-annes.ox.ac.uk

Advisory Board

Patrick Crowley

Charles Forsdick

Pierre-Philippe Fraiture

Nicki Hitchcott

Kate Marsh

David Murphy

The SFPS logo, designed by Caomhán Ó Scolaí, is based on a Téké mask from the Upper Sanga region (Congo-Brazzaville).

SFPS Membership

Membership of the Society includes:

- Subscription to *Francophone Postcolonial Studies* (published by Liverpool University Press), and the biannual electronic *Bulletin of Francophone Postcolonial Studies*;
- Reduced rates on the purchase of back copies of ASCALF/SFPS publications;
- A complimentary copy of new titles appearing in the SFPS critical studies series;
- Admission to the annual SFPS conference (and other SFPS-sponsored events) at reduced rates;
- Electronic mailings on conferences, study days and publications of interest to SFPS members;
- Access to SFPS grants for conference/colloquia organization is available to SFPS members;
- To join SFPS and renew your membership, please download the membership form, which lists membership rates for the current year: <http://www.sfps.ac.uk/>.