1-1-2002

# Rejuvenating France : the creation of a national youth culture after the Great War.

Barbara C. Fox
*University of Massachusetts Amherst*

# REJUVENATING FRANCE: THE CREATION OF A NATIONAL YOUTH CULTURE AFTER THE GREAT WAR

A Dissertation Presented

by

BARBARA C. FOX

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

February 2002

History

# REJUVENATING FRANCE: THE CREATION OF A NATIONAL YOUTH CULTURE AFTER THE GREAT WAR

A Dissertation Presented

by

BARBARA C. FOX

Approved as to style and content by:

Charles Rearick, Chair

Daniel Gordon, Member

Margaret Higonnet, Member

Gareth Matthews, Member

David Glassberg, Department Head
History Department

ABSTRACT

REJUVENATING FRANCE: THE CREATION OF A NATIONAL YOUTH CULTURE AFTER THE GREAT WAR

FEBRUARY 2002

BARBARA C. FOX, B.A., UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Ph.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Charles Rearick

This dissertation examines the new emphasis on childhood in France that came from the destructiveness and trauma of the First World War. After the Great War, the French sought to rebuild their nation by redefining both young people's social responsibilities and adults' duties towards children. Politicians, educators, scientists, and social activists sought greater control over what seemed to be an increasingly valuable and potentially volatile social group. From 1918 to 1949, I argue, in public debates about the fashioning of a new, post-war youth culture, traditionalist, idealist, and scientific conceptions of childhood were competing alternatives. Each of these ways of thinking and talking about the social and cultural role of the next generation expressed different visions of the French nation in response to national crisis. Through the schools, family legislation, and leisure culture such as youth groups and the children's press, the younger generation assumed a new social and cultural position. French youth began to be seen as a national community, set apart by their age status from the rest of society, yet reflecting patriotic ideals and deeply-rooted French values. The new and distinct youth culture that developed as part of post-war recovery served to mediate young people's relationship to the nation, circumventing the earlier primacy of family relationships as the basis for social identity. During this time, French children were pulled out of the more private

space of the family. This increased the sense of the power of youth as a collective entity, which also contributed to new fears of youth rebellion. These underlying tensions, between tradition and science and between heroism and rebellion, also led to the implementation of official regulation of French youth culture, notably through the passage in 1949 of a law censoring children's periodicals. Throughout this period, with state support, scientific theories gained the greatest authority over constructing the French child's world, but this new public space retained a deep-seated connection to adult-envisioned national ideals. In reforming the role of the younger generation after the war, the French found grounds for hope and national rejuvenation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

France's loss of nearly 1.5 million men in the First World War disrupted the traditional French family and created unprecedented anxiety about the nation's children and youth. For a country long reliant on patriarchal authority, the deaths of such a high proportion of men--one in five French soldiers and one in ten French men--left a gaping wound in the surviving social body.[1] Providing some kind of training or guidance to the next generation became a concern more urgent than ever for many French adults. In their view, youth were to redeem France's war losses, to make sure the French soldiers had not died in vain.[2] As prospective adults, children represented a potential for the future rather than a present asset. In the wake of its Pyrrhic victory in the Great War, what was at stake was France's social, cultural, political, and economic future, a future that French children seemed to represent.

During the war, public discussions about youth's patriotic role paid scant attention to French children's mundane experiences, except to engage the youngest members of French society in the same commitment to "holding out" against the enemy required of adults.[3] Magazines and newspapers, textbooks and teaching plans all called for a higher level of youthful heroism, one that selflessly reflected France's patriotic *union sacrée*, a sacred union against anti-French forces, and anti-*civilisation* forces, epitomized by the

---

[1]On the impact of the demographic shifts caused by the high number of deaths of men during the war, see for example, on the missing young adults of the 1930s, Eugen Weber, The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1994); on the imbalance between men and women, Mary Louise Roberts, Civilization without Sexes: Reconstructing Gender in Postwar France, 1917-1927 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), and on the natalist movement, the Forum "Population and the State in the Third Republic," French Historical Studies 19 (Spring 1996): 633-754.

[2]Mary Louise Roberts, Civilization without Sexes, Roberts shows that women became a focal point for rhetoric about the need for redemption in France after World War I.

[3]For coverage of patriotic rhetoric directed at adults during World War I, see, for example, Jean Jacques Becker, The Great War and the French People, trans. Arnold Pomerans (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986).

"barbaric" Germans. Individual acts of sacrifice and courage were hailed as contributions to the national cause.[4] By engaging with French adults in fighting the enemy, French children seemed to best represent France's hopes for a future victory.[5] This required above all for them to learn, especially through the classroom and through children's extracurricular culture, about what it meant to be truly French. This dissertation explores the ways that adults set about raising children to particular values designed to prepare the next generation for their future role as French adults, and examines some of the results of these efforts. Although the main thrust of adult efforts through this period was to inculcate French values, their efforts also led to the development of a new set of youth-oriented values.

The wartime emphasis on creating an ever-stronger sense of national identity for young people remained potent after the war ended. While adults let go of the ideal of the *union sacrée*, children were expected to maintain that idealized unity of national feeling. What had begun as wartime rhetoric endured into peacetime as the commonplace social treatment of French children, projecting the image of the French youth onto a higher patriotic plane than the image of the French adult. The latter ideal was much more strongly affected by actual adult behavior, whereas children's behavior was often channeled and directed by official institutions in an effort to ensure conformance to the national ideal, or at least to seem to do so. After gathering children into the national cause during wartime, this type of patriotic ideal served in peacetime to distance youth's national identity from that of adults.

As youth became more firmly defined in generic patriotic terms, they also began to be seen as a national community, set apart by their age status from the rest of French

---

[4]See Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau, La Guerre des enfants 1914-1918: essai d'histoire culturelle (Paris: Armand-Colin, 1993).

[5]George Mosse shows that in Germany as well as in France, children were often depicted in advertisements and on postcards as little future soldiers. George Mosse, Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 136-137.

society. As this dissertation will show, this emerging sense of youth as a collective social group led to new efforts to define and create a distinct French youth culture. A new perception arose of an age-based, socially and culturally homogenous, nation-wide social group, requiring a separate and distinct cultural world. This constructive process replaced older methods of social identity formation that had centered primarily on family ties and were more strongly class-based.

Philippe Ariès, in his 1960 study L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien régime (translated into English in 1962 as Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life), argued that the class foundation of family life, particularly that of the bourgeoisie, had given rise in the early modern period to a new segregation of children from adults in society. Ariès' efforts to find the origins of childhood segregation in the history of the family and of class were, in his own time, a response to complaints about the twentieth-century authoritative failure of the French family. He concluded that, in the modern period, the family was not so much weakened as it was reformulated with children holding a new, more central, position. In this dissertation, Ariès' study is significant as a twentieth-century source rather than as a history of the early modern period. His book serves as a retrospective account of a perceived shift in the social and cultural place of the child in French society in the first half of the twentieth century.[6] Whereas Ariès' thesis suggested that this shift took place in the early modern period, I argue that authority over child-rearing indeed shifted especially radically in the years following the first World War. This created a new social and cultural space for childhood within which parents had far less control than they had previously held. In the interwar years, French youth's relationship to the rest of French society was reconstructed in a more direct way, allowing

[6]Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1962). Originally published as L'Enfant et la vie familale sous l'ancien régime (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1960). Ariès argued that the distinctions made between adults and children, which led to increasing social isolation of the child, began in the Early Modern period, especially among the bourgeoisie. This view has been much debated; what is most significant for my thesis is that Ariès took this modern differentiation of child and adult as his subject because he saw it as pervasive in the twentieth century.

greater circumvention of the mediating influence of socially divisive family ties. Yet even while children were begin given a social field of their very own, that field was being constructed in accordance with a larger social dynamic dependent on extra-familial adult concerns.

Despite the universalizing nature of such efforts by adults, especially through the state and its institutions, there was strong disagreement about just what constituted an appropriate French upbringing. Throughout the decades following the Great War, different discourses about childhood, having in common their rootedness in ideals of Frenchness, both competed and overlapped. Whether founded in tradition, science, or philosophy, they articulated children's nature, their social role, and their appropriate social treatment by adults. They all shared the premise that reconstructing French childhood in accordance with some vision of the future was an important way to control national recovery.

This dissertation seeks to shed light on the ways that French recovery from the First World War affected twentieth-century reconceptualizations of childhood. First it examines official discourses about the nature of children and childhood, and projections about young people's social and cultural role in French society in the aftermath of the war. Chapters One and Two attempt to isolate "pure" theoretical views of the child from more practical, everyday attitudes. These philosophical and scientific theories served as legitimating sources for institutions such as the national education system and the Catholic Church that sought greater control over French children's upbringing. Such institutional efforts competed with philosophical and social activist ideas that intellectuals and teachers propagated around the development of a new, extra-institutional youth culture. These theoretical discourses provided the backdrop for interwar efforts at creating a new, more prominent, social and cultural identity for the up-and-coming generation, explored in the second part of this dissertation. Chapters Three through Eight address the practical or applied element of new ideas about childhood. Educational

programs, youth groups and the youth press, and legislation affecting familial roles all played a part in efforts to actively reformulate the French child's social and cultural role in the interwar years.

The descriptions and prescriptions that adults proffered contributed to the construction of childhood in this period; the degree to which children and adolescents contributed remains much more obscure. One of the problems faced by historians of childhood is that children's agency is often invisible.[7] The more visible children's agency, the more they appear problematic rather than ordinary. The young voices that historians can find in the historical record frequently belonged to children who were in some way exceptional.[8] Autobiographies of childhood, for example, tend to be written only by people who have become famous as adults, and therefore their accounts of their young lives depict themselves as standing out from the crowd in a way that reflects their later achievements. The records of court cases and social service activities tend in the opposite direction--the children whose lives were probed were perceived as abnormally troubled or criminal. Much of the available forms of writing authored by children, on the other hand, show a strong degree of adult direction, and thus reflect a greater homogeneity of feeling and thought than was likely to have been actually the case. Essay contests, for example, or offers by magazines to publish the "best" stories and poems submitted by readers, strongly reflect the contestants' desire not only to be obedient, but to win, to be chosen according to adult judgment, rather than reflecting more individualistic agency on the child's part. Adding to these considerations is the overall

---

[7]Michael G. Wyness argues that the notion that children have any social agency is a fairly recent reconception of the child in society, and that it is only since the late twentieth century that efforts have been made to allow children to "count," to become even statistically visible, let alone to have a voice. See Michael G. Wyness, Contesting Childhood (London and New York: Falmer Press, 2000), esp. pp. 8, 22-29, and 88-89.

[8]Ludmilla Jordanova, "Children in History: Concepts of Nature and Society" in Children, Parents and Politics, ed. by Geoffrey Scarre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 5 and 12.

dearth of child-authored historical evidence, compared to a much greater wealth of information about adults, and a much freer play of adult agency in the historical record.[9]

What kinds of insights, then, can the study of adult constructions of childhood provide us? If we assume that lack of evidence of children's agency means that children are or have been an oppressed social group, then adult constructions lead us to descriptions of the way children's lives have been repressively circumscribed, or policed, by adults.[10] Another, perhaps less judgmental, approach suggests that children's very being has been intertwined with adults' in such a way that it is only through the study of adult conceptions of growing up that we can arrive at any understanding of childhood, in both its repressive and its creative aspects.[11] This view leads us much closer to a view of childhood as existing necessarily in continuum with adulthood. In discussing the twentieth-century "theorizing" of childhood by adults, some sociologists have argued that "children's culture" consists more strongly of children's interactions with the adults in their lives than with their peers. Granted, a separate, peer-oriented "children's culture"

---

[9]Some child study researchers insist on the need to better determine children's reception, suggesting that "The historian of childhood must be far more resourceful than others, teasing evidence and meaning from unlikely sources." This often includes the use of psychohistorical methods. I avoid such subtle "teasing" in part because I argue that child psychology is, itself, a part of the historical construction of the child - contributing to "the invented child." Also, as is unavoidably admitted even by advocates of a more reception-oriented approach, the influence of adults on children's lives is inextricably intertwined with most practices in which children engage. See Emily Cahan, Jay Mechling, Brian Sutton-Smith, and Sheldon H. White, "The Elusive Historical Child: Ways of Knowing the Child of History and Psychology," in Children in Time and Place: Developmental and Historical Insights, ed. Glen H. Elder, Jr., John Modell, and Ross D. Parkes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 194 and 200-201. In part as a response to Cahan et.al, in the same volume historian Michael Zuckerman questions the ability of psychology to move away from its own historical disciplinary identity long enough or well enough to provide methodological help to historical study. Michael Zuckerman, "History and Developmental Psychology, a Dangerous Liaison: A Historian's Perspective," p. 235.

[10]See, for example, Jacques Donzelot, The Policing of Families, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon Books, 1979), originally published as La Police des familles, 1977; and Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), originally published as Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la prison, (1975), pp. 186-187, on training as a form of discipline in the school.

[11]David Kennedy, "The Roots of Child Study: Philosophy, History and Religion," Teachers College Record 102 (June 2000): 514-538.

exists, on the playground, for instance, but such child-centered culture plays a smaller role in influencing children's social and cultural experiences than does the role of adult controls, guidance, and expectations.[12] In other words, the choices that adults make concerning children's upbringing historically shapes the way that childhood is experienced, both individually and collectively. This is not to say that children's experiences have always--or even often--directly reflected adult intentions, but rather to argue that children's experiences have been strongly affected by adult constructions of childhood.

The notion that childhood and adulthood exist in a continuum of experience also suggests that definitions of childhood cannot be considered at all except as a counterpoint to definitions of adulthood.[13] "Childhood" and "adulthood" are polarized concepts existing on the same plane. For any given time and place, "the child" is defined as a derivative of "the adult." In developmental and chronological terms, the child comes before the adult--yet most often the child is defined in terms of a lower or less-developed position on the continuous scale from childhood to adulthood. Adults conceive their ideas about children, therefore, primarily in reference to themselves. Similarly, adults' memories of their own experiences of childhood, and of their transition to adulthood, loom large in their thinking about the not-yet-adult. This is the case whether or not those expectations are understood in "whiggish" or in "nostalgic" terms.[14] The way in which

---

[12]For coverage of these debates, see Allison James, Chris Jenks, and Alan Prout, Theorizing Childhood (New York: Columbia Teachers College, 1998), esp. pp. 55-57, on "Childhood as a Subject[ed] Space," and pp. 214-216, on "The tribal child."

[13]David Kennedy, "The Roots of Child Study," pp. 515-516.

[14]Joseph M. Hawes and N. Ray Hiner, "Looking for Waldo: Reflections on the History of Children and Childhood in the Postmodern Era," paper presented to the History of Childhood in America Conference, Washington, D.C., Aug. 5-6, 2000, as reproduced on <ww2.h-net.msu.edu/~child/conference/hiner.htm>, pp. 3-5. Hawes and Hiner take the approach that "children are too important for their history to be reduced to what adults said and did," suggesting that the history of childhood as a social construction (as it is discussed in this dissertation), is a limited approach to the history of *children*. What they do not discuss is the contribution the history of childhood can make to history more generally, rather than limiting it to efforts to determine the history of children's experiences.

adults project these ideas onto the children in their care also helps to shape children's expectations about growing up, and about becoming adult themselves. These expectations are then incorporated into the next generation of adult memories of childhood.[15]

The study of adult treatment of children also enlightens us about historical change more generally. My work shows that while adult choices in France in the years following the First World War helped shape French social and cultural experience for children and the adults they were to become, they also more broadly reflected French adult perceptions and experiences of the condition of the French nation at that time. Adults, through political and public institutions, asserted confidence in their ability to use their control over the youngest members of the nation to help reconstruct France as a vibrant and healthy player on the international scene. Their assumptions about the efficacy of this form of social engineering did not always reflect the problems stemming from ideological disagreement, nor did they always take into account the difficulties of putting theories into practice. By examining publicly articulated ideas about childhood, as well as delving into the practices of some of the more important institutions that helped shape children's lives, we can better understand the crucial place of ideas about childhood in the larger fabric of French history.

---

[15]This kind of continuity of generational identity was portrayed by Robert Wohl, in his study of the way the social identity of the "generation of 1914" (more accurately, "generations") was indelibly marked by their definition of themselves around the experience of becoming adult during and just after World War I. Robert Wohl, Generation of 1914 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979). The idea that a particular event during adolescence shapes generational thinking points to the continuities in identity formation between youth and adults.

# CHAPTER 1

## WORKING THE FORGE OF YOUTH: SOCIAL ENDS FOR CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

As France emerged victorious from the Great War, French patriotic fervor that glorified "holding out" against the enemy shifted to a growing awareness of the destruction the war had left behind. Families were missing sons, brothers, and fathers, and women were no longer maintaining traditional roles as wives and mothers.[1] Such widespread demographic disruption created new anxiety about the traditional family's ability to shoulder the burdens of national recovery. The French child's representation of the future of the nation was at stake, and alternative institutions for transforming children into good French adults became more important than ever before. Both French tradition and the emerging scientific study of the child worked to guide the process of reshaping French childhood in the war's aftermath. State institutions and the Church began to offer greater guidance for child-rearing choices.[2] As the nation sought a return to peacetime "normalcy," the scientific community provided a base of expertise from which institutions could draw a new understanding of children's nature.

Although science is often viewed as opposing tradition, around the issue of raising children, there were many points of agreement between the two. Most "child scientists," including child psychologists, were not social reformers.[3] They did not try to alter the

---

[1]On the war's effect on family life, see Susan Pedersen, Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State: Britain and France, 1914-1945 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); on changes in gender roles caused by the war, see Mary Louise Roberts, Civilization Without Sexes: Reconstructing Gender in Postwar France, 1917-1927 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994).

[2]On education and schooling in this period in France, see volumes 3 and 4 of Louis-Henri Parias, ed., Histoire générale de l'enseignement et de l'éducation en France (Paris: Nouvelle Librairie de France, 1981).

[3]Edouard Claparède used the inclusive term "paidologist," taking it from the title of an English journal, to define those who worked on any of the sciences relating to the child. Although this word never gained common currency, it accurately represents those scientists who were not fully definable as child psychologists or pedagogues yet who worked on the science of childhood in the early twentieth century.

traditional social order, rather they found new methods to strengthen it. French child scientists rearticulated traditional conceptualizations of the child into a new, scientific, idiom. Science as a discipline focused on reforming pedagogical methodology rather than on reforming the younger generation's place in society, and traditional conceptualizations of the child's social role remained a constant backdrop for their efforts.

Traditionalists did seek a moderate kind of social reform in the years following the Great War, as the child's social role took on new meaning. Recovery seemed to require a special social and cultural role for the child as an imitative embodiment of some type of traditional French cultural ideal, adapted to the changed postwar situation. Traditionalists of various stripes hoped that emphasizing certain older French cultural rituals and values would help smooth over and minimize the reforms and cultural changes the war threatened to bring about. By the interwar years, French culture included a number of different kinds of "tradition," including older Catholic and "True France" traditions as well as newer Republican traditions.[4] Although traditionalist social theorists' visions were in some ways quite different from one another, they had in common a reliance on tradition as *the* determining influence on childhood development. Memorization of rules and rituals, along with following good role models (and avoiding bad ones) were at the base of childrearing practices for these theorists. Some traditionalists saw the emphasis on social scientific knowledge as competitive with religious truths, and held out against the "scientism" that had long been an aspect of the

---

Edouard Claparède, Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, trans. Mary Louch and Henry Holman (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., London: Edward Arnold, 1911), pp. 16 and 40.

[4]Herman Lebovics, True France: The Wars over Cultural Identity, 1900-1945 (Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press), 1992. Lebovics suggests that, "beginning around the turn of the century, the new French right...promoted a deadening hegemony of the idea and practice of a True France as the only hope for national renewal, the power of that idea and practice coming from the right's claim to be the sole representative of the French heritage" (p. xiii). "The discourse of True France employs the essentialist, determinist language of a lost or hidden authenticity that, once uncovered, yields a single, immutable national identity" (p. 9). Lebovics argues that this sense of homegeneity permeated images of French culture in the early twentieth century, and combined or reconciled several different visions of Frenchness, across varying political structures and including both regional and national cultures.

anticlerical and secularizing programs of French Republicanism.[5] To others, however, the appeal of technical and medical advancements, which often served to support ideals of French progress and economic competition in the modern world, countered such anti-modern fears.

New scientific views of childhood reinvigorated rather than opposed traditionalist reconceptualizations of the French child. The same awareness of the destructive effects of the Great War that drove traditionalists to insist on the child's role as an embodiment of French traditional values led the more scientifically-minded to rely for succor on social engineering ideas. The idea that society and the individuals comprising it developed according to systematic and natural rules held wide appeal as an antidote for potential social chaos. When scientists like Alfred Binet, Edouard Claparède, and Jean Piaget offered French institutions new methods to understand and guide "normal" childhood development, their goal was to strengthen the traditional, pre-war, "normal," social order.

## Child Psychology as a Social Engineering Tool

Knowledge of psychology in France had long been considered a tool for social engineering. Early twentieth-century psychologists began with the assumption that childhood development, and thus the science that studied it, had social, rather than individual, ends. Helping those with authority over French children to better guide their upbringing, would ultimately benefit society, they posited. The alternative would have been to assume that the goal of child science, and psychology especially, was to enable individual children to have better lives--to be happier--by fitting in with a mainstream or

[5] Adrien Dansette, Histoire religieuse de la France contemporain: L'Église catholique dans la mêlée politique et sociale (Paris: Flammarion, 1965), pp. 369-372.

"normal" developmental trajectory. During this time, however, achieving "normalcy" was a social, not an individual, goal.[6]

A second argument concerned the exact nature of children's differences from adults. Most French scientists increasingly asserted the complete differentiation between the condition of childhood and that of adulthood. This strongly affected ideas about the social treatment of children, which guided educational, labor, judicial, and civil reforms throughout the twentieth century. A third, related problem was just how to measure this difference. Along with physical, medical testing of children, intelligence testing also came to the fore. Again, the importance of the social benefit drove efforts to determine the child's intellectual potential. Intelligence testing enabled children to be labeled and categorized in a way that allowed for more effective institutional guidance, better gearing children towards their potential adult future. This potential was to be realized through conformance to the existing social order, rather than through reform.

Prior to 1914, French state programs sought to stem social degeneration, focusing on rooting out the abnormal or the criminal, and to this end they drew heavily on theories of eugenics and social hygiene. Many of these prewar state educational and social service programs relied on medico-sociological theories and diagnostics for guidance.[7] After the war, social programs designed to regenerate, improve and perfect social development came to the fore. In a balance between pessimism and optimism, the emphasis shifted from a more repressive stance against error, criminality, or abnormality, to greater persuasion and encouragement towards doing the "right" thing. With an increased focus on children as the representatives of France's future, such "normalizing" programs

---

[6]On the way in which ideal values are incorporated into definitions of the "normal" in human life, see Georges Canguilhem, Le Normal et le pathologique (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966), esp. pp. 76 ff., and 175 ff.

[7]See Robert Nye, Crime, Madness and Politics in Modern France: The Medical Concept of National Decline (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), and Catherine Rollet-Echalier, La Politique à l'égard de la petite enfance sous la IIIe République (Paris: Institut National d'études démographiques: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990).

became widely urged and argued. Child psychologists took their place beside medical doctors as France's experts of choice for guiding treatment of the next generation's development. Scientific ideas about childhood as a stage of life grew increasingly popular as more and more people--teachers, legislators, social workers, and social commentators--sought new justifications for emerging social programs and educational projects.

Because of the international quality of scientific research, there was both cooperation and competition between scientists in different nations. A strong cultural sympathy bound together French-speaking scientists, however, which included Belgian and Swiss French psychologists and pedagogues. In the immediate aftermath of the war, the discipline of psychology, especially the newer child psychology, was not yet well defined and established, and psychologists' input was not yet uniform. French scientists like Gabriel Compayré, Alfred Binet and Théodore Simon, and the Swiss French Edouard Claparède laid part of the theoretical groundwork for later twentieth-century views of child psychology. The theorist who after World War II became an undisputed leader in child psychology, Jean Piaget, was a Swiss French scientist whose study of children began in Paris in the early 1920s. It was while working for a child psychology laboratory set up by French scientists Binet and Simon that Piaget seriously began to consider the role that childhood development played in helping to understand human civilization's course of development.[8] Building on pre-existing theories and striking out in new directions, child psychology reflected and guided French concerns about childhood in the interwar years. Increasingly during the interwar period, child science, especially child psychology--propounded by Piaget and others--became the yardstick against which new

---

[8]For Piaget's own autobiographical account of his two-year stay in Paris, see A History of Psychology in Autobiography, vol. IV, ed. Edwin G. Boring, Herbert S. Langfeld, Heinz Werner, and Robert M. Yerkes (Worcester, MA: Clark University Press, 1952), pp. 237-256; See also Fernando Vidal, Piaget before Piaget (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 225; Jacques Wittwer, "Jean Piaget," in La Psychologie de l'enfant en langue française, ed. Jean Chateau (Toulouse: Privat, 1979), p. 145.

programs and legislative reforms were measured to justify their potential social effectiveness.

## Nature and God as Guides to Childhood Development

From the late nineteenth century, French child scientists' efforts contained a degree of ambiguity about whether their subject for research was the natural child or the social child. Sociologists were content to study the already socialized child, but psychologists tried to lever themselves underneath the social and arrive at an understanding of the child in what they saw as a purer, more natural state. In the 1890s, for example, French social scientist Gabriel Compayré argued that scientists could not study the unsocialized or unenculturated child, as if child subjects existed in a social vacuum. At the same time, he assumed that the purpose of psychological study of the child was to better guide social development. His ideas about the way France's or the world's future could be perfected through reforming the upbringing of the next generation influenced many interwar traditionalists and scientists, though Compayré himself died in 1913.

Compayré's first book on the child, The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child, was published in 1896 and translated into English in 1911. In this work, Compayré cited Jean-Jacques Rousseau's emphasis on learning as much as possible about children's nature, especially as the foundation for systematic pedagogy, but made clear his own reflection that social engineering was the purpose of this study. "If it is true that children carry the future of humanity in their little hands," he wrote, "it is no less true that in developing their mental and moral faculties more perfectly we may modify this future and improve the moral destinies of the human race."[9] Thus for Compayré, the objective of child study--its *raison d'être*--was to direct the trajectory of social development.

[9]Gabriel Compayré, The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child, trans. Mary E. Wilson (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1906), p. 5.

Neither religious nor practical arguments should stand in the way of child science, he argued. "Practical philosophers who wish to form and direct the mind will be convinced more and more that their efforts would be in vain if they had not begun to learn at the child's cradle in what paths education should be led, in order to aid Nature while following it, to govern without cramping it, and to what spontaneous forces they must give free scope, to what weaknesses bring aid." This speculative assumption, reflective of his interpretation of Rousseau, led Compayré to envision a perfected child psychology that would aid society in encouraging some aspects of children's nature while discouraging others.[10]

Although Compayré's secular focus emphasized Enlightenment ideals of "perfecting" humanity, the way in which he described adults controlling this perfection through encouraging the good while discouraging the bad fit neatly with traditionalist, even religious, efforts to guide children's moral upbringing. In the aftermath of the Great War, the French Catholic Church was no less interested in renewing and guiding social morality through French young people, discouraging some behaviors while encouraging others.[11]

One postwar spokesman for the church was Father Fernand Jamin, who in 1921 wrote Conseils aux jeunes gens de France après la victoire. Jamin's advice centered on retaining the strength of the traditional French family, reminding young people not to turn away from an older Catholic and patriarchal social order in the war's aftermath.[12]

---

[10]Compayré, The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child, p. 7.

[11]Jay Winter, Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995). Winter shows that across Europe there was an increased reliance on traditional spiritual values and religion to help survivors through their mourning.

[12]After the war, Catholics tended to support the natalist movement, advocating the ideal of the "numerous" or large family with even greater zeal than they had done prior to the war. See Mary Louise Roberts, Civilization Without Sexes: Reconstructing Gender in Postwar France, 1917-1927 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), pp. 90-91; See also the Forum "Population and the State in the Third Republic," French Historical Studies 19 (Spring 1996): 633-754; Pedersen, Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State: Britain and France, 1914-1945.

> Young people. It is you who I address. After the glorious outcome of the war, you have the duty to regenerate our France, to make it strong, beautiful, prosperous.
>
> ...It is [Jesus] who communicates to you, young Catholic people, above all through Holy Communion, the supernatural force that we will need to accomplish the work of national renewal...[13]

Behind all social efforts at French recovery, according to this Catholic priest, the motivating force that would guide youth's healthy growth flowed from God. Through a metaphor of the patriarchal family, Jamin described all levels of authority in French society as parallel, with God as the highest, most authoritative father.

Like Compayré, Jamin suggested that adults needed to guide or train young people's moral character, thus ultimately benefiting society as a whole. According to Jamin, moral development resulted from life-long adherence to rules concerning the body, the mind, and social relationships. Obedience to healthful regulations concerning the body would result eventually in a diminution of the "number of scrawny and infirm among us, to multiply on the contrary the robust offspring who will be the joy, the honor and the force of our country."[14] Jamin tied the image of a battalion of healthy young people ready to renew the strength of traditional French culture to Biblical precepts and Catholic dogma, but added as well a family-and-nation orientation.

> You have to undertake an incessant battle to become and remain master of your body, to keep it in good order, to resist its gross passions that so quickly endanger degrading vices that you know: gluttony, drinking, laziness, flabbiness, lust, and to follow a path conforming to reason, worthy of your nature as an intelligent and free being and of your name as a man worthy of your family and of France, your *patrie*, worthy of the religion that you profess. It is not a question of forbidding with too much violence to your body all the pleasures towards which it is drawn, but of refusing illegitimate pleasures, and even more. You will not win an

---

[13]Fernand Jamin, Conseils aux jeunes gens de France après la victoire (Paris: Perrin et Cie, Librairies-Éditeurs, 1921) pp. v-viii.

[14]Jamin, Conseils aux jeunes gens de France après la victoire, pp. 7-8.

> absolutely incontestable and complete victory if you cross your own frontiers and transfer the war to enemy soil; what matters, literally speaking, is that you must deprive yourself of some of the permitted pleasures. Mortification is necessary. It is one of the required conditions so that you can see blossom among you with all the sparkle of their beauty, sobriety, the energy to work and chastity which, alone, will assure peace, pure sincere joy, and fecundity to your mortal life, which alone will permit your soul to attain, in the measure that is possible here below, the goals of your spiritual faculties, truth, beauty, and good.[15]

The meaning of the war to the next generation would not be found in selfish, vainglorious ends, but in battling against human nature's negative tendencies. That he included "flabbiness" in his list of sins supported the connection he sought to make between physical fitness and moral virtue.[16] For youth, this battle required strong self-control and sacrifice, just as had been required of young soldiers fighting for the nation during the war. Jamin argued that adults should teach children to sacrifice their natural inclinations in favor of higher moral strength or the perfection of the soul in accordance with God's intentions. The difference between this religious view and Compayré's was that the social scientist saw this as a training of the mind or the psyche, rather than of the soul.

Jamin's description of parental roles was at least partly in keeping with new views on disciplining children that were moving away from physical punishment and towards a more rational or psychological method.[17] He wrote that the two central means of raising children were to provide virtuous role models for them to imitate, and to correct

---

[15]Jamin, Conseils aux jeunes gens de France après la victoire, pp. 58-59.

[16]Years later, Marc Bloch used the term "flabby" to describe the condition of the French military during the interwar years, as one explanatory factor in France's quick loss in World War II. Bloch was Jewish, and presumably did not consider this fault in the same religious sense that Jamin did; but the similar use of the term suggests the way that larger nationalistic issues were infiltrating Jamin's theologically inspired views. March Bloch, Strange Defeat: A Statement of Evidence Written in 1940, trans. by Gerard Hopkins (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1968), p. 94.

[17]Antoine Prost, l'École et la famille dans une société en mutation, vol. IV of Louis-Henri Parias, ed., Histoire générale de l'enseignement et de l'éducation en France (Paris: Nouvelle Librairie de France, 1981), pp. 122-125. Prost argues that in the 1930's and later, this new type of discipline was better practiced by the mother, and that it did not offer a strong masculine disciplinary role to fathers, but Jamin clearly advocates it as a father's duty, supported by the need for a stronger social and moral order clearly along patriarchal lines.

them when they strayed. In the case of adoption, the baby or young child may already have been exposed to bad examples, which may have "corrupted their own nature." Parents must correct these bad habits. Parents should behave consistently, and begin by calmly reprimanding children and reciting for them the rule they had broken. If they repeated the bad behavior, the parents' tone should grow more severe. At each repetition, the chastisement should be intensified, to the point of punishing them by taking away certain privileges, such as dessert. Above all, Jamin asserted, the child's egoism was "the great enemy to combat." Again, an image of war served as a metaphor for battling passions, in this case, the parents battling against their children's passions.[18]

For Compayré, it was not the child's innate egoism that needed to be battled, but the potential for sliding off the track of "normal" or natural childhood development that must be guarded against and rectified if discovered. He asserted that the key piece of knowledge that would serve as a foundation for raising children to follow a normal trajectory was adult understanding of the natural stages of child development. Compayré's focus was determining "the birth of faculties" in humans, and the order of stages of development. He emphasized the transition from primitive to civilized, whether, as in animals and some children, it was permanently arrested at a particular pre-civilized stage, or, as with most children, it was carried through to its civilized end. He asserted that the purpose of early childhood was to bring into existence, however imperfectly, the adult mind's faculties, which education would subsequently order and organize into a differentiated and thereby controlled whole. In Compayré's view, the "normal" child was the child who could be educated appropriately to full adulthood. When they understood the order of developmental stages in young childhood, scientists

---

[18]Jamin, Conseils aux jeunes gens de France après la victoire, pp. 203-204.

would be able to control and enhance, through speeding up or slowing down, encouraging or discouraging, the "natural" traits whose beginnings lie in the first few years of life.[19]

Methodology and Training of Scientists and Teachers

Given the developmental nature of children, which included--indeed, focused on--their ability to be educated, how could scientists examine their "natural" traits? As already mentioned, Compayré recognized that children could not be studied in a purely natural state. Child subjects were already socialized or educated to some extent by the time the scientist attempted an experiment. Compayré argued, however, that statistical compilations of data from research from a large body of experiments would provide a true measure of natural childhood development. The most important thing was that child scientists should be trained in scientific methods. Psychology-based judgment of children should be developed in imitation of and with the help of medical science and physiology, Compayré declared. Although, unlike the child's body, the workings of the child's mind were not readily accessible to the researcher, Compayré argued that the transparent quality of children's actions, which included facial expressions, allowed the child scientist to have confidence in his ability to perceive children's true feelings and thoughts. He suggested that child psychologists could be most successful if they, themselves, were fathers--but they also had to be trained in scientific methods. By gathering, tabulating, testing, and confirming data taken on individual children, trained scientists could establish comprehensive knowledge of the child's psychological development. Despite diversity among individual subjects, Compayré was convinced that the order of developmental stages was the same for all children, and gaining knowledge about this order was therefore the child scientist's job.[20]

---

[19]See Compayré, The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child.

[20]Compayré, The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child, p. 21.

Compayré reiterated Rousseau's methodology for those studying the child.[21] In Emile, Rousseau had pointed to difficulties in performing what would later be known as a Skinner box experiment.[22]

> But where shall we find a place for our child so as to bring him up as a senseless being, an automaton? Shall we keep him in the moon, or on a desert island? Shall we remove him from human society?...I am showing what we should try to attain, I do not say we can attain it, but I do say that whoever comes nearest to it is nearest to success.[23]

Compayré agreed with Rousseau's statements about methodological difficulties. "The only truly decisive experiment would be to isolate a child, to separate him from all social environments, to let him grow by himself, without help of any sort....But who would allow such violence to the natural order of things to be on his child!"[24] He suggested that when the scientist performed experiments on children, his subjects would not remain unaffected. Experimentation would serve as a kind of education for the children, so that those who were tested would improve their skills through the repetition of testing. That children do indeed develop over time thus serves to thwart scientific aims, unless scientists perform tests on a number of different individuals, rather than using the same subject repeatedly. He referred to compilation of observations on diverse subjects as

---

[21]Many French child psychologists looked to Rousseau as an original thinker. See Albert Schinz, État présent des travaux sur J.-J. Rousseau (Paris: Société d'Édition les Belles Lettres; New York, Modern Language Association of America, 1941), pp. 253-265. For Compayré's glowing approval, see Gabriel Compayré, Jean Jacques Rousseau and Education from Nature, trans. R. P. Jago (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1907).

[22]B. F. Skinner argued that in order to understand human nature in an unsocialized form, a child would need to be raised in a kind of social-deprivation box, fed and cared for only mechanically, with no real human contact. See B. F. Skinner, The Behavior of Organisms: an experimental analysis (New York, London: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1938), pp. 49 and 55, for Skinner's description of such a box for experimentation using rats. For the fictional use of a similar device for human babies, see B. F. Skinner, Walden Two (New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1948, 1976), pp. 86-90.

[23]Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Émile, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1911, 1992), pp. 58-59.

[24]Compayré, The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child, pp. 16-17.

"natural experiments," which would result in a body of knowledge about childhood development as a comprehensive system.[25]

Compayré explained that studying abnormal subjects served scientists especially well. "These natural experiments are still more significant, more instructive, when a gap, a lesion of the organism, a constitutional weakness, any cause whatever of disturbance, as it were, maiming the human soul, impeding the scope of the faculties, lets us see the consequences of the abortion of an organ, of the atrophy of a sense, or else, by arresting the development, renders a transient stage of normal evolution permanent." Compayré considered abnormal or arrested development to be an illness or wound of the body or soul, not a sinful result of weakness of character. It was scientific expertise, therefore, that would have the ultimate authority over determining childhood developmental good and ill.[26]

Religious traditionalists held a different conception of abnormalcy. In contrast to Compayré's reliance on scientific definitions of the abnormal, Jamin concluded that the church was the institution, representing God's will and reciting God's rules to the people, that held such authority. Unlike "natural" institutions like the family, the church should be recognized as "a gift of God," which "came from heaven, divinely organized, perfect by consequence and ever since unreformable in its essential lines." Aside from supporting the scholastic science of St. Thomas Aquinas, Jamin did not move very far towards accepting scientific views of human development. After the Great War, with so many fathers dead, paternal power would shift from the heads of families to the State, but according to Jamin, the State itself would remain obedient to the Church.[27]

---

[25]Compayré, The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child, p. 18.

[26]Compayré, The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child, p. 18.

[27]Jamin, Conseils aux jeunes gens de France après la victoire, pp. 236-237.

Schooling and Childhood Development

The Third Republic showed itself in the interwar years to be more obedient to the scientific community than to the Catholic Church, especially when it came to legislation concerning the secular national education system. This was despite efforts to create a new, postwar "Ralliement," or reconciliation of church and state in France.[28] After the separation of Church and State in 1905, Catholic schools had maintained their student enrollment, and were considered by many parents to provide a better quality education than the national primary schools did. The Third Republic began to consider more seriously the way that the public schools could competitively prepare students both for work and for higher education after completion of the primary school curriculum, usually around age 13. Legislators scrutinized both new technical education programs preparing young people to work, and curricular changes designed to create new pathways leading to higher degrees.[29] This democratizing push demanded new ways of determining which children would follow which path, and no longer relied entirely on parental choice of schools. Schoolteachers, backed by philosophical or scientific ideas, moved into position as those who would apply scientific conclusions to the task of categorizing and guiding children's development.

---

[28]See Harry W. Paul, The Second Ralliement : The Rapprochement Between Church and State in France in the Twentieth Century (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1967), esp. Chapters 2 and 3; William Bosworth, Catholicism and Crisis in Modern France: French Catholic Groups at the Threshold of the Fifth Republic (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), pp. 16-39; Oscar L. Arnal, Ambivalent Alliance: The Catholic Church and the Action Française 1899-1939 (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985), pp. 102-103; John Neubauer, The Fin-de-Siècle Culture of Adolescence (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 183-185. Although Neubauer suggests, as does Arnal, that newly conservative and religious youth were especially attracted to the right-wing Action Française, he also cites Agathon's study from 1912-13 in which the authors (Massis and de Tarde) claimed that young people rejected such monarchical and chauvinistic extremism.

[29]See, for example Pierre Chevallier, ed., La Scolarisation en France depuis un siècle: Colloque tenu à Grenoble en mai 1968 (Paris: Mouton, 1974).

Different types of traditionalists proffered different roles for schoolteachers.[30] Father Jamin stuck to a traditionally elitist ideal for schooling. His was not an elitism founded on class differences, but one based on a meritocratic sort of order. He complained that too many rich sons filled up the higher levels of education when they lacked the necessary skills, which led to demoralization to themselves and "to the detriment of their professors and their comrades."[31] At this time, however, although close to 100% of French children attended elementary or primary school, only 3% were enrolled in secondary schools, so Jamin appears to have had an extremely exclusive ideal.[32] As a priest, Jamin would have wished to retain exclusivity for private secondary schools, rather than extend public, secular, secondary classes to greater numbers of children.[33] Some children needed only a basic education, and "fathers" should only "push" the most intelligent of their children to the secondary level, and only on the advice of the teacher (presumably, in Jamin's view, the priest, though he did not explicitly state this). Parents, Jamin wrote, could not accurately assess their children's intellect, because their love would be likely to mislead them.[34]

Leading educator Jean Finot also supported the importance of the teacher's guidance and judgment for French recovery after the Great War. His calls for reform

---

[30]On similarities between schoolteachers and priests as soldiers, see "Priests and Instituteurs in the *Union Sacrée*: Reconciliation and Its Limits," French Historical Studies, 22 (Spring 1999): pp. 263-289.

[31]Jamin, Conseils aux jeunes gens de France après la victoire, p. 205.

[32]Alain Norvez, Le Corps enseignant et l'évolution démographique: effectifs des enseignants du second degré et besoins futurs, préface d'Alain Girard, Institut national d'études démographiques, Travaux et Documents, Cahier no. 82 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1977), p. 5; La Scolarisation en France depuis une siècle, p. 130.

[33]In 1921, the number of children age 10-17 enrolled in secondary public school was approximately twice that of those enrolled in private school. This proportion had shifted greatly since the late 1890's, when there were more youth enrolled in private than in public secondary schools. La Scolarisation en France depuis un siècle, p. 130. Not all private schools were Catholic, but it seems especially unlikely that Fr. Jamin would have approved of increasing numbers of youth enrolling in the secular national education system.

[34]Jamin, Conseils aux jeunes gens de France après la victoire, p. 205.

reflected traditional secular and Enlightenment values, and his plan utilized the Republican school system. He used the patriotic sacrifice of soldiers in the Great War as support for his assertion that the teacher, with the state's support, should act to form youth into good, moral, patriotic citizens. He suggested that "the great torment has made radical modification of many directing ideas of modern pedagogy more necessary." Teaching optimism in the national public schools, he proposed, would prepare the ground for France's recovery from the war. In a paper published in 1919 and based on his earlier book Progrés et bonheur, Finot encouraged teachers to view their role as the foundation for "the essential creation of the man" as opposed to the Scriptural doctrine of determinism, under whatever form.

> More than ever, it is up to us to combat tragic reminiscences of sorrows and deceptions which, by infiltrating our souls, will finish by making them deaf to the appeals of life. 'Optimist Pedagogy' is meant to transform the kingdom of our souls plunged in sorrow and mourning, brought about by the horrors of the war and the inevitable deceptions of future peace.[35]

Finot saw the school system as having the highest influence on France's children, and thus on France's future in peacetime.

Another advocate of a form of traditional French education of the next generation as the basis for French recovery was presented by soldier Paul D'Arc. Although supportive of Republican values, he also glorified an older French heritage. He similarly included a political duty for schoolteachers as agents of the State, using the patriotic rhetoric of the war.

> Thus, your place is beautiful, and your duty is great. You cannot speak as you should of our French glories, of Bossuet or of Renan, of Corneille or of Hugo, of our heroes: Clovis at Tolbiac, Joan of Arc at Orleans,

---

[35]Jean Finot, "Les Instituteurs de demain et la pédagogie optimiste," Revue des Deux Mondes, no. 137 (1919): 216-231. This paper was originally presented at a well-attended teachers' conference just before the war; Finot reprinted it with a new introduction declaring that the post-war environment made his suggestions even more urgent.

> Dumouriez at Valmy, and as well of all the sublime heroisms of the war of 1914, if you are not yourselves good patriots....There are no longer *parties*; there are nothing but *Democrats*...because the first condition to love your country is to desire and to work for national unity....the memory of our dead soldiers, of all these dead who reach their supplicating arms towards us, command us to make France's future unified, strong, and brave. Here is the first rule to impose on you, teachers and professors, you who have the heavy task of forming youth. The Government must additionally impose this rule on recalcitrants, or simply throw them out of the teaching corps.[36]

The ideal of the French *union sacrée* was powerful in D'Arc's view, negating the ideologically divisive factors that had plagued educational debate before the war.

These traditionalists, then, did not rely on parental teaching or guidance for the inculcation of French values in young people. They pointed to the school as the institution that was best situated to systematically provide the moral education that children required. They most often upheld the teaching of French history, as well as classical languages. Whether Republican or Catholic, they supported pedagogical efforts to train students' memory and provide them with good role models to imitate.[37] Like Compayré, they emphasized the role of trained professionals. Schoolteachers, whether Catholic or secular, humanist or nationalist, served as a frontline for traditionalist plans for national recovery.

Alfred Binet and Théodore Simon: Defining and Directing "Normalcy"

Placing schoolteachers in the frontlines for national recovery intensified efforts to formulate new, more scientific forms of teaching methods. Unlike Compayré, Alfred Binet, with the help of his associate, Théodore Simon, had argued just after the turn of the century that children's development of intelligence could be studied in its natural,

---

[36]Paul D'Arc, L'Éducation Française, vol. 1 of Pour l'Après-guerre: notes, impressions, souvenirs pendant la guerre (Paris: B. Grasset, 1917), pp. 178-182. This was written during the war, looking forward to France's victory. "D'Arc" was undoubtedly a psuedonym taken on during the war years.

[37]On Republican memory-training, see Matt K. Matsuda, The Memory of the Modern (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 65 and 76.

unsocialized or uneducated state. Binet argued for a better, more scientific way, to determine the natural or "normal" developmental trajectory for children.[38] His goal was to enable teachers and doctors to categorize children according to their degree of conformity or non-conformity with the "normal" development of others of their own age. Binet asserted that parents were not appropriate judges for their children's intellectual potential. Instead of Jamin's glorification of the church's role, albeit through the Catholic school, Binet saw the medically and psychologically informed school as the institution best suited to categorizing pupils' potential.

At the turn of the century, the classification method used to designate levels of backwardness was, at the least-competent end, "idiot," then "imbecile," then "moron." Binet complained that determination of these designations was grossly unscientific, that different people, including teachers, school administrators, and doctors, lacked a uniform understanding of the terms and a uniform and accurate method of testing. With the help of a younger colleague, Théodore Simon, Binet developed the first intelligence "scale" specifically to meet the need of teachers and doctors to determine the difference between "morons" and "imbeciles." This would help teachers decide which students could stay in the regular schools and which had to attend special schools.[39]

---

[38]Binet's degree was in biology but he had become interested in the child's intellectual development in the 1890s through observing his own two daughters. A bit of a scientific iconoclast who never developed very good relationships with more established scientists, Binet held no professorial position. He educated himself professionally by working at the Salpetrière clinic, where he learned about psychology from Charcot. He later turned away from Charcot as well, striking out in his own direction and publishing several books. After working with the established psychological laboratory connected to the Sorbonne, in 1899 he was asked to participate in the newly-founded Société libre pour l'étude psychologique de l'enfant, where he rapidly moved into a position of leadership. This society was later renamed the Alfred Binet Society. See Theta H. Wolf, Alfred Binet (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1973), esp. pp. 286-287.

[39]Alfred Binet and Th. Simon, The Development of Intelligence in Children (The Binet-Simon Scale), trans. Elizabeth S. Kite (Vineland, NJ: Publications of the Training School at Vineland New Jersey, 1916), p. 14. Binet was appointed to the ministerial Commission set up to study this problem. Wolf, Alfred Binet, p. 29.

The Binet-Simon scale was based on statistical data derived from experiments that posed to children a set of questions and commands and noted their response. The subjects' answers were then laid out on a scale according to their age and the degree to which they could accurately respond. This experiment and the data scale that derived from it allowed the examiner to administer it as an intelligence "test," and compare any child's test results with those that Binet and Simon had published. What became the intelligence "test" was thus actually a repetition of the original "experiment" devised by Binet and Simon.

Binet did not argue that his test measured the mind's content, which was invisible. Rather, he tested the functioning of mental processes in the child. Though these mental processes were not, in Binet's view, intelligence themselves, they pointed to the existence of intelligence. By measuring mental processes, therefore, one could come closest to measuring actual intelligence. This rather subtle distinction seems to have been largely ignored by those who subsequently utilized the Binet-Simon test. The notion that intelligence was not itself quantifiable was largely forgotten, at least by intelligence testing proponents. Instead, intelligence in the child, or at least that aspect of intelligence which, it appeared, could be known and quantified, was from that point forward defined in terms of the functioning of mental processes, or skills mastery. If a child could show that his mental processes allowed for the mastery of a particular skill, then it could be assumed that he had attained a certain developmental stage of "intelligence."[40]

Binet was careful to distinguish between the kind of skills that were learned in school and those that he claimed were a part of the child's "natural" development. His test was not intended to be an achievement test, ranking children as they would be ranked in school, according to their ability to learn the curriculum content. Therefore the kinds of questions he asked did not parallel the content of formal schooling. He asserted, "We

---

[40]Binet and Simon, The Development of Intelligence in Children, p. 40.

believe that we have succeeded in completely disregarding the acquired information of the subject." He argued that when children took his test, it was not necessary for the examiner to know whether the child could read or write; even when the test was concluded, the examiner would most likely not have learned that fact about the subject.[41]

In Rousseauean terms, Binet's subject was intended to be the "natural" rather than the "social" child. He insisted on the need to filter out both the learned aspect of schooling that required reading and writing and the socializing aspect that might interfere if the test were administered collectively. The Binet-Simon test, therefore, was administered verbally and individually. Because his efforts were directed from the beginning towards filling a pedagogical need, however, it seems he was not as successful at distinguishing between the natural and the social as he initially hoped. By 1911, in his third modification of his intelligence test, Binet admitted that there seemed to be a correlation between social environment and intelligence levels. By then, numerous other pedagogues and psychologists had begun to develop tests similar to his, and their findings contested Binet's idea that intelligence could be measured entirely based on the natural development of the child, without reference to the social and cultural education of each test subject.[42] Nevertheless, throughout the interwar years most practitioners maintained that the tests were objective.

It was not until the 1950s that critics seriously questioned the objectivity of intelligence testing. In the psychology journal Enfance, an article by Georges Snyders looked back to Binet's 1911 comments and complained that all the modifications of intelligence testing to that point continued to ignore the impact of class. Snyders wrote, "what is there to say about a method that aims to evaluate intelligence, the intellectual valor and the fount of human valor, when it ends up attributing a mental age of 12 years

---

[41] Binet and Simon, The Development of Intelligence in Children, p. 42.

[42] Binet and Simon, The Development of Intelligence in Children, pp. 316-321.

to the working class?" Snyders suggested that the results of many years of intelligence testing that followed Binet's original method led to a kind of paternalism affected by the governing classes. Certainly, he argued, the data that showed that the working classes were not able to develop as well as the upper classes, both intellectually and physically, led to a well-meant desire to ameliorate their social condition. Even well-meant efforts at guidance would always fall short, however, as long as the intelligence of workers continued to be seen as lagging behind that of the upper classes. Intelligence testing, when used as a base for education that also served the purpose of social engineering, could cause and cement the very inequalities that such "experiments" were originally intended merely to describe.[43] This kind of concern went well beyond what Binet could have anticipated in the years just prior to World War I. Though Binet died in 1913, the impetus he gave to child psychology methodology grew by leaps and bounds, intensified by the need after the war for the state, through its schools, to gain an ever-greater knowledge and control of the children it sought to transform into citizens.

In response to new legislation passed in 1920, the work of Binet's psychological laboratory, continued under the direction of Simon, became a component of normal school preparation for teachers. One textbook published in 1922 recommended to future teachers that they pay special attention to the works of Alfred Binet and to the Bulletin of the Alfred Binet Society. It went so far as to give the subscription price of the latter, as if it were an advertisement rather than a textbook bibliography. The main thrust of this textbook was to use the results of experimental psychology, not only from the experts in pedagogical laboratories, but from their own classes, to learn to teach children's unconscious mind, so that students' learning would penetrate deep into their souls. The advice for classroom activity and curriculum presented in the book incorporated numerous ideas from both adult and child psychologists up to that time; it included both

[43]Georges Snyders, "Quelques inquiétudes au sujet du Binet-Simon-Terman," Enfance: Psychologie, pédagogie-neuro-psychiatrie-sociologie, vol. IV (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951), pp. 5-17.

academic subjects and the development of moral character. The conclusion cautioned against turning every classroom into a pedagogical laboratory, but clearly advocated judicious use of the scientific methods developed by pedagogues and child scientists. This textbook remained in use into the 1930s.[44] In the 1950s, one psychologist referred to the 1920 reforms as grossly inadequate, verbally reformist but actually quite static and traditional, especially in regard to class issues.[45] During the interwar years, however, French child psychology appeared quite sound and progressively scientific. Binet's push to make teachers' judgment and the classification of students more scientific appeared to have been successful.

Edouard Claparède: The Child's "Tendency" to Grow Up

According to one of Binet's colleagues, Swiss-French psychologist Edouard Claparède, by 1910 the discipline of child science required stronger definition. He lamented the underdevelopment of child science (*paidology*) in France. In 1912, he founded the Institut J. J. Rousseau in Geneva, which was to serve as a laboratory for the science of education. From its inception, the Institut J. J. Rousseau attracted students from many different countries, and devoted itself to supporting international cooperation between researchers and teachers. The Institut took the lead in providing scientific theory for the international use of pedagogy.[46] Like Compayré and Binet, Claparède sought

---

[44] J. Boucher, Psychologie appliquée à l'éducation d'après les programmes officiels du 18 août 1920, 15th edition (Paris: Librairie Delagrave, 1934).

[45] F. Seclet-Riou, "La Psychopédagogie et les réformes de l'enseignement," Enfance: Psychologie, pédagogie-neuro-psychiatrie-sociologie vol. IV (Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 1951), pp. 77-91.

[46] Claparède's interest in child psychology had begun by the turn of the century, but he had difficulty in getting his subject officially recognized at the university in Geneva. He offered classes in his laboratory in 1906 for future teachers. He called this little school the "Seminary of Pedagogical Psychology," which he hoped would become officially endorsed by Geneva University, but this did not come about. Although Claparède became an Associate Professor of Psychology in 1908, he remained disappointed in the University's lack of interest in child psychology as one necessary tool for pedagogical training. Privately funded for almost two decades, the Institut J.J. Rousseau was recognized by the State of Geneva and incorporated into the University in the late 1920's. See Claparède's contribution to A History of

most of all to improve the methods of child science. Significantly, these methods, through their application to pedagogy and educational practices, ultimately had a social engineering goal.

In the revised and expanded fourth edition of his book Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, Claparède enumerated several different branches of child study, including different types of psychology He separated "pure" from "applied" child science, and argued that pure science could study both the content and the process by which children acquired culture. He advocated using theoretical knowledge as one base for pedagogical reform. He also argued, however, that child scientists would develop their knowledge in conjunction with the goals of pedagogical reform. He embraced eugenic ideas, citing especially the theories of Herbert Spencer, and Frances Galton's Eugenics Laboratory in London, "where statistical research designed to demonstrate the factors which influence the qualities of the race are made."[47] Thinking about childhood development in terms of the acquisition of particular "civilized" cultural content placed Claparède in line with many traditionalists' social views.

Psychology itself formed only a part of the foundation for pedagogy, Claparède declared. Claparède defined experimental pedagogy as "the knowledge of, or the inquiry into, the circumstances favorable to the development of the child, and the means of educating him towards a given end." Although the "given end" to which he referred was clearly a social goal, Claparède pointedly declared that the end itself was not determined by science. "Experimental pedagogy works with a certain end in view, but *this end is given to it*; that is to say, that it takes it such as it is, without discussing it, and without considering its *value*." In this way he separated what he saw as the more objective and

---

Psychology in Autobiography, vol. I, ed. Carl Murchison (New York: Russel & Russel, 1930, 1961), pp. 87-89.

[47]Claparède, Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, pp. 17, 50. Claparède also cited numerous other work in child science done in other countries.

scientific aspects of child science from those whose primary purpose was sociological. Determining what children should or should not do, he argued, was the domain of the dogmatic branch of pedagogy. Pedagogues did need to include moral considerations in their theorizing, however, Claparède argued. He related this to medical doctors' need to make moral judgments as a part of their prescriptions for health.[48]

Claparède saw scientists like himself as a part of their social and cultural milieu. In a brief autobiography Claparède was commissioned to write in 1930 for the first volume in the series A History of Psychology in Autobiography, he explained his own moral values. "In my mind I unite Liberalism, Pragmatism, and Protestantism, which are to politics, philosophy, and religion what the experimental method is to science, a method of truth, substituting the free study of facts for the coercion of dogma or the dead-weight of prejudice." These three ideologies or theories all constituted methods of free inquiry in different realms of human life, and, according to Claparède, relied on a foundation of toleration and anti-dogmatism. Thus he saw even pure science as related to political goals.[49]

He declared himself to have always been a firm believer in keeping empirical science separate from philosophy. He formulated a biological interpretation of interest (defined as "want"), which he called "functional conception." Functional conception, he explained, was a methodological approach to the functions of the mind and body that asked what was the use of the function. For example, he asked, what was the use of sleep to the whole biological organism? He denied that his functionalism was overtly subjective.[50] "I believe...that we show our confidence in science when we bring within

---

[48]Claparède, Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, pp. 41-59.

[49]A History of Psychology in Autobiography, vol I, p 83. See also Vidal, Piaget before Piaget, pp. 101-102, for discussion of Claparède's views in the Swiss-French, Protestant context.

[50]Debate about whether the development of biological characteristics can be known through studying their functions can be found in other scientific disciplines. See, for example, the sociobiological debate as discussed in Daniel Dennet, Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life (New York: Touchstone, 1995), and Steven Jay Gould and R. C. Lewontin, "The spandrels of San Marco and the

her jurisdiction the question of knowing how these useful functions have developed in the organism. But, if one would examine this problem, one must not begin by shutting one's eyes to it, in the name of some dogma, borrowed from extra-scientific considerations. This ostrich-like attitude is not worthy of the man of science, who should be capable of examining everything, without any preconceived ideas." In Claparède's view, it was "ostrich-like" to deny the benefits of empirical science.[51]

Clearly, when Claparède applied his theory of "functional conception," however, he had social ends in mind. In Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, he asked the question "Of What Use is Childhood?"

> Childhood is for play and imitation. A child is not a child because he has no experience, but because he has a natural need to gain this experience. It is not because he is not full grown that a child is young, but it is because a secret instinct urges him to do all that is necessary in order to become full grown. And...this instinctive tendency to develop shows itself by play and imitation....Insufficiency of function is by no means sufficient to create the child type...It is not the fact of a child's ignorance that makes him a child; it is the fact that he wants to know, that he tends to become something more than he is...The essential quality in the child, then, is not that he is insufficient, but that he is a candidate...Adult age is crystallization, petrification; the aim of infancy is to defer as long as possible that moment when "being," losing its aptitude for "becoming," congeals, takes its definite form, like a piece of iron which the blacksmith has allowed to grow cold.[52]

Here Claparède combined several different ideas: the idea that the child was a "type" of human; that the "function" or use of childhood related directly to the child's "tendency" to become an adult; that adult functions were no longer developmental; and that the fundamental goal of childhood was, therefore, correlated to the child's future social

---

Panglossian paradigm: a critique of the adaptationist programme," in Proceedings of the Royal Society, London, B 205, 581-598 (1979).

[51] A History of Psychology in Autobiography, vol. I, p. 79.

[52] Claparède, Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, pp. 146-147.

condition. For this reason, Claparède declared that girls' psychological function differed from boys.

> It is necessary in the interest of the race that woman should be more passive, more conservative, that she should have in a less[er] degree the taste for research and for those enterprises which would carry her far from the domestic hearth, and from those children with whose fate her own should be associated. It seems as if this comparative abbreviation of the period of childhood were the means that nature has used to put restraint upon the intellectual evolution of the woman.[53]

It is not hard to imagine how Claparède applied his idea of "functional conception" to eugenic and Social Darwinist ideas. According to Claparède, like other types of statistically proven diversity of intellectual achievement between different individuals, the underlying system determining the function of human development was a biologically-based social need founded on future "interests." The relationship of child psychology to the social order depended on the future "wants" of the individual combined with the functional needs of society, which determined the child's "tendency" to become adult. The influence of society's future, like an Aristotelian "final cause," was a part of each child's blueprint for development from the moment he or she was conceived. Thus, Claparède's "natural" child was, from the beginning, also a "social" child.

This future social function of "the" child type played backward into his self-proclaimed empiricist and objective scientific methodology. This was incorporated into his assertion that education should be attractive to children. "We have here the fundamental elements of a pedagogy which is, I believe, the true one. It consists in exercising a child's activity only when he feels the natural need for doing so, or after having skillfully *created the need*, if it is not instinctive - in such a way that the object of this activity may captivate the child, may excite in him the desire to acquire it, provided always that the activity itself shall have the characteristics of play." This reiterated

---

[53]Claparède, Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, pp. 147-148.

Rousseau's ideal of well-regulated freedom for childhood education and "natural" versus warped psychological development. Repressive techniques, threat of punishment, and other nature-negating techniques which Claparède, like Rousseau two centuries earlier, found at the heart of traditional teaching methods, would create only an antagonistic reaction in the child. Forcing a child to eat a food he disliked resulted in the food not being well-digested, and probably being brought back up, he argued, thereby nullifying the purpose of forcing the child to eat in the first place. "The intellectual meals that the school prepares for its young guests are subject to the same laws as other meals. They must be consumed with relish if they are to do good to those who eat them." Play, Claparède asserted, was nature's means of encouraging children to perform the tasks which led to adult maturity. Children's pleasure as part of developmental psychological functions must be considered paramount, he argued. He did suggest, however, that adults could create the need that pleasure would fulfill. Adults could use a child's natural developmental processes to their own ends. The attractiveness of education, in his view, was thus the teacher's greatest social engineering tool.[54]

Even forms of play which might be annoying or disgusting to the adult mind had some kind of function for the child, he argued. "When it is said that certain 'savage' or 'barbaric' impulses of the child should be allowed free expression, because it is useful to development, no one means that he must be taught to handle the boomerang, to hunt the bear, or to worship idols. We must be careful, however, for it is quite possible that what seems to us and to our pedantic reasoning 'deviations and errors' may be in reality the shortest way to the goal, because it is the way that nature herself has made - and it may possibly be the only practicable way." Thus it was not cultural primitivism that the child needed to express, but rather natural or biological primitivism. The latter took the form of developmental stages that involved a kind of work-play providing the means for a

---

[54]Claparède, Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, pp. 148-159.

child to advance to a greater level of maturity. These might be stages the child merely passed through, as the four-legged frog passes through a legless tadpole stage, and might not be the formation of something which would become a part of the "congealed" adult personality. Claparède thus showed less confidence than Compayrè earlier had in the ease of use of child psychology. Claparède's classification of child sciences suggested a greater level of complexity for society's ability to encourage some behaviors while discouraging others.[55]

Claparède also considered the function of childhood interests in light of the 19th-century idea that "ontogenesis recapitulates phylogenesis."[56] This theory suggested that the individual developed in a way that paralleled all past development of humanity. He explained that this apparent parallelism was only approximate; as there was a difference between being a stone-age child who developed into a stone-age man, and being a modern child who went through a stone-age stage of development on his way to becoming a modern man. Nevertheless, Claparède firmly supported such an approximate recapitulation of physical and cultural progress in the developmental stages of childhood.

> In the realm of psychology, in what other way than by innate instinct can the liking for playing at Indians, for pursuit, for ruses and surprises, so general among children, be explained? Whence can come to them that passion for living in the open air, for climbing trees, for building houses, for digging caves and establishing themselves therein in improvised colonies, of paddling in streams, of making primitive weapons, and of parading on hobby-horses made of a simple stick? And is not the uniformity in these manifestations of child-life in all climates and latitudes most astonishing? There is more in this than imitation: imitation alone would not cause the child this joy which is the invariable symptom of the satisfaction of the vital instinct. These facts, and many others, show that

---

[55]Claparède, Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, pp. 189-190.

[56]This is also known as "Haeckel's Law," after Ernst Haeckel. On the influence of Haeckel's theories on Social Darwinism and on National Socialism, see Daniel Gasman, The Scientific Origins of National Socialism: Social Darwinism in Ernst Haeckel and the German Monist League (London: MacDonald and Co., 1971).

> an incontestable parallelism exists between the evolution of the race and that of the individual.[57]

The idea of recapitulation worked to explain why children took pleasure from engaging in uncivilized kinds of behavior.

Claparède's 1914 book continued to be influential for many years, and the J. J. Rousseau Institute he had started in Geneva gained ever greater fame, augmented by the reputation of that city as the center for international cooperation. It was from this center during the interwar years that Jean Piaget began to publish his own work, which in the years following the second world war catapulted him to international leadership in the field of child science.

Jean Piaget: Childhood as Primitive Error

Piaget first turned to the study of children in 1919, when he went to Paris to undertake post-graduate education and was hired by Simon to work at the Binet laboratory.[58] Years later, Piaget described his decision to study children by saying that he wished to study primitive man, especially to chart man's epistemological development. Since he was barred from interrogating the pre-historical, he turned to children as the next best thing. His initial impulse was in this way strongly marked by recapitulation theory, which Piaget continued to accept throughout his life.[59] In an interview in 1977, Piaget explained it this way:

> ...the men in the street have centuries of culture and of formation behind them...To study the formation of the human mind as I have dreamed, one would have had to reconstitute the stages from monkey to man, the stages of prehistoric man, the stages of fossil man; for which we know but a few

---

[57]Claparède, Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child, p. 187.

[58]A History of Psychology in Autobiography, vol. IV, pp. 237-256.

[59]See, for example, John J. Messerly, Piaget's Conception of Evolution: Beyond Darwin and Lamarck (Lanham, Boulder, New York and London: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1996), p. 2; Jean-Claude Bringuier, Conversations libres avec Jean Piaget (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1977), pp. 140-141.

> techniques. The beginnings of language, transmissible techniques, all this has unfortunately escaped us...The problem is to know how this knowledge forms, as a structure of intelligence forms; and so, in contemporary man, there are an enormous number of structures already formed for which we do not know the history...So, to reconstitute the history...That is what's great about it with the child, it's exactly to always find an individual who starts from ground zero, and to see how all that comes to be.[60]

This, of course, was not precisely what was being accomplished at the Binet Laboratory in Paris. There, Piaget was put to work administering, verbally and individually, a German intelligence test that had been translated into French. Piaget's job was to create a scale of norms for French children.

While giving the test, although he was employed merely to write down the degree to which the subjects were able to answer correctly, Piaget noticed that the children consistently gave the same incorrect answers.[61] This observation became the basis for Piagetian theory. In keeping more with Claparède's and Compayrés ideas than with Binet's, Piaget sought to determine the stages of children's intellectual development by analyzing the order in which their incorrect answers became correct, according to their age. He was especially interested in assessing their acquisition of knowledge about the world around them.

Knowledge of the external world, in Piaget's view, led ultimately to a Newtonian understanding of physics--comprehension of the invariable laws governing nature. Piaget considered such knowledge the highest achievement of human civilization.[62] When Piaget left the Binet Laboratory's intelligence test behind to work at the J. J. Rousseau Institute in Geneva, he began to do experimental testing on children that focused mainly

---

[60]Bringuier, Conversations libres avec Jean Piaget, pp. 39-40.

[61]A History of Psychology in Autobiography, vol. IV, p. 244.

[62]Bringuier, Conversations libres avec Jean Piaget, pp. 141-146.

on their ability to understand physical properties.[63] He began publishing the results of his studies in 1923.[64] By distinguishing what constituted the most civilized form of acquired cultural content from other types of culture, Piaget followed Claparède in assuming that the purpose of childhood development was the gradual acquisition of adult knowledge and perception. Children went through many error-filled stages prior to arriving at the correct, most civilized, understanding of the world around them.[65] Furthermore, this developmental pathway recapitulated the development of civilization as a whole, leading ultimately, in Piaget's view, to science.[66]

By testing a succession of children, Piaget sought to determine at precisely what age a subject would be able to correct the immature errors in their perception of the physical world. He focused especially on the moments that they would begin to think about physical qualities in terms of conservation or of number rather than of general size. By correlating the data from experiments like these, Piaget was able to outline a large-scale schematic universally applicable to all children. Piaget thus utilized an experimental testing method similar to Binet's. Binet's goal, however, was to create an exact definition of subnormalcy, which determined a life-long social intellectual category for particular children. Piaget's method, in contrast, served to determine the invariable stages of intellectual development of normal children viewed collectively (the normal child), specifically, their acquisition of scientific comprehension of the natural world. In

---

[63]Jean Piaget, The Child's Conception of Physical Causality (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1930); See also Molly Brearley and Elizabeth Hitchfield, A Guide to Reading Piaget (New York: Schocken Books, 1966) for a simplified explanation of Piaget's experiments.

[64]Jean Piaget, The Language and Thought of the Child (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959), originally published in 1923.

[65]See Gareth Matthews, The Philosophy of Childhood (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), pp. 30-53.

[66]Piaget said in an interview that his own turn towards science as the highest form of knowledge was inspired by his father's advice. His father was a historian who argued that historical methodology could never arrive at the same kind of truth as scientific methodogy could. Bringuier, Converations libres avec Jean Piaget, p 22.

accordance with recapitulation theory, Piaget assumed that this order of development followed the order of stages of human cultural "knowledge" leading up to the modern world.[67]

In addition to Piaget's focus on the collective, normal child rather than Binet's individual subnormal child, Piaget also moved away from Binet's insistence on a consistent method for experimental psychology. Where Binet had urged the use of precise and identical intelligence tests applied uniformly to large numbers of subjects, Piaget developed instead a method for investigators that he called "*conversation libre*," or free-form conversation. Instead of asking the subject a series of exactly worded and pre-determined questions, the Piagetian researcher would simply engage the child in discussion on the topic at hand. Piaget argued that this free-form style circumvented problems related to the skill--or lack thereof--of test-taking itself. Using Piaget's method, the researcher could better draw from children their real understanding of the subject, and avoid running the risk that they might misunderstand the exact wording of a standard question. The drawback to Piaget's "free-form conversation," as many other researchers pointed out, was the greater capacity for the researcher to influence the subject, thus influencing the experiment's results. Piaget countered this objection in part by insisting that his experiments did not actually constitute intelligence tests, which inherently involved standardization.

> One poses, one chooses, one determines the questions in advance. How can you, with your adult mind, think you can know what will be interesting? Unless the child sometimes follows by responding to you in an unforeseen manner, instead of being guided with questions foreseen in advance, one finds out nothing new...Of course, there are three or four questions one always poses, but around these, one turns and explores all the environs more than holding to strict questions.[68]

---

[67]Bringnier, Conversations libres avec Jean Piaget, pp. 39-40.

[68]Bringnier, Converations libres avec Jean Piaget, p. 46.

Piaget's own method, he asserted, was especially interesting because of how often the subjects' answers converged. Piaget did not think this convergence, at the same age, was due to belonging to the same environment, but rather, it signified that different children of the same age were at the same stage of intellectual "evolution." Although some children moved more quickly or more slowly through the stages of evolution, like Compayré and Claparède, Piaget maintained that the order of these stages always remained the same.

Piaget's views on racial or ethnic development were based on the idea that a child would progress as far, but no farther, towards the level of civilization reached by the culture of which the child was a part. Although he argued that this was a biologically determined developmental trajectory, apparently following a Lamarckian rather than Mendelian understanding of genetics, where learned traits were passed on to offspring, he also distinguished between different levels of cultural development in different places, involving different ethnic groups. Towards the end of his life, in the late 1970s, Piaget discussed efforts to use his methods in other countries, and at that time, he echoed some of the same kinds of concerns Binet had much earlier voiced about the problem of comparative analysis. To engage in free-form conversation with children in foreign countries required a complete understanding of the language and culture as well as training in the research method, all of which in combination was not easy. Piaget's response suggested that he considered children in less-developed countries to be slow or backward because of their environment. He thus contradicted his assertion that the environment was not the primary cause for the commonality of development among children. The average child of Martinique, Piaget declared, was four years behind the French child, despite being educated according to the French education system. He attributed this backwardness to the social milieu, even telling a story about the poor father of one subject who, when building a house, forgot to include the staircase. This analysis makes sense only if we consider the degree to which Piaget saw childhood development

as a recapitulation of the development of civilization. The economic level of the milieu played a role, but ultimately he was suggesting that the society at large was not as well-developed as French society, and thus the children there exhibited an extreme level of "backwardness." Clearly, he was using the French or Swiss child as the "normal" yardstick to determine this level of slowness.[69] Piaget's theory, reflected in his term "genetic epistemology," posited that every human was genetically programmed to pass through certain invariable stages of mental development, but this programming then interacted with the environment. The latter served as a limiting factor in determining how quickly children could move forward through those stages. Clearly, French and Swiss children were able to move more rapidly, as their social environment better enabled their development of cognitive structures.[70]

When he left the Binet laboratory in 1921, Piaget moved to the J. J. Rousseau Institute, where he later took over Claparède's directorship. Piaget published several books in the 1920s and 1930s, but his international renown grew slowly. Through the Geneva Institute, he communicated his ideas to a growing body of child psychologists. Piagetian theory became highly influential, especially for pedagogy. As we have seen, child science moved forward primarily in response to social, cultural, political, and economic needs. As child psychology became increasingly well-defined as a discipline, it gained greater support, both from state institutions and private philanthropy. Piaget's theory of epistemological development neatly filled a post-World War I social need to increase pedagogical control over children in order to engineer a better society in the 20th century. Although Piaget's own stated intention was to determine the historical development of human intelligence, in the interwar years such work was considered

---

[69]Bringuier, Converations libres avec Jean Piaget, pp. 57-58.

[70]Bringuier, Converations libres avec Jean Piaget, pp. 63-65.

useful solely for its ability to help shape education. Indeed, as we have seen, both the Binet laboratory and the Geneva Institute were founded for pedagogical purposes.

Later, Piaget sought to distinguish his own theory from the discipline of psychology, insisting that his work constituted "genetic epistemology" and not, properly speaking, psychology. In the interwar years this kind of distinction was unnecessary, and after World War II, it seems to have been largely ignored. Towards the end of his life, Piaget also suggested that he had never thought it was a good idea to use his theories as the foundation for pedagogy: in this respect, his early career clearly contradicts him.[71] Piagetian theory was influenced by other French child science during Piaget's early years, which points up discrepancies between his later description of his work and the way that it actually developed. Many of the elements of child science that Piaget incorporated into his theory were eventually set aside, but Piagetian theory was never purged of some of these components, including recapitulation theory and eugenics. In his early books, Piaget often cited Claparède and Binet, as well as Pierre Janet, the adult psychologist whose classes at the Sorbonne Piaget attended during his time in Paris. It was through Piaget that such ideas were re-packaged and exported to an international community, stretching eventually far beyond the scientific milieu and into the daily work of teachers, social workers, and even family life, throughout the western world.[72]

Intellectually, Piagetian theory did not move substantially beyond its interwar French origins, though other researchers, especially through the Geneva Institute and the International Bureau of Education which Piaget also directed, did go in different directions. The Institute, like the Alfred Binet Society in Paris, published numerous books, and its researchers regularly contributed articles to a variety of psychology and pedagogy journals. Once a year, the Institute held a week-long seminar, where Piaget

---

[71]Bringuier, Converations libres avec Jean Piaget, pp. 194-195.

[72]For a critical view, see David Cohen, Faut-il brûler Piaget? (Paris: Éditions Retz, 1981).

often propounded his theory and discussed his experiments to audiences of researchers from many different countries. Most often, this research was taken up by those looking to redesign educational practices. In the late 1930s, for example, a group of researchers at the Institute published a book arguing whether classes should be age-based or project-based. The group sent out questionnaires to teachers in several different countries, asking them to undertake experiments in their classrooms and then respond to the Institute with their findings. The question was, should children of different ages work together in teams towards completion of particular projects, or should they attend classes only with age peers? Piaget contributed the conclusion to this book, in which he argued that although the results showed that some teamwork was probably a good thing, by and large he felt it was important to separate children on the basis of age, at least the younger children from those over the age of 10.[73] As Piagetian theory became more dominant in the years following World War II, the notion that there should be as direct a correlation as possible between age and class level became the norm. Rousseau's assertion that children should not be taught anything until they needed to know it was transformed, in Piagetian theory, into the view that children could not learn anything until the underlying mental structures necessary for comprehension were in place.

Like his predecessors, Piaget worked to provide a solution to the problem of differentiating the social child from the natural child. He argued that child science was a pure discipline, but that it was utilized in conjunction with pedagogy, which was a social discipline. Ultimately, then, the scientifically-supported childrearing tactics advocated by child psychologists were never purely applied. Nevertheless, by relying on scientific advice, he asserted, teachers and legislators could at least attempt to incorporate a degree of scientific purity into their reforms. In his comment on the study of teamwork, Piaget wrote:

---

[73] Le Travail par équipes à l'école (Geneva: Bureau International d'Éducation, 1935), pp 179-196.

> We have already said before, the proper function of the International Bureau of Education is not to defend or to combat this or that pedagogical process, but rather to make understood, thanks to the purely scientific methods of comparative pedagogy, how the different educative tendencies are developed and to what results they lead from the point of view of their initiators. In this regard, a new pedagogical movement is always to be considered as being the combined product of sociological factors characteristic of the adult milieu in which it was born and of psychological factors characterising the children and adolescents growing up in the same milieu.[74]

In this passage, he suggested that scientists objectively sought to provide clear evidence that their work was not itself tainted with political or social interests. He set the psychology of the child in opposition to adult sociological factors, suggesting that child psychology when applied to pedagogy was somehow purer than the aims of educational reformers.[75]

Most significant over this period of time were these scientists' repetitive efforts to lay claim to a "pure" or "hard" scientific quality for new child sciences. This required somehow separating the social from the biological or natural. It also required developing objective methods for studying children. Yet the social remained problematic in two ways. It affected children's lives in a causal sense. Scientific efforts to deny the influence of class and educational experiences failed to provide a complete explanatory model for children's developmental diversity. Social ends also influenced scientists' thinking about the purpose of their own work. The broadly felt need to fulfill social goals after the war lent support to child science precisely because such systematic study seemed to provide the means for national recovery. It was this problem of social ends that brought scientists in line with traditionalism in France. As the French people sought a

---

[74] Le Travail par équipes à l'école, p. 179.

[75] For examples of debate about the usefulness of Piagetian theory to education, see Jean Piaget: An Interdisciplinary Critique (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), pp. 61-102.

return to social "normalcy," child scientists provided the methods and knowledge for assuring "normal" childhood development.

As we shall see in the following chapters, reformers and social commentators of a variety of sorts, when they drew on the precepts of child science, did so not in an effort to objectively determine social action, legislation, or pedagogical methods, but in order to support their subjective goals, no matter how defined. Piaget, unlike Compayré and Claparède, did not admit that the goal of scientific experimentation was a re-engineering of society through control over children's development. Nevertheless, much of Piagetian theory continued to reiterate ideas first formulated by earlier French and Swiss-French scientists.

One of the unintended outcomes of scientific efforts to define childhood development was that the sense of universality of stages also contributed to a sense of children as a social collectivity. As we shall see, this was especially the case when child science theories were applied to the development of children's culture, in and out of the schools. Defining the child as distinctly different from the adult, and at the same time ascribing to that difference a universal developmental trajectory, led to a new conception of "the" child as an ideal social type, a type to which all children could or should feel an affinity. That ideal was described not as the exception, but as the norm, and the job of adults was to judge the child's distance from the norm and correct any discrepancy. Differences in social class, ethnicity, and gender could easily be incorporated into scientific views of "the" child, thus separating children into distinct social categories. Yet the gap between French children and adults was pushed even farther apart than children's distance from one another.

Intensification of children's distance from French adult society helped reshape French childhood in the interwar years, but not without contestation. While scientists and traditionalists sought greater control over a distinct social and cultural childhood space, others sought to incorporate the next generation more firmly into the fabric of French

culture. As the systematic nature of new scientific "knowledge" influenced new institutional programs, some educators and philosophers looked to a different, more humanistic base, for reconstructing French childhood.

# CHAPTER 2

## YOUTH-CREATED "NEW HUMANISM": A STRATEGY FOR FUTURE REFORM

> ...[S]earch well in the depths of yourself, and you will discover this precious thing that your mama, your papa, your brother and sister have possessed since the age of 7, that in sum belongs to everyone, to the rich as well as the poor, to great thinkers as well as to simple artisans....[W]hen you know [reason], as you love it, it will be your best friend. With it you will always be happy, always smiling, you will become a philosopher, a nice little philosopher. (Madame La Philosophe to Kiki, age 10)
>
> Léontine Zanta[1]

Léontine Zanta, a journalist and teacher, and Robert Garric, a professor of French literature and the founder of the youth group, the Équipes sociales (1921), advocated creating a "new Humanism," as the foundation for bettering France's future. Their new kind of Humanism would act as a guide for greater social and cultural respect for women, workers, and other historically excluded groups in France, thus reforming pre-war French patriarchal and bourgeois attitudes. This philosophically-based method of improving the nation relied heavily on youth's cultural contribution. Not content merely to view the next generation as the future embodiment of existing French traditions, Zanta and Garric saw young people as creators of a new future for France. Their vision rested on youth's rationality, their intuition, and their creative adaptability. Enabling greater cultural creativity played an important part in shaping young people's participation in the process of constructing a reformist or even rebellious youth culture in the aftermath of the first World War. Such reformism by youth offered the possibility for a more dynamic adult culture in the future. In this way, New Humanists offered a vision of young people's nature and their social and cultural role that differed in many important ways from the ideals projected by traditionalists and child scientists.

---

[1]Léontine Zanta, "Le Coin des petits philosophes: L'Âge de raison," Les Enfants de France (Paris: Éditions du Figaro, Revue de la Jeunesse), Nov. 1, 1928, pp. 559-560.

Rather than perceiving children as heroic because of their innocence (i.e., lack of reasoning ability and experience), New Humanists suggested that young people could incorporate fresh insights into France's moribund system of values. Instead of portraying youth as weak and in need of patriarchally-ordered controls, thinkers like Zanta and Garric played up youth's ability to react against the patriarchal order, resisting and reforming French traditions as a form of social evolutionary adaptation. They therefore supported providing young people, from an early age, with greater freedom of choice and a stronger public voice. They perceived youth as having the potential to improve upon their elders, and this potential, especially in the aftermath of the Great War, accorded the younger generation a special heroic status. Examining the ways that Zanta, Garric, and their associates argued for reform illuminates one impulse contributing to the reconceptualization of the French child after the Great War.

*Developpement de la Personne* and "Finding the Common Denominator"

Development of *la personne*, meaning the "self"--but not the bourgeois, selfish and materialistic "individual"--was a key theme for Zanta, renowned for being the first woman to receive her doctorate in philosophy in France.[2] Zanta's depiction of the "nice little philosopher" in a 1928 article she wrote for a children's magazine reflected her faith in human nature. She disagreed with child scientists like Binet, Compayré, and Piaget, however, that childhood constituted a developmental process leading to traditional adulthood. Her view was that children needed to be given the opportunity to develop beyond the point that the older generation had reached. Beginning at a very young age, she suggested, development of the self was dependent on being socially *engagé*, and was guided by an altruistic form of reason. Garric's social activism, primarily directed towards ending class animosity between young people, also encouraged faith that self-

[2] "*La personne*" can also be translated into English as "character," though this translation tends to obliterate the opposition between *la personne* and the bourgeois "individual."

development through a modernized humanism would lead humanity to a higher level both socially and culturally. For both these thinkers, youth would lead the way.

New Humanism was an idealistic approach to social reform that emphasized synthesis of social goals within a diverse community. Veering away from Hegelian philosophy, New Humanists' notion of a synthesis was not the result of tension between opposing forces. It was instead an effort to look underneath differences for some common denominator, for some more essential trait that underlay social disagreement and could form the basis for a more conciliatory philosophical and practical pathway to reform. This led New Humanists to insist that their philosophy was non-aggressive and non-revolutionary. It was, however, distinctly reformist, and advocated the active engagement of youth in bringing about sweeping social changes.

Although not doing away with tradition, New Humanists focused on traditions of dynamic change. They looked back historically to moments of widespread philosophical reform, such as the European Renaissance. Both reason and passion, a combination in their view similar to that which underlay the humanist reforms of the sixteenth century, played a role in their twentieth-century dreams of reform. On the heels of the war, these intellectuals, teachers, journalists, and authors envisioned the French opening their eyes to the failures of many of France's traditions, and creating a new, twentieth-century renaissance that would advance civilization by virtue of generational evolution.

Instead of focusing, as both traditionalists and child scientists did, on society's need to deflect or correct childhood's developmental wrong turns, New Humanists played up the role of young people to correct the wrong turns of society. Young people's developmental nature, New Humanists hoped, would allow them greater flexibility for bringing about sizable reforms. Youth's creativity and critical spirit, adapted to the changing needs of society, could lead to better understanding of social problems and solutions. Because youth were not yet warped by socially divisive ideas, they could, by

working together towards a common goal, become more fully aware, more actively conscious or conscientious than older generations.

Zanta and Garric and thinkers like them aimed to achieve a synthesis of ideals between different social groups. In their view, efforts at integration or synthesis did not depend on homogenization. Diversity of class, gender, race, or religion was beneficial, and greater awareness of these social differences would involve attitudinal changes in all groups. No one existing group was proposed as fitting a New Humanist ideal. In this they differed from French religious and nationalist *intégristes* as well as from French communists. New Humanists thought that critical analysis of social differences would allow for raised consciousness of a common denominator between groups that could lead to a unified front for social reform. These thinkers expected that divergent groups--workers and the bourgeoisie, men and women, and different religious groups--could be brought together to work for common reformist goals while free choice and toleration would be maintained.

Trench Experience as a Spiritual Transformation

In his novel Belleville, written in the late 1920s, veteran Robert Garric reiterated the call to ex-soldiers, no longer so young themselves, to transform the next generation. Trench fraternity and the wartime ideal of a *union sacrée* continued to serve as a model for unification of feeling between all French people.[3] The press and literature played an important role in creating and transmitting collective understanding of national memory of the Great War. Garric's contribution was a new element added to the centuries-old consideration of military service as marking a shift to manhood.[4] Soldiers' transformative

---

[3]For a discussion of acceptance and rejection of the ideal of the *union sacrée*, see Jean Jacques Becker, The Great War and the French People, trans. Arnold Pomerans (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986).

[4]Sabina Loriga,"The Military Experience," in A History of Young People in the West, ed. Giovanni Levi and Jean-Claude Schmitt, trans. Carol Volk (Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press, 1997), p. 11-12.

experiences in World War I, New Humanists supposed, gave youthful veterans an expanded social role dependent on the lessons of the trenches.

> We will take the youth, the children, - those whom life, society, classes have not yet deformed. We will teach them the lesson of the past, that of our experiences....To have been the generation that knew the truth of humanity in the fire of the war; to be the generation that has passed this magnificent torch, this torch of love, to those who will come, - to persuade them to love one another.[5]

Garric applied to the enterprise of humanistic reform the ideal of loving one another as the soldiers in the trenches had loved one another. World War I soldiers felt a sense of connection and brotherhood on both an emotional and an intellectual level, which Garric based on their engagement in a common cause.[6] Garric and others who proposed the trench experience as a New Humanist model left aside the aggressive aspect of war, and the ideals of soldierly virility emphasized by many traditionalists.[7] Instead these philosophers focused on the emotional commonality of the trench experience, which sprang in part from mutual suffering. Sympathetic experience of pain and misery could serve, they thought, as a platform for greater consciousness of both human faults and capabilities, and was thus educational. For Garric, this fraternal enlightenment received by the soldiers in the trenches of the Great War needed to be perpetuated through transferal to the younger generation.

The war's eye-opening destructive results formed the first step, but the specific goals that would be discovered and worked towards by the next generation were not yet

---

[5]Robert Garric, Belleville (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1928), pp. 246-247.

[6]See George A. Panichas, ed., Promise of Greatness: The War of 1914-1918 (New York: John Day Co., 1968); Modris Ecksteins, Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age (New York: Doubleday, 1989), p. 190; Robert Wohl, The Generation of 1914 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), p. 18.

[7]These masculine ideals were also emphasized by fascists; New Humanists emphasized sensitivity and emotional/philosophical enlightenment. For images of virile youth in fascist Italy in the interwar years, see Laura Malvano, "The Myth of Youth in Images: Italian Fascism," in A History of Young People in the West, pp. 232-256.

clear. Thus, for New Humanists in the first decade after the war, restructuring or renewing France's future required a commitment to a process with unknown results. What was clear to them was that significant reforms were necessary to provide an environment encouraging new, freely creative youth development, based on mutual respect and conscientiousness. Ideals such as Love, Beauty, and Truth would serve as moral guidelines. Their imagined future had no particular date, and little specific content. Enlightened youth, New Humanists suggested, could see clearly the humanistic faults of some traditions, but they could also maintain those aspects of French society and culture that they deemed worthwhile. New Humanists thus attempted to straddle conservatism and radicalism, traditionalism and scientific modernization. Raised consciousness--both intuitive and rational--rather than revolutionary commitment would provide the key to a new and renewed humanistic world order.

A Combination of Reason and Passion as the Catalyst for Social Reform

As with traditionalist and scientific discourse about childhood as a developmental stage of life, New Humanist philosophy had its origins in pre-war ideas. Among Zanta's circle was the philosopher Henri Bergson, who became less active during the interwar years, but continued to associate closely with Zanta.[8] His work, especially Évolution créatrice (1907), was strongly influential in the development of New Humanism and Personalism. Although not directly centered on youth, his evolutionary schema supposed the importance of generational development for the advancement of civilization. Bergson argued that an original life force, the *élan vital*, flowing through every person, had diverged over time and continued to create greater and greater differences between humans. This blossoming lay at the base of evolutionary progress. Seizing the power of the vital force, which involved using nearly-forgotten human intuition--"reabsorbing

[8]Henri Maleprade, Léontine Zanta (1872-1942): Vertueuse aventurière du féminisme (avec une lettre inédite du Père Teilhard de Chardin) (Paris: Éditions Rive Droite, 1997), p. 145.

reason into intuition"-- would enable individuals to develop themselves most fully and thereby encourage evolutionary change. This could only happen, he argued, in a society that supported free creative and intellectual development. Bergson described freedom of consciousness as allowing the intellect to turn inward on intuition, which worked to develop the self over time (in duration). "The more we succeed in making ourselves conscious of our progress in pure duration, the more we feel the different parts of our being enter into each other, and our whole personality concentrate itself in a point, or rather a sharp edge, pressed against the future and cutting into it unceasingly."[9] When applying this intuitive rationalism to youth development after the war, New Humanists moved from Bergson's more individualistic stance to a collective ideal.

For the French, New Humanism served as more than an artistic or literary critical method. It also guided social action, or *engagement*. In 1927, Julien Benda reacted against this role for the intellectual in La Trahison des clercs. Benda advocated that intellectuals raise themselves above social involvement, and engage in a more hermetic, ivory-tower intellectual mission. Benda railed especially against Bergson and his followers for their emphasis on personal experience in duration rather than a classical, disinterested effort to know and understand timeless values. He complained that the problem with modern intellectuals was their unwillingness to follow Socrates' model and drink the hemlock. Benda saw all socially engaged intellectuals as seeking, above all, self-aggrandizement. He was willing to consider intellectuals as leaders, but unlike Zanta and Garric, did not think that the guidance they offered to society could arise from community engagement.[10]

---

[9]Henri Bergson, Creative Evolution, trans. Arthur Mitchell (New York: The Modern Library, 1944), pp. 200, 220.

[10]Julien Benda, The Betrayal of the Intellectuals, trans. Richard Aldington (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1928).

For many French thinkers, the philosophical content of the New Humanist vision was essentially Christian, and most often Catholic. New Humanists followed the path blazed in the late nineteenth century by those labeled "Catholic Modernists," who had radically shied away from the dogmatic outpourings of the Vatican.[11] In their integration of religiously-oriented ideals with human understanding of scientific "reality," these thinkers sought earthly perfection through social reforms. They argued that the Catholic Church should modernize its mission, in order to better serve its parishioners, and should be more flexible and tolerant of different beliefs. Politically, Catholic Modernists took two paths, one democratic, one more aristocratic. Both views emphasized the needs of the people rather than the institutions of state or church.[12] In 1907, under the papal leadership of Pius X, the Vatican condemned Catholic Modernists as subversive to the faith. In contrast, Pius X was exceptionally tolerant of the nationalist Catholic integrism of the Action Française, which under its leader Charles Maurras had a strong influence on youth. The Pope apparently saw the anti-dogmatic and anti-authoritarian stance of French Catholic Modernists, so soon after the 1905 legal separation of Church and State in France, as more dangerous to papal authority than Maurras' nationalist imperialism. That Maurras himself upheld the Vatican's condemnation intensified the outrage of Catholic Modernists--even those who, like Henri Bremond (another of Zanta's circle), had been on relatively friendly or tolerant terms with Maurras earlier. Other Modernists, like

---

[11]The term "Modernist" was used by Pope Pius XI when he condemned this group, though prior to this in France the movement was often referred to as "Loisyism" after Alfred Loisy, its earliest articulator. Catholic Modernism was not limited to France. See for example, Alec R. Vidler, M.A., The Modernist Movement in the Roman Catholic Church: Its Origins and Outcomes (London: Cambridge University Press, 1934), pp. 69-139.

[12]Adrien Dansette, Religious History of Modern France (New York: Herder and Herder, 1961), pp. 751-752.

Lucien Laberthonnière and Maurice Blondel, had been considerably less tolerant of the Action Française from the organization's inception at the turn of the century.[13]

One reason that Catholic Modernists felt they were on secure theological ground was that the 1892 papal encyclical, Rerum Novarum had advocated a reconciliation of the modern democratic state and the Church on the basis of liberalism. Modernists turned to a modern brand of neo-Platonic universal idealism rather than the Maurrassian glorification of ancient imperialism and the strongly-ordered state. Pius X did not agree, and the Vatican began demanding that Catholic Modernists either toe the line or suffer reprisals ranging from public shame to excommunication. Perhaps ironically, the Third Republic's 1905 separation of Church and State allowed those Catholics who were not actually members of the clergy to continue teaching and publishing and yet remain beyond the reach of the Vatican. It appears that the harshness of papal condemnation led in some cases to polemical liberation. The most extreme Catholic Modernist priest, Alfred Loisy, stepped away from excommunication in 1908 into publishing belligerent denunciations of Vatican dogma and policy, especially during World War I.[14] Others were more cautious. Père Sertillanges, Zanta's close friend and confessor, also spoke out publicly against Vatican policy during the war, but stopped short of outright rebellion.[15]

"Personalism" and Shared Consciousness

After the war, New Humanists combined their Christian idealism with personalist philosophy and turned their sights on the younger generation. Along with Bergson's

---

[13]Michael Sutton, Nationalism, Positivism and Catholicism: The Politics of Charles Maurras and French Catholics 1890-1914 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 7.

[14] Marvin R. O'Connell, Critics on Trial: An Introduction to the Catholic Modernist Crisis (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994), pp 369-370. O'Connell quotes Loisy saying that he felt relieved at the excommunication, after which he became a professor at the Collège de France.

[15]Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Lettres à Léontine Zanta (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1965), introduction by Robert Garric, pp. 11-30; Maleprade, Léontine Zanta, p. 178.

ideas for developing the personality, other thinkers' approaches to personalism were also influential. Personalism was a stance concerning the relationship between the individual and society.[16] Generally, personalists sought a mutually beneficial correspondence between the individual's will and social or community ends. Around the turn of the century, Charles Renouvier and Octave Hamelin both wrote on personalism and grappled, as Bergson did in Évolution créatrice, with the question of whether expression of human will conformed to any external system.[17] The problem of human consciousness as an intermediary between an external reality and perception of it lay at the heart of their dilemma. If all of life's phenomena were understandable only as they were perceived by the human mind, whether through reason or through intuition, it would seem that idealism of any sort could not be absolute; all moral ideals or systems would have to be deemed relativistic. In the same way, lack of an external cause for human choice negated the idea that humanity could progress towards the best of all possible worlds, or ultimately, to perfection. Although in differing ways and with differing conclusions, Bergson, Renouvier, Hamelin, and others sought a resolution to this moral problem in personalism. The function of contemporary experience played an important role--after the war it was the wartime experience that seemed most important to the French.[18]

In the years after the Great War, personalist philosophy merged with calls for a New Humanism. Development of the self over time and through experience, combined

---

[16]There were alternative explanations of personalism focused more on the relationship of the individual to God, but French Personalists had a more society or community orientation. See Jean Lacroix, Le Personnalisme: sources-fondements-actualité (Lyon: Chronique Sociale, 1981).

[17]Charles Renouvier, Le Personnalisme suivi d'une étude sur la perception externe et sur la force (Paris: F. Alcan, 1903); and Octave Hamelin, Le Système de Renouvier (Paris: J. Vrin, 1927).

[18]In the 1930s, Emanuel Mounier and Denis de Rougemont both updated personalism, giving it a considerably more political bent. See John Hellman, Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left 1930-1950 (Toronto and Buffalo, University of Toronto Press, 1981), and Denis de Rougemont, Politique de la Personne, Problèmes, doctrines et tactique de la Révolution Personnaliste (Paris: Éditions "Je Sers," 1934), esp. pp. 145-156. Counter to Hellman's argument that the Personalism of the 1930s led straight into French fascism, de Rougemont suggested that Personalism opposed fascism.

with the human capacity to communicate differing perceptions, offered the possibility of a critical method enabling human civilization to better itself systematically. That this would happen as an evolutionary process focused attention on the younger generation.

Shared consciousness of experience of the Great War offered an excellent example for a personalistic, New Humanist criticism. In the view of the New Humanists, patriotic propaganda during the war led the way toward the creation of collective understanding. In the post-war period, this philosophical prescription was aimed primarily at French youth. For some, like Robert Garric, the experiences of the soldiers themselves took top priority. For others, like Léontine Zanta, the war experience on the home front was similarly instructive. In his war diary from 1917, soldier, priest and anthropologist Teilhard de Chardin, also a close friend of Zanta's, explained the connection he saw between war experience and evolutionary progress through development of raised consciousness of the self.

> What the future imposes on our present existence....borders on a sort of sadness...but it leads also to a sort of higher joy....a slow but continual process of adaptation is going on, at the end of which the soul finds that it has been raised up to the level of the great duties that await it....the front cannot but attract us, because it is, in one way, the *extreme boundary* between what one is already aware of, and what is still in process of formation. Not only does one see there things that you experience nowhere else, but one also sees emerge from within one an underlying stream of clarity, energy, and freedom that is to be found hardly anywhere else in ordinary life - and the new form that the soul then takes on is that of the individual living the quasi-collective life of all men, fulfilling a function far higher than that of the individual, and becoming fully conscious of this new state.[19]

Teilhard developed Bergson's idea of a divine force driving human evolution both in the individual and the collectivity to the point where humanity as a whole would evolve to a higher spiritual level. Not only did Teilhard argue that the *élan vital* flowed from a

---

[19]Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Making of a Mind: Letters from a Soldier-Priest 1914-1919 trans. René Hague (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), p. 205.

unitary source, but also that evolution eventually would cause all development to converge on a unitary, divine end. The personalist aspect of his vision, the idea of raised consciousness of the self in connection to the whole, lay at the heart of his theories.[20] The Vatican cracked down on such views, barred Teilhard from teaching in Paris in 1925, and denied him the right to publish his work during his lifetime.[21] He did continue, however, to send his writings to a circle of clerical and lay friends, including Léontine Zanta.

Feminism as a Form of New Humanism: Léontine Zanta and the Future Woman

Although Zanta was 42 years old in 1914 when she received her doctorate, in the 1920s, she became a role model for young people, especially young intellectual women. Her greatest public cause was increased access to professional, "liberal," careers for women. She campaigned for changes in French education programs for girls in order to provide them with equal career opportunities. She also used her public status to urge legislators to extend voting rights to women, which the Third Republic never granted. Zanta died in 1942 during the Occupation, and thus did not live to see women granted the vote after World War II.[22]

Highly conscious of the difficulties of women intellectuals in public life, Zanta set herself to constructing a public role that would enable her to speak with authority. As Joan Scott has argued, the paradox of feminine authority in the public sphere created a problem for feminist expression.[23] To be a female intellectual automatically catapulted

---

[20]Madeleine Madaule-Barthèlèmy, "Introduction à un rapprochement entre Henri Bergson et Pierre Teilhard de Chardin," in Les Études Bergsoniennes, vol. V. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960), pp. 65-84.

[21]Combes, André, Teilhard de Chardin et la sainte évolution (Paris: Édition Seghers, 1969), pp. 190-191.

[22]Teilhard de Chardin, Lettres à Léontine Zanta, pp. 11-30; Dossier Zanta, Bibliothèque Marguerite Durand; Maleprade, Léontine Zanta.

[23]Joan Wallach Scott, Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and The Rights of Man (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), p. 3. "Feminism was a protest against women's political exclusion;

Zanta into feminism, and feminism seemed intrinsically radicalizing. Yet Zanta struggled against speaking within a radical idiom, for fear that a charge of radicalism would weaken her public voice. What she hoped to articulate was not merely feminism, but a broader philosophical reformism that depended especially on the evolutionary transformative powers of youth, which included, but was not limited to, young women. She attempted to resolve her dilemma by positioning herself as an intellectual saint, a heroically inspirational role model for all women. She designed for herself a new social role--a fully feminine one based on a combination of reason and faith. Her male and female students affectionately referred to her as "*La Lampe*" for her efforts to enlighten them and to lead the way towards opening new paths for female professionals.[24]

Beginning in 1901, Zanta was vice-president of a cooperative tutoring organization called "Mutualité Maintenon," for which service she won the Legion of Honor in 1924.[25] Like some other intellectual girls, Zanta herself had been educated through tutoring outside of the regular school program, first by her father, a classicist, then by a philosopher friend of the family.[26] Zanta's tutoring organization helped prepare students, male and female, for the *baccalauréat* and the *agrégation* exams. She did not hold a teaching position at the lycée or university level during this time, because of her gender and academic specialization. It was not until 1924 that education programs for girls were expanded to include classes in philosophy and classics.

---

its goal was to eliminate 'sexual difference' in politics, but it had to make its claims on behalf of 'women' (who were discursively produced through 'sexual difference'). To the extent that it acted for 'women,' feminism produced the 'sexual difference' it sought to eliminate. This paradox--the need both to accept *and* to refuse 'sexual difference'--was the constitutive condition of feminism as a political movement throughout its long history."

[24]Teilhard de Chardin, Lettres à Léontine Zanta, pp. 11-30.

[25]See the Dossier Léontine Zanta at the Bibliothèque Marguerite Durand. Zanta won this award especially for enabling male students to rise to the position of professor; this was a very limited appreciation of her intellectual feminism.

[26]Teilhard de Chardin, Lettres à Léontine Zanta, pp. 11-30; Maleprade, Léontine Zanta, pp. 26-27; Dossier Zanta, Bibliothèque Marguerite Durand.

During the war, Zanta held the chair of philosophy at the Lycée Buffon, a boy's school, taking the place of a professor mobilized for war service. In an article written after the war, feminist and doctor Marthe Bertheaume commented: "Respected and admired by her older students, she enabled them to brilliantly pass the baccalaureat, but, the war over, Léontine Zanta suffered the fate that, professors or medical doctors, all the women who occupied official positions reserved for men have experienced." Zanta, Berthaume lamented, was sent back, with much praise, to her home.[27]

Zanta's apartment in Neuilly, however, was not an intellectual Siberia. Once "sent" there after the war, she made of it a suburban center for Parisian intellectualism. Her decor in her study represented her interests: along with shelves full of books, she had a bust of Socrates, a painting of Erasmus, and a reproduction of Michelangelo's "David."[28] In the 1920s, she authored two novels and expanded her career in journalism, writing frequent articles for L'Écho de Paris and other periodicals. She was well-known in Parisian intellectual circles, holding *salons* at her home, where many intellectuals and artists attended and exchanged views. These included Henri Bergson, Maurice Barrés, and playwright Maurice Donnay, as well as Catholic Modernist clergy like the Abbé Bremond and Père Sertillanges. She became friendly with Teilhard de Chardin just after the war through Teilhard's cousin, Marguerite Teillard de Chambon, and it was at one of Zanta's salons that Teilhard met young Robert Garric. Zanta also invited some of her young students to meet and mingle during the pre-dinner hour.[29]

The respectful, even if argumentative, exchange of views in a civilized setting realized Zanta's belief in personal development through community engagement. She

---

[27]See Dossier Zanta, Bibliothèque Marguerite Durand. Berthaume was the penname of Madame Darcanne, a close friend of Zanta's. See Maleprade, Léontine Zanta.

[28]Teilhard de Chardin, Lettres à Léontine Zanta, pp. 11-30; Zanta repeated this description in her depiction of a female philosophy tutor (herself) in an autobiographical novel. Léontine Zanta, La Science et l'amour: Journal d'une étudiante (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1921).

[29]Teilhard de Chardin, Lettres à Léontine Zanta, pp. 11-30.

considered Third Republican politics merely formalized aggression based on private interest. Intellectual debate, on the other hand, driven by the dictates of reason and intuition rather than materialistic selfishness, was part of a process necessary for the humanistic advancement of civilization. It was especially important to Zanta that women became full contributors to this enterprise. She saw herself as the proof of women's capabilities and recognized her potential role model status, encouraging girls to reach farther than the majority of the current older generation of women had done.

"Mademoiselle Zanta" as a Public Figure: A Role Model for Young Women

Zanta's humanist feminism also radicalized her as a public figure supporting Catholicism. During the war, Père Sertillanges asked Zanta to contribute to a book intended to revitalize Catholicism (Témoins du Renouveau Catholique, 1917). Clearly it was her ability to act as a public figure that encouraged his request for her contribution as a token female in an otherwise all-male list of intellectuals. Telling her she would be a "symbol, as on a poster," in his letter to Zanta he added that she was "predestined" to become a "standard bearer." In the article Zanta contributed, she wrote that she had "always thought that our soul's destiny has been clearly written in our life as a child...a blank slate...not in the manner of a Descartes...but in the manner of a believer." She described belief as a motivation for realizing the God-given ideal of your own person, for searching in yourself for the divine "sketch" (*ébauche*) or underlying outline for personal development.[30] This view, though related to Catholicism, echoed both Plato's ideals and the Renaissance thinker Pico della Mirandola's notions of humanist development of the "seeds" of potential in each individual. For Zanta, female intellectualism was grounded in faith in development of the human being, or *la personne*. For Zanta such development had to begin during childhood. This was an interpretation that did not sit well with most

[30]Maleprade, Léontine Zanta, pp. 83-84.

Catholics who felt that women's religious duties properly relegated them to the home and domestic tasks, and whose upbringing should therefore focus on imitating their mothers.

Her double emphasis on faith and feminism was not always recognized by Zanta's audience. Young women who remembered Zanta's influence in later years did not refer to her faith at all, but solely to her feminism. One woman who had been a student in Paris in the interwar years remembered that "All the feminists brandished [Zanta's] name like a flag."[31] It was reading an article about Mademoiselle Zanta that led feminist Simone de Beauvoir as an adolescent to make the decision to continue with her education. "[Zanta] had been photographed, in a grave and thoughtful posture, sitting at her desk; she lived with a young niece whom she had adopted; she had thus succeeded in reconciling her intellectual life with the demands of feminine sensibility. How I should love to have such flattering things written one day about *me*!"[32] Beauvoir's mother, with the support of her bourgeois friends, refused to allow Beauvoir to take a degree in philosophy, however, deeming it dangerous to her religious education. Instead Beauvoir studied literature. In her autobiography of childhood, Beauvoir wrote that she became disillusioned because she found she could not emulate Zanta as an intellectual woman; she did not receive the respect that Zanta claimed for herself and dangled before others.

> If I established myself in life by writing a work which would do honor to humanity, I would be congratulated for having trampled conformity in the dust; like Mademoiselle Zanta, I too would be accepted and admired. I made the brutal discovery that I had been wrong from the start; far from being admired, I was not accepted at all; instead of weaving laurel wreaths for me, people were banishing me from society.[33]

---

[31]Françoise d'Eaubonne, Une Femme nommée Castor: Mon amie Simone de Beauvoir (Encre, 1986), cf. 3, p. 85.

[32]Simone de Beauvoir, Memoires of a Dutiful Daughter, translated by James Kirkup (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1959), p. 169.

[33]Beauvoir, Memoires of a Dutiful Daughter, p. 199.

Zanta's self-representation as a personalistic role model appears to have outlived its usefulness for young Simone. Despite her disappointment, Beauvoir continued her intellectual pursuits, and eventually won fame for her own contributions to feminism. In some ways Beauvoir's The Second Sex echoed Zanta's earlier efforts, but without Zanta's legitimating emphasis on maternal sensibilities or religious faith.

New, Youth-driven Social Rights for Women: Girls as Reformers

Zanta saw contemporary limitations on female intellectualism as the main ground for women's political oppression. It was to this end that she wrote the best-known of her books, Psychologie du féminisme in 1922.[34] Berthaume wrote of this book that it had "inspired numerous works, and it had pointed out the demands of the truly reasonable feminism that we claim, based on our value as moral persons, having rights, like men, intellectual and political rights."[35] The "crisis of feminism" in which French feminists found themselves after the war, she argued, was at bottom the creation of the Third Republic through its refusal to acknowledge the real benefit of women's service during the war. In particular, Zanta decried the failure of the Third Republic to extend the vote to women, a cause for which she continued to campaign.

Zanta's hope for the future lay in youth and their potential to bring about progressive reforms. In a changing world, each generation needed to adapt to new circumstances, she urged.[36] It was the combination of traditional, patriarchal education and traditions and a poorly-understood modern individualism that most ruined women's abilities to adapt appropriately in the post-war period. Using examples from novels and from history, she contrasted two types of twentieth-century female individualism:

---

[34]Léontine Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1922).

[35]Dossier Zanta, Bibliothèque Marguerite Durand.

[36]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 193.

> Here displayed against one another are the two types of women who are in the process of fighting in our modern French society, in a moving, almost tragic, duel. One is strong due to her whole past of secondary femininity, hypocrisy, lying, deceitfulness, low seduction, of intuitive, blind, and cowardly force. She has around her all who profit from her beauty, her luxury, her display, her mutilated "Eternal feminine." The other is strong due to her complete humanity, her developed "Eternal feminine," her clear conscience, to her living ideal, who plunges into the absolute and it never disappoints her; she has around her a humanity that thinks, that understands her mission as a reasonable and free being and who believes in the future of the beautiful and the good. If it is true that one day she will achieve her mission, in a better society of more conscientious and better developed beings, it is the new woman who will win: she who works, who thinks, who first painfully opens the paths, like a pioneer of the *avant-garde*, with no fear of the undergrowth, nor the ravines, in the meantime becoming like Beatrice, she lights them with the sole strength of her shining.[37]

Zanta might have been describing herself as an intellectual pioneer, but her vision of the future applied her hard-won status to ever-greater numbers of women. Although in the past, she claimed, it was female saints who proved themselves, despite suffering abuse for their beliefs, in the present it was female students who were showing their mettle. Although the movement towards gender integration had begun with a small elite, it would widen as it became democratized. For Zanta this meant countering the individualistic drive that had encouraged the success of these as yet intellectual "princesses," and taking on instead the personalistic mission of intellectual apostles to the lower classes.[38]

Citing early socialist and feminist Flora Tristan, Zanta argued that class differences should not divide women--that the question of women's role in the moral order was not limited by class allegiance. Bourgeois values, especially for women, degraded female humanity, and created the sort of weak, selfish, vain and materialistic

---

[37]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 194.

[38]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 201.

woman Zanta despised. This was especially a problem with the values encouraged in their daughters by bourgeois mothers.

> Pardon me if this description is maybe a bit brutal, but too many flowers have been thrown to the young girl, so-called ideal, who has been raised for too long for the man, only for the man. And under this fossilized type of "the well-brought-up young girl" one suffocates her personality.[39]

Zanta cited several examples of bourgeois mothers as depicted in novels to show how such attitudes negatively influenced young people's lives. She praised instead the values of the *petite bourgeoisie*, "the most modest class, the most virtuous in the nation." She included in the petty bourgeoisie artists and intellectuals, including students. She glorified the *petite bourgeoise* above all for her hard work, which Zanta claimed had been improved through the progress of feminism.[40]

Work, especially outside the home, placed women face to face with "cruel realities," which did away with their past complacency about their social and cultural role. This had been increasingly the case since the war.

> Romantic dreams are in the process of going up in smoke, she understands that the first solid and sure conquest to make is that of herself; that individual morality is at the base of all social morality, or rather that there is no society that will last without having foundations sealed by strong moral personalities. In asking her to develop herself completely, we are doing nothing more than claiming for her the right to her entire, profoundly human, personality.[41]

In this way, Zanta formulated a version of feminism as a component of a new, personalistic humanism. Her vision of the "New Woman" was as one type of New Humanist, bringing a particularly feminine perspective to the humanist enterprise of moral progress. Once the moral ideals of Humanism were achieved, she claimed, there

---

[39]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 17.

[40]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 21.

[41]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 203.

would be no need to speak of feminism. Feminism as the philosophy of women, in some distant, perfected society, would be melded equally with the philosophy of men, thus rendering the need for a distinct and aggressive feminism *passé*.[42]

Political Implications of Zanta's Thought

Was Zanta's feminism radical?[43] She denied that she was a radical, with that label's implications of belligerence and revolutionism, and many of her ideas seemed conservative, especially when aimed towards an adult audience. Unlike many feminists of the time, Zanta rested her feminism neither on suffrage nor on individual rights--though she did not reject either. Instead she focused on culturally redefining gender differences, which required a kind of culturally deconstructive analysis. It was for this reason that her philosophy emphasized the educability of youth, who as a group seemed better able to understand and to take on new cultural definitions, thus transforming society.

At this time, "radical" feminism was associated with democratic inclusion rather than with the political left. Socialists before the war had denied the legitimacy of feminism as a thoroughly individualistic, bourgeois, and capitalistic concern.[44] Conservative feminism like that of the Patriotic League of French Women, a Catholic organization, actively propounded a "separate-but-equal" policy, bourgeois and individualistic rather than social. Similar groups in the Netherlands, Belgium, and

---

[42]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 139.

[43]Christine Bard, Les Filles de Marianne: histoire des féminismes 1914-1940 (Paris: Fayard, 1995), p. 545. Bard divides feminists into three camps: radical, reformist, and moderate. In her view these categories do not correspond neatly to existing political parties. In the interwar years, she argued, all feminists wanted to make women's lives better, but most feminists sought to evade the charge of radicalism which was often associated with the Communist left.

[44]Françoise Picq, "'Bourgeois Feminism' in France: A Theory Developed by Socialist Women before World War I," trans. Irene Ilton, in Women in Culture and Politics: A Century of Change, ed. Judith Friedlander, Blanche Wiesen Cook, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Carroll Smith-Rosenberg (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1986), pp. 330-343.

Germany emphasized motherhood and moral enlightenment, but did so in a way that strengthened patriarchal values and protected the legitimacy of their own social standing.[45] Zanta's views were somewhere in between: she attempted to redefine feminism (as well as Catholicism) in social terms, yet in her personalism she did not fully reject individualism, and her philosophy contained a strong element of intellectual--though, in her view, not social--elitism. She directed her efforts at shifting the ground of feminist discourse away from particularistic social and political concerns and towards a more wide-ranging, collective, and "psychological" cultural analysis, within a long-term evolutionary vision. Her primary audience was young women and young men.

Significantly, she often looked to older conservatives for support for her views. She was friendly with many men who were avowedly right-wing, and her comments seemed to be responding to conservative ideas. By engaging those on the political right in reasoned debate about feminism and especially women's political rights, however, she clearly hoped to swing public sentiment towards feminist reforms. She succeeded in this effort, at least partially, with Maurice Barrès, who publicly advocated women's suffrage. "In the aftermath of the cruel war which created so many widows among our French women and revealed so many energies in their ranks, M. Maurice Barrès claimed in the Chamber the right for them to vote that had been given them in the Estates General of 1560; he was not heard." Zanta wrote that it was hardly surprising that this created a moment of crisis, and that when treated badly by legislators, French women responded in kind, with aggression. In this way, she chided legislators and attempted to force them to see that their oppression was the root cause of the feminism they so feared. She urged them instead to treat women's rights with the respect they reasonably deserved. Women only wanted the right to live in accordance with "the laws of universal mechanism"--the

---

[45]Anne-Marie Sohn, "Catholic Women and Political Affairs," trans. Debra Irving; and Mieke Aerts, "Catholic Construction of Femininity: Three Dutch Organizations in Search of a Politics of the Personal, 1912-1940," both in Women in Culture and Politics, pp. 237-268.

system of liberal values based on natural human rights that men enjoyed. Giving women only some of their rights "struck them with partial death," and feminist crises were thus reactions to the historical situation that kept women from living fully as respected human beings. Male legislators would do better, Zanta urged, to listen to women's claims and enter into reasoned debate with them. Young girls should be prepared from their youth for political participation by being exposed to political processes and issues at a young age. What looked like a lack of political ability in women was due only to their having been denied development of their intellects in youth, to being kept merely as *demi-savantes*.[46]

Paul Bourget, who had drifted to the political right by that time, wrote an introduction to Psychologie du féminisme, which illustrates Zanta's influence. Bourget's preface reads like a summary of Zanta's thesis, but he interpreted her words to suit his own ideas, which were not whole-heartedly accepting of Zanta's redefinition of feminism. Although in 1894, as a young man, Bourget had praised the American education of girls and especially Wellesley College, over the following decades he changed his mind. He increasingly supported a gender and class elitist, classical education, in 1927 writing Le Tapin, a glorification of classicism.[47] Despite his earlier sympathies, therefore, Bourget appears an odd endorser for Zanta's book, and this disjunction is born out in his introduction. He wrote that her book raised many worthwhile points, but then he presented his own thoughts concerning those issues, in a way that almost paralleled a verbal debating style. He concluded his introductory comments with praise for Zanta's book because it showed "the mark of good feminism and the limit of bad [feminism]." He interpreted Zanta's complaints about the inadequacy of contemporary political action to be a limit on feminism itself, which her own words did not support. Bourget based this

---

[46]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, pp. 137-139.

[47]Armand E. Singer, Paul Bourget (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1976), p. 88.

interpretation on her assertion that feminism should be, as he put it, "before all else a movement of moral action." Given that Zanta herself lobbied outside the legislative session in 1922 when the vote for women was again debated (the first loss having come in 1919), it does not appear that she considered the moral issue to supersede that of civil rights. In that parliamentary debate, one legislator cited Zanta's book, but declared that even though Paul Bourget had supported her reasoning, it was not a strong enough argument to warrant granting women the vote.[48] Her subtlety, her moderation and calm, in this case, do not appear to have been wholly successful with her own generation, even though her book succeeded in gaining the ear of conservative legislators. Bourget's restrained support was ultimately ineffective.

In addition to her efforts on the issue of suffrage, other parts of Zanta's vision of feminism also responded to conservative ideas. For example, she asserted that women's perspectives were biologically and theologically based. Women thought differently from men, and no amount of equal education would change that, but, according to Zanta, it did not logically follow that female intellectualism was inferior. She argued that women's maternal instincts, especially, guided female productivity, and in this way women's contributions would tend to differ from men's. She also suggested that it would be of benefit to society that women's maternal nature had been kept free from public sphere influences, albeit through oppression. Mothers (with the exception of bourgeois mothers) were historically less warped by aggressive material and political interests than men, and therefore could bring a more natural, more intuitive and loving kind of productivity to an improved human ethos in the 1920s. They would bring something new to the public sphere when their exclusion was finally rectified. The instinct to love in a more

---

[48]Maleprade, Léontine Zanta, pp. 44-45.

"concentrated" way formed part of the development of the "Eternal Feminine" as Zanta defined it.[49]

She argued in a conservative way about the moral role of motherhood in society, but this was not the type of conservative feminism that has been linked with the notion of maintaining separate spheres for women and men. Zanta more radically envisioned the historical and spiritual aspects of such human traits benefiting women and men equally in the future. She suggested that men would benefit from the maternalism of women, by learning how to be more deeply and selflessly loving themselves.[50] What was needed was not homogenization, but equal respect for and understanding of gender differences in both the public and private spheres. This mutual respect and understanding needed to begin with youth.

## Marriage and Work in the Future

For Zanta, gendered differences provided positive input when applied to the same tasks, resulting in a synthesis of gender perspectives. Each sex brought something special to the enterprise of living, and this was the reason that women's role should not be limited to the domestic sphere. Women in the public sphere would not simply behave like men, she asserted. Significantly, Zanta argued that feminine love, though based on maternal instinct, could be applied not merely to children, but to wider social and humanist enterprises. Women would bring the same depth of love to their passion for philosophy, literature, and art, as well as to social action or *engagement*. Zanta herself never married nor had children, though she had a close relationship with numerous nieces and nephews, thus offering an example of this feminine humanist potential herself.

---

[49]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, pp. 27 and 55.

[50]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p 156ff.

Despite her own unmarried state, Zanta did not consider marriage and motherhood poor choices for women in a society progressing towards her ungendered ideal. Married women and mothers, in Zanta's view, were already becoming increasingly *engagé*. She suggested that young couples were already changing their relationships to reflect contemporary needs, that evolutionary progress in this direction was already underway. No longer were all young women marrying for materialistic reasons, no longer were they relying solely on dowries to determine their social value. More and more, Zanta suggested, they were turning to work as the source for their duties and their rights.[51] The middle-class daughter whose family lacked resources knew that the best she could offer to her spouse and children was her ability to work. All girls should be prepared for a career, Zanta argued, whether or not it seemed necessary at the time of marriage, because so many marriages became troubled.[52] This definition clearly applied to war widows as well as to divorced women. "Women are becoming conscious of their value as moral beings and are refusing to enter into an association that does not give them an equal part. They are searching more and more to emancipate themselves through work and one cannot blame them for that."[53] Zanta herself had remained unmarried, because, she explained in an interview from the 1920s, she had never fallen in love. After her father's death in 1901, she had been fully self-supporting.[54]

---

[51]On World War I opening new job opportunities for women, and the way those jobs were again for the most part closed in the years following the war, see Steven Hause and Anne Kenney, Women's Suffrage and Social Politics in the French Third Republic (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 198-199.

[52]Zanta supported divorce to the extent that she recognized the existance of bad marriages, but felt that in a more perfect world where people would marry for love rather than for material benefit, divorce would prove unnecessary and undesirable. Her friend Marguerite Teillard de Chambon, Teilhard de Chardin's cousin, agreed. See Teilhard de Chardin, The Making of a Mind, pp. 52-53.

[53]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, pp.7-9.

[54]See Dossier Zanta, Bibliothèque Marguerite Durand.

Zanta's description of women's work and marriage, along with their political rights, was for this time a relatively radical feminist stance. By stressing it as an evolution that was already underway, however, she infused it with a more moderate organic quality. By comparing women's work outside the home to the tradition of the dowry, and by arguing that it benefited the family, she embedded the work question in a more conservative idiom. Yet ultimately it was youth's reformist potential, already exhibited in various ways, that formed the nucleus of Zanta's social philosophy.

## Religion and Feminism

Zanta's religious beliefs played an important role in shaping her philosophy. Her view of women's roles had some radical elements, even while it carried forward some more strongly traditional components. She wrote three biographies of female saints: Saint Theresa, Saint Odile, and Saint Monica. She argued that women, by virtue of their sensibilities, were better suited to saintliness than men. Women were better able to devote themselves to their faith, and to use that faith as a guide for their choices in a way that would benefit others. The argument that a stronger emotional character enabled female mysticism was not new; it had been used for centuries both to glorify women and to keep them in an intellectually subordinate role within the church. What Zanta argued, however, was that female mysticism was at least as beneficial to humanity as male rational theologizing. Further, religious women were just as capable of incorporating reasoning ability into their faith. Although Zanta might be called a "Bergsonian" philosopher, on the issue of women and religion, she and Henri Bergson disagreed. Though Jewish, Bergson moved increasingly towards Catholicism throughout the interwar years, eventually claiming in his will that he would have converted if not for the anti-Semitic climate of that time. In The Two Sources of Morality and Religion, published in 1932, Bergson described intuitive/rational "dynamic" faith as a masculine

pursuit, while he relegated women to dogmatic, "static" faith.[55] It was precisely the ability to engage in "dynamic" faith that Zanta claimed for women.

The two periods of religious history that interested Zanta most were Ancient Christianity and Renaissance Christian Humanism, and she read these movements through the philosophy of Stoicism. Her dissertation consisted of a translation of the Manuel d'Epictete and La Renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle.[56] Calling herself a *stoïcienne*, she argued that women were better at suffering than men. She did not suggest, as did many Catholics, that their suffering led to greater humility, or greater awareness of their frailty. On the contrary, like Teilhard de Chardin she argued that through its experientially educational qualities, suffering led to enlightenment and strength, as well as to greater sympathy for the suffering of others. This was one reason Zanta saw the female saint as ideally suited to ameliorative social action. This stance on suffering fit well the homefront experience of the First World War, and the new kind of girls and women developing in the aftermath of the war seemed especially well-suited to Zanta's brand of saintliness.[57]

Nor was religion important for women because their emotionality required stronger dogmatic guidance. Women did not need greater checks on their choice-making than men; they did not more strongly require religion to control their otherwise more sinful--because more emotional--nature. Zanta countered claims of this sort by declaring that it depended on the meaning of the word "religion." If "religion" meant merely long hours spent praying and engaging in religious rituals, encouraging sentimentalism in the name of female suffering, then, she suggested, it was bad for women. She offered instead

---

[55]Henri Bergson, The Two Sources of Morality and Religion, trans. Ashley Audra and Cloudesley Brereton, with W. Horsfall Carter (New York: Holt and Co., 1935).

[56]Léontine Zanta, La Renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1914).

[57]This vision of the "New Woman" offered an alternative to the image more commonly portrayed, as, for example, in Mary Louise Roberts, Civilization Without Sexes: Reconstructing Gender in Postwar France, 1917-1927 (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 19.

Saint Theresa of Avila's example of a more modern understanding of the role of religion in women's lives, including the developmental period of youth. Saint Theresa's method was "first, independence in the free development of natural strengths, then discipline."[58] For Zanta, such discipline consisted of submission to ideals, which followed the tradition of stoicism. What it did not signify was submission to patriarchal authority. It was from within each developing personality, beginning in childhood and becoming fully realized in adulthood, that stoic ideals would come to be known, not from patriarchally dogmatic control, but through rational guidance and intuitive comprehension.

The religious element of Zanta's philosophy, although ignored by many younger feminists, did influence some younger Catholic women. Catholic Modernist, feminist, and social worker Cecile de Corlieu was inspired by reading Psychologie du féminisme to fight throughout her life for women's equality within the Church and their right to perform priestly duties. Corlieu thus attempted, with little success, to take Zanta's encouragement to young women to engage in intellectual "sacerdotalism" into the institution of the Church itself.[59]

For Zanta, the Stoical submission to the ideal did not constitute a brake on intellectual development, a check to the intuitive, the emotional, and the relativistic. Zanta called it a crime to stifle the flowering of genius, which, she asserted, "has no sex at all."[60] Like other French New Humanists, she did not claim that every person was capable of genius. "Intellectual culture...carries in itself a process of selection."[61] Denying genius, no matter its source, however, weakened the progress of civilization. Zanta declared that any risks to femininity that the development of genius might carry

---

[58]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, pp. 112-113.

[59]Cécile de Corlieu, Carnets d'une Chrétienne Moderniste de 1898 à nos jours (Toulouse: Privat, 1970), p. 23.

[60]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 153.

[61]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 152.

constituted necessary and dutiful risks for female intellectuals. She demanded that society support women's humanist mission. It was thus necessary for parents and teachers to provide both literary and scientific materials to girls as well as boys in order to cultivate a new, increasingly gender integrated, humanism.[62]

Zanta's Influence on Children

Zanta herself engaged in spreading this new youth philosophy to young people both through her tutoring activities and in the children's press. In the late 1920s, Zanta contributed a series of articles to a new children's journal called Les Enfants de France which was designed to be educational yet not pedantic. It was intended to appeal to young people's intellectual interests, and was aimed, roughly, at 7 to 15 year olds.

"Le Coin des petits philosophes" featured "Madame La Philosophe" and several children who corresponded with their mentor. The first article depicted a 10-year-old girl named Kiki talking on the telephone with Madame La Philosophe, and served as a vehicle for Zanta to explain the meaning and function of reason in young people's lives. She called age seven the "age of reason," and urged Kiki to recognize that true reason did not serve self-interest, but acted as a guide to happiness.[63] Zanta's child characters had the same names as her great-nephews and -nieces, who grew up in Neuilly in the apartment across the hall from hers. Written like "realistic" short stories, the main thrust of these articles was to extend stoic, New Humanist and personalist values to youth.

In a set of two articles from 1930, Zanta told the story of 14-year-old Marthe, previously introduced as an especially bright and diligent student of philosophy, and her role in an upsetting incident at a primary school that was attached to a Collège.[64] One of

---

[62]Zanta, Psychologie du féminisme, p. 153.

[63]Léontine Zanta, "Le Coin des petits philosophes: L'Âge de raison," Nov. 1, 1928, pp. 559-560.

[64]Léontine Zanta, "Le coin des philosophes: Un Grand procés," Les Enfants de France (Paris: Éditions du Figaro, Revue de la Jennesse), Feb. 15, 1930, pp. 1476-1477.

the youngest children, a 7-year-old, had plucked the feathers from a little bird who had accidentally flown in through the window while the boy was alone. The other students were appalled at his cruelty, and demanded some sort of retribution, so one of the teachers suggested a trial with the students as lawyers and jury. Marthe acted as the defense attorney, arguing against an older male prosecutor who demanded that talionic law be brought to bear on the young miscreant. The prosecutor, a "great devil of seventeen years, who resembles your brother, your cousin or brother of one of your friends, long as a day without bread, skinny as if he had fasted his whole life," urged that the boy's hair be pulled out. He cited La Fontaine, La Bruyère, and Victor Hugo to support his claim that "childhood is without pity." A cry of indignation arose from the assembled students, but the older boy continued to address the youngest among them, arguing that their egoism had to be redressed in order to prepare them for their adult, altruistic, social role.

Marthe stepped forward, "her cheeks more flushed than usual, because her heart beat faster, she loved little children so much, and absolutely did not believe in their soul's cruel egoism." She referred to Tolstoy and Saint Vincent de Paul, both Catholics who defended the value of the soul's inner life, against the secular writers cited by the prosecutor.

> To so quickly condemn the soul of the child in its first fumblings, she cried, is to condemn in advance the soul of the man he will be tomorrow...if you deny the child the natural strength of loving his neighbor, of sympathizing with his suffering, that is to say that he has nothing but egoism, that people only do good in order to get a reward, that they only avoid evil in order not to suffer!...I questioned this child before preparing my speech. He avowed with the greatest simplicity, tears in his eyes, that he had never wanted to hurt the bird, but simply to see him without feathers, because it was funny, and he added that ever since he understood, after the scolding of his teacher, that he had made the poor little beast suffer, he had been trying to warm it up in his hands...This child thus sinned through ignorance, concluded Marthe, and not through evil, and I ask for complete acquittal, but at the same time I ask of the

> parents present here truly to want to sort out of this trial an education for themselves, to know that it is necessary to teach children to go out of themselves to partake of the suffering and the joy of others, I mean the suffering and the joy of all creation.[65]

All the children applauded, and "with the pronouncement of Francis's acquittal, was the acquittal of charitable humanity."

The next article, set at the school the following day, depicted Marthe and her fellow students discussing the trial in their philosophy class, in relation to Socratic ideas. Marthe again played a heroic role, this time by fearlessly offering advice to her teacher. She argued that the class needed to "pass from the domain of theory into that of practices and deeds." Her male teacher, "a bit mortified by her calm and somewhat authoritative tone," argued against her. Marthe persisted, pointing out that Socrates' method had been to question actions, not Sophistic argumentation, in his efforts to enlighten people by forcing them to examine their own consciences, to find the truth. The teacher capitulated, and in the following discussion, Marthe took the lead, describing Socrates as an intellectual apostle to a whole generation who were otherwise mislead by Sophistry, and by politicians who taught them "phariseeism" (clearly, here a reference to rule-laden dogmatism).

The themes Zanta took up in this story recapitulated her arguments in Psychologie du féminisme, from the defense of natural human goodness, warped by secularizing social and political pressures, to support for *engagé* feminine intellectualism, based on love for children, played out in the public sphere, in this case the mock courtroom and the classroom. What was more apparent in these pieces--more directly and transparently argued--was that children, especially young girls, should heroically stand on their own principles in the face of patriarchal, dogmatic, or institutional authority. Although Zanta

---

[65]Léontine Zanta, "Le coin des philosophes: Le Tribunal des consciences," Les Enfants de France, March 15, 1930, pp. 1520-1521.

again suggested the practical benefits of calm and reasoned debate, she also much more clearly supported youth's open rebellion against the older generation.

Garric and the Équipes Sociales

At the end of the classroom discussion, Marthe offered a comparison between Socrates and an intellectual "apostle" to youth of the 1920s--Robert Garric, founder of the Équipes sociales. Zanta's friend and journalist colleague, Garric held views similar to hers about genius and humanistic integration or synthesis, but unlike Zanta, he focused primarily on the working class. Nearly twenty years younger than Zanta, Garric clearly benefited from his association with her, both through the opportunity to meet other intellectuals in her circle and through her own skill at philosophical debate and support for social action. For an introduction to a book of Teilhard de Chardin's letters to Zanta that was published after Teilhard's death in the 1950s, Garric wrote a short, glowing biography of her.[66] Years later in an interview, just before his death in the 1960s, Garric remembered Zanta and her *salons* with reverence.

> She combined with an extreme intelligence, with a great curiosity, a taste for social issues. She made of her house, and made of her *salon* a *rendez-vous* for writers, social workers, philosophers...whether one discussed philosophy or social issues, one left that house with a sense of optimism and of realism that truly stemmed from the thought and the heart of the mistress of the house. She must hold a place in the intellectual life of France of this epoch.[67]

In the 1920s, Zanta's articles for children reciprocally helped foster interest in Garric's mission. Through the voice of Madame La Philosophe in Les Enfants de France, she wrote approvingly of Garric.

---

[66]Teilhard de Chardin, Lettres à Léontine Zanta, pp. 11-30.

[67]Michel Manoll, Entretiens avec Robert Garric (Paris: Les Éditions de l'Épargne, 1970), p. 65.

> Garric had experienced, during the war, the true life of fraternity with his soldier companions, and he understood all that there was of the profound, of enrichment, of sweetness in this sympathy, without reservation, which in a single blow did away with all the barriers between the classes and also and above all the craving, that worm-eating, which one finds at the bottom of all our political battles.[68]

During the interwar years, Garric's mission focused primarily on the youth group he formed, the Équipes sociales, which attempted to bring about a new level of understanding between bourgeois intellectual youth and working class youth.[69]

Garric was 18 years old at the start of World War I, but had already proved himself a fine student. Despite his youth he advanced rapidly, receiving his *licence* to teach in 1915, and continuing as a student while simultaneously teaching at the Lycée Lakanal, where he took the place of an older professor who had been mobilized. He became an artillery sub-lieutenant in 1917, was trained at the École Fontainebleu before going to the front, and was awarded the *croix de guerre*. He received his *agrégation* in 1919, at the age of 23. In 1924 he became the editor of La Revue des Jeunes, a Catholic publication for adolescents and young adults.[70]

Garric maintained that his experiences in the war gave him the idea to work towards creating a new, professional, general, human culture, because the soldiers he had met, including the working-class soldiers, had demonstrated their need for "this new humanism." At the front he came to the realization that the workers had a "philosophical curiosity" and "great possibilities for personal reflection." Despite his own Catholic beliefs, Garric felt it was better to "profoundly respect the truth of each being." Like Zanta, Garric believed that a New Humanism would serve to guide humanity towards a

---

[68]Léontine Zanta, "Le coin des philosophes: Jacques au téléphone," Les Enfants de France (Paris: Éditions du Figaro, Revue de la Jeunesse), Oct. 1, 1929, pp. 1222-1223.

[69]See my Chapter 5.

[70]"Hommage à Robert Garric," Revue de la Haute-Auvergne, Jan. - June 1968. This entire issue is given over to a memorial to Garric.

more egalitarian and more socially just state of civilization. He saw his position as a teacher, editor and journalist as a stepping-off place for social action. One of his concerns was to bring an end to class warfare. Just as Zanta saw a redefinition of gender differences as the base for a New Humanism, Garric hoped a new understanding of class differences would lead to a new critical and creative method that would result in a cultural renaissance for France and ultimately for the world.

In an interview in 1938, Garric explained that the three books he published in the interwar years all demonstrated his search for the "common denominator" among people--an idea he said he had learned from Colonel Lyautey, who in the 1920s was resident general of Morocco. Garric claimed that his three books were really one for him, that they all followed the same path, attempting to find "the secret of human communication."[71] One was a biography of Albert de Mun, another covered the ideas of Lyautey, and the third was an autobiographical account of Garric's observations in Belleville, the working-class area of Paris where he centered the Équipes sociales.[72] Like Zanta, Garric's audience consisted primarily of the bourgeois Catholics who became teachers in the program. Despite his efforts to reach out to the working class, there is little evidence that they took in Garric's philosophy. Although his youth group was non-confessional (not officially Catholic), Garric's message drew strongly on Christian belief, and it was well known that he was a Catholic himself.

Like Zanta, Garric insisted that his vision of humanism should not be tainted by partisan politics. Although spiritual understanding would illuminate every aspect of life, and would serve to motivate sincere believers to immerse themselves in civic activities, it remained absolutely necessary to avoid "*confusionisme.*" Garric's efforts to support civic

---

[71] Dominique Auvergne, Regards catholiques sur le monde (Paris: Deselée de Brouwer, 1938), p. 136.

[72] Robert Garric, Belleville. Scènes de ta vie populaire (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1928); Robert Garric, Albert de Mun (Paris: E. Flammarion, 1934); Robert Garric, Le Message de Lyautey (Paris: Éditions Spes, 1935).

*engagement* yet avoid partisan squabbles increased in the mid to late 1930s, as French politics became more polarized and fractious. In 1935, Garric agreed to speak to an audience of primarily Christian students in the Latin Quarter as part of a seminar advertised in a way that implied support for a move to a dictatorial or fascist regime. The posters for the program read, "What do we want? One Master. One Faith. One Law." Garric's lecture presented his faith in Jesus as his master, thus sidestepping the political implications of the program. According to one witness, those in the audience--both believers and unbelievers--were extraordinarily moved by Garric's sincerity. They felt they were no longer alone, because they could put their faith in someone outside themselves. It may have been that they looked as much towards putting their faith in Garric himself as a charismatic leader, but his message to them clearly directed youth's allegiance to a power both higher than society and within themselves. In an interview in 1938, Garric reiterated that "religion is outside of and above all politics."[73]

Spiritual conviction would lead youth to recognize their own important status as heroic transformers of French culture and society. Yet for Garric, as for Zanta, such conviction would not develop from dogma nor from dictatorial patriarchalism. Based on the sort of sympathetic fraternity experienced by World War I soldiers in the trenches, individual differences, communicated through humanist criticism and literary expression, should instead be fostered and respected. Garric's belief that such sympathy was best expressed through Christian faith in Jesus' message was not necessarily exclusionary, but it did appeal best to Christian youth.

New Humanism Applied to Cultural Differences

Garric extended the notion of celebrating the variety of humanistic expression beyond questions of class tension. In 1926, an article by Garric on "La Langue du

---

[73]Auvergne, Regards catholiques sur le monde, pp. 137-139.

Terroir" (The Language of the Land) was published in a dual-language book, La Bête du Vaccarés. This folktale by Joseph d'Arbaud, printed with French and Provençal on facing pages, provided a regionalist defense in the face of efforts by the Third Republic to enforce use of French only in the national schools. Charles Maurras, leader of Action Française, wrote the preface, in which he glorified the many fine French authors whose native tongue was not French, and whose literary genius was best expressed in the language they had learned first and most intimately. Garric's contribution took a different approach, and applied his New Humanist synthetic ideals to the subject of language learning and usage.[74]

Garric argued that children needed to learn French and their native language in conjunction with one another, rather than be oppressed by the imposition of French and the restriction against their native language in school. If the Third Republic continued its current policies, children would learn to think of the culture of school as a distant, pale, unreal component of life, compared to the vibrancy of the lived experience of the culture expressed daily in their native tongue. This opposition would lead them to view French culture as the enemy. As with the animosity between class and gender, this cultural differentiation, when enforced dictatorially and dogmatically, would ultimately intensify regional separatism, Garric argued, rather than to the unifying, Frenchifying results the state desired. If, instead, the two languages were taught in an integrated fashion, alternating one with the other, and offering constant translations in order to show the way both languages served equally to express experiences that were most intimately known and understood by children, they would be able to love French. Rather than consider it merely "a Sunday habit," a language of the "civil state, of politeness, and of

[74]Garric's attached "note" does not actually mention the book itself; it was probably published first as an article in La Revue des Jeunes and reprinted for this publication. Maurras' preface does not express the New Humanist ideas explained in Garric's article, but focuses instead on glorifying regional languages and the genius of non-French authors. Joseph d'Arbaud, La Bête du Vaccarés ed. Daniel Halévy, preface by Charles Maurras, "with a note by Robert Garric on the school and the language of the land" (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1926).

controversies," they would come to understand a true unity, a sense of Frenchness that incorporated the intimate life of their soul. "The young tree will grow that much better, will carry its leaves that much higher and farther when it is more profoundly rooted."[75] A greater respect for regional culture and an effort to teach understanding of French culture in a way that communicated the sense of both in an integrated way, reiterated his support for "finding the common denominator" between people. In his view, this would ultimately lead to a unity of feeling, without eradicating either French or regional culture. Not only the working class, but the *paysans* as well would benefit from a New Humanism that supported individual differences for the general good of society.

Garric's philosophy was less complex than Zanta's, and more fully focused on literary creativity and criticism, which he used as his basis for organizing youth. Like Zanta, however, he had faith that the roots for the future of French culture already struggled beneath the surface, and could be made to grow and flourish with the application of a new critical humanist method, philosophically drawing on development of the person and open communication between different groups, or between different cultures. In her emphasis on gender issues as well as class issues, Zanta could not rhetorically and philosophically rely as confidently as Garric could on the groundwork laid by the experience of the war. The trench experience proved a stronger and better lasting cultural image than the New Woman's contribution to the war effort, especially as the period of war itself receded in memory. For both thinkers, Catholic Modernist ideas, expressed as a less specific sort of Christian value system, were neatly integrated with Renaissance Humanist ideals and Enlightenment faith in human progress, with a strong dash of Darwinistic evolutionary ideas thrown in. Their eclecticism, their focus on cultural deconstruction as a first step towards creating a new unity of feeling, and their emphasis on the process of developing personhood seemed to apply especially well to

---

[75]d'Arbaud, Bête du Vaccarés, pp. 365-378.

youth, and their glorification of heroes and saints appealed to the continuing image of the French child as cultural redeemer in the period after World War I. As social activists, journalists, and teachers, both Zanta and Garric communicated these ideas both to adults and directly to young people.

New Humanism, drawing on the philosophically transformative aspects of the Great War, proposed a new kind of moral base for French society. It was a philosophy that could aspire to unity of feeling and stoic idealism while at the same time respecting individual differences. New Humanism offered the possibility for youth to become educated to a new vision of Frenchness, one in which gender, class, and regional differences could become strengths rather than weaknesses. New Humanists' goal was convergence on a unitary social end through a free and open cultural process. Their vision of the future of French culture and society was one in which communication of differences intellectually and publicly would result in a new, more cohesive and respectful, society. This philosophy competed, especially around the issues of dogmatism and patriarchal authority, with traditionalist and scientific ideas throughout the interwar years.

The faith and idealism of thinkers like Zanta and Garric led them to assert that if they built a New Humanism, social reform would come, embodied by new, youthfully creative *personnes*. This "field of dreams" was to be built, in theory, not by adults working within an old-fashioned patriarchal system, but by youth--male and female, rich and poor--asserting their social and cultural agency. Adults needed merely to give to youth the cultural space, including through the press and youth groups, to achieve this end. In this way, New Humanism provided French youth culture with a framework within which young people could view their relationship to society as potentially more productive and autonomous than it had been in the past.

The New Humanist brand of generational philosophy contributed to a more general mood of heroic reformism after the Great War. In this vision of youth's potential,

however, tradition and science were less important than originality and humanist creativity. The role of the next generation was more important than the role of adults. Adults, simultaneously broken and enlightened by their war experience, would serve merely as enablers for youth to fulfill their potential. Because Zanta and Garric were both theorists and social activists, they brought their ideas directly to young people, as Chapters 5 and 6 will show. They worked in ways that were primarily extra-institutional, however, and set their activities over and against state-supported efforts that more strongly emphasized a combination of French tradition and new scientific understanding of childhood as a social stage. The next two chapters will examine the institution of the school, where, on a more potent, mainstream base, tradition and science held sway.

# CHAPTER 3

## THE YOUTH-SOLDIER AND THE STATE: FAMILY INTERVENTION AND EDUCATION

> The war, at the same time that it is the cause of numberless ruins, can become, by the same excess of suffering, the source of new and fecund energies.[1]

The idea that the war was fought for the good of posterity meant not only saving France and her culture from "barbaric" German invasion, but also using the destructiveness of the war to create a better France. Even as those too young to fight were mourned as orphaned and deprived victims of World War I, they were also seen by many as reapers of the war's benefits. Rather than emphasizing cultural and personal development, as the New Humanists did, the state and its representatives touted scientific social engineering as the means to reconstruct French society and culture. Scientific progress and patriotism served as dual bases for engineering new programs and legislating new cultural habits.

Encouraged by a perceived need to maintain youth's wartime unity, teachers and administrators increasingly utilized scientifically-determined techniques as part of the movement towards recreating the French child as healthy and "normal." In this way they also upheld youth's patriotic loyalty. Standardized tests like Binet's intelligence scale, for example, were one means to determine if children were developing along nationally mainstream lines.[2] This homogenizing process also encouraged the growth of a new type of nationally-delineated collective youth consciousness. Scientific theory and patriotic

---

[1] Enfance et Jeunesse, vol. 1 of La Guerre et la vie de demain: Conférence de l'Alliance d'hygiène sociale, 1914-1916, with papers presented by MM. Émile Boutroux, le Professeur Chauffard, Mme. Jules Siegfried, M. le Professor Pinard, Mlle. Berthe Milliard, MM. le Dr. Mosny, Montjotin, J. Lefebvre, Cohendy, Gustave Bèlot, Louis Liard, under the presidence of MM. Léon Bourgeois, le Dr. Emile Roux, Mme. la Marquise de Ganay, MM. le Professseur Chauveau, Ferdinand-Dreyfus, le Dr. Mathieu, Ferdinand Buisson, Paul Painlevé, Ernest Lavisse (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1916), avant-propos, p. 1 of 2.

[2] See Chapter 1.

unity together reshaped the cultural space of French childhood, defined both in terms of its role relative to the nation, and in terms of its difference from the adult world.

Youth's patriotism, fueled by the war and supported through the schools, served in part to legitimate increasing levels of state intervention. Teachers and professors framed the younger generation as a social group that welcomed reform even while they embodied traditions of Frenchness in their sympathy for their soldier peers. Through state-administered institutions, a more direct relationship between the state and French children developed, which circumvented the traditional mediating influence of the family. Instead of parents and other older and authoritative adults, the young soldier as a public and patriotic role model for all French children served as one focal point for rhetoric supporting increased state intervention and educational reforms.

Soldiers were often depicted collectively as the nation's youth, both patriotic and sacrificially decimated. A large part of post-war reform efforts attempted to reconstitute a lost generation of young intellectual elites, leaders of the nation. It was from the ranks of those too young to fight in the war that such a new elite would need to come. Due to the youth-soldiers' leveling experience in the trenches, however, there was a shift to meritocratic educational advancement. Soldiers' heroism and sacrifice were metaphorically expanded to encompass all French youth, and the youth-soldier seemed to represent the entire next generation who would step in to fill their shoes. Youth soldiers' patriotic commitment to supporting the nation and the Third Republic that sought to represent it forced a stronger and more direct reciprocal state duty towards young people. Support for new programs and reforms was seen both as a State debt and as a right held by young people relative to the State. Calls for reforming France's education system ranged widely, from those interested in social hygiene or the economy, to those encouraging youth's patriotic loyalty or the leveling of class differences. The reformers believed that overall, France as a nation would benefit as these new programs and legislation sought to stabilize or to advance its future existence.

Opportunities for Social Hygiene

Social hygienists, for example, quickly stepped into the breach in family life caused by the war. Léon Bourgeois, solidariste French Senator and President of the Social Hygiene Alliance (an alliance of the British Society of Friends and the French Visiting Nurses, founded in 1905), issued a press release in 1914 proclaiming that the war provided the perfect opportunity to advance scientifically-based programs of social hygiene.[3] Above all else, the Alliance's concern was establishing and maintaining new social hygiene programs by re-educating, or retraining, French youth to healthier attitudes and lifestyles. It seems that increased hardships as the war progressed served only to strengthen Bourgeois's agenda. In his 1916 introduction to the publication of a series of lectures by politicians, intellectuals, educational administrators, and medical doctors that the Alliance had sponsored from 1914-1916 at the Musée Social, Bourgeois reiterated his argument.

> The great common peril poses problems; it provokes reforms; it creates institutions and charitable organizations. A sole thought, that of the nation in danger, pushes particular interests to the back burner, triumphs over egoisms, arouses the will, devotion, arms the new virtues of the common soul. After the war it is necessary that nothing be lost from the increase of forces that this generous fever has made circulate in the blood of the nation.[4]

New programs would be for the benefit of "the French race."[5] Introducing the first speaker in the series, the Académie Française's president, philosopher Emile Boutroux, Bourgeois declared that to keep things going beyond the war, "we must undertake a campaign of education and propaganda; we must ask, above all, youth, who have not had

---

[3] La Guerre et la vie de demain, avant-propos, p. 1 of 2. The press release stated that these reforms were to combat "avoidable illnesses."

[4] La Guerre et la vie de demain, avant-propos, p. 2 of 2.

[5] La Guerre et la vie de demain, p. 3, also the lecture by Pinard, devoted to the "health of the race," esp. p 43.

the time to be engulfed in yesterday's prejudices, not to let themselves take up again the errors of the past and to accept the new efforts as the truth of tomorrow."[6] Bourgeois and subsequent speakers, including Boutroux, Ferdinand Buisson, Charles Gide, Louis Liard, M. and Mme. Jules Siegfried, Paul Strauss, Alexandre Ribot and René Viviani, envisioned such education and propaganda as reconstructing everyday French habits. These everyday actions ranged across the moral, physical, and intellectual, and included numerous leisure activities like sports and entertainment.

The war acted as a fever-driven social purgative, creating increased support for reforms like pronatalist subsidies, the banning of absinthe, and the early closing of cabarets, for which the Alliance had long pushed.[7] As it had under the early Third Republic, intervention would continue to redress problems like that of the "child in moral danger" to respond to present concerns and avoid future problems. After the war, it could also more forcefully be used to engineer France's future through her children.[8] This view of intervention moved beyond concerns about abnormal or criminal child development to oversee "normal"--or normalizing--development for all French children.

The substance of many of these reforms as well as the process of modifying social habits were not dissimilar to some of the suggestions of traditionalists. Rather than emphasize continuity of pre-war traditions, however, the Alliance's reforms were discursively legitimated through science. Social hygienists, in the face of the institutional disruption caused by the war, emphasized a newly important role for scientific institutions. Such institutions worked with one another, directed towards the same goals of social betterment. For example, another member of the Académie Française, Professor Chauffard, supported the Academy of Science's recommendation that milk products

---

[6]La Guerre et la vie de demain, pp. 6-7.

[7]La Guerre et la vie de demain, pp. 6, 18-19, and 44.

[8]On the nineteenth century, see Sylvia Schafer, Children in Moral Danger and the Problem of Government in Third Republic France (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

needed better regulation.[9] Chauffard was introduced in the Alliance's lecture series by Émile Roux, member of the French Institute and Director of the Pasteur Institute. This is one case when several scientific institutions banded together to influence legislation, on the grounds that they were working to improve the health of French children and thus better France's future.

Emile Boutroux's lecture on December 19, 1914, contained the basic rhetoric that was used again and again throughout the war and in the years following: the Great War was being fought for the sake of the future. "We have chosen to suffer so that [our descendants] can be free and strong, to die so that they can live. A war like this one, it is really the sacrifice of the present for the future."[10] In Boutroux's view, this did not mean turning one's back on the present, but rather, carefully controlling the present as a means of preparing for the future. Quoting Homer, Boutroux declared that the greatest sort of paternal love was the desire to see one's children surpass one's own achievements. He described the war as an opportunity, suggesting that wartime provided certain motivations for reforms, especially pronatalist reforms, that neither erudition nor will power could bring about in peacetime. The war and its reforms would restore "joyous and fecund" youthfulness to an aging world, enabling it "to die and be reborn."[11] Boutroux's views of the transference of culture from one generation to the next through a process of suffering, loss, and death, then rebirth into a new form, was organic, and created a sense of continuity over time rather than revolutionary change. The idea that an aging and degenerating France could reinvest her creative energies through support for cultural reincarnation seemed to give France's older, paternal authorities a second chance

---

[9] La Guerre et la vie de demain, p. 49.

[10] La Guerre et la vie de demain, p. 16. See also Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau, La Guerre des enfants 1914-1918: essai d'histoire culturelle (Paris: Armand-Colin, 1993).

[11] La Guerre et la vie de demain, p 19.

that relied on increasingly careful and scientifically engineered oversight of France's children.

According to Boutroux, youthful fecundity would manifest itself in science, art, literature, and "practical activity." He emphasized the ideal of thought united with action. He did not, as did many educational reformers from this time, downplay the importance of intellectualism, but declared that ideas and reasoning needed to be constantly "doubled" by "tangible realities."[12] For Boutroux, such "realities" were both scientific and social. He argued that in France, the ostensible social divisiveness caused by necessarily diverse work led to sympathy and intimate confidence in one another. Members of the French community felt like members of the same family. The camaraderie of French troops in the war mirrored the fraternity, the "moral equality" within a "hierarchical inequality" of French society at large. Successful intellectualism could not transcend social reality, but in Boutroux's view, could rise from the social conditions that the war had brought into sharp relief. He quoted Pascal on the need to avoid the "rhythmic balancing" that tends towards mediocrity, and seek instead the "moral energy" to make certain that scientific reforms would avoid ephemerality.[13] Framed by the patriotic concepts of unity and moral equality, new ideas would recreate social reality. Youth, in this view, would take the new social reality for granted, rather than experiencing it as revolutionary. despite Boutroux's use of the word "fecundity" to describe youth's role, young people would not so much create a new world as they would perform it as directed by the older generation. What was required was their obedience rather than their creativity. Like pronatalist policies such as the banning of birth control to push women and men into life choices they would otherwise avoid, the next generation

---

[12] La Guerre et la vie de demain, p. 21; for an example of an anti-intellectual, pro-technical education stance, see Georges Hersent, La Réforme de l'Éducation Nationale (Paris: Hachette et Cie, 1917), esp. p. 15-17. Hersant was an engineer who expressed dislike of the bourgeois nature of the schools and of bourgeois childrearing.

[13] La Guerre et la vie de demain, p. 25.

would be pushed into producing an idealized and purified world wrought by scientific experts.

Part of the increased emphasis on science went in the direction of support for technical education. The 1919 Astier law was the first of a series of laws in France to increase and improve technical and professional education. The plan offered three types of part-time technical courses for post-secondary study: a general education to round out the primary school courses; courses providing the scientific bases for professional work; and practical exercises designed to fit with artisanal apprenticeships. The law applied to all students who wanted to work in industry after they had completed primary school. The state sanctioned parents and *patrons* who obstructed youth's class attendance. Youth themselves risked a possible prison term if they refused to attend. Initially, these classes were not well-attended; subsequent laws buttressed the Astier law, leading to greater school attendance in the 30s. They lowered of the age of mandatory attendance to under 13, and implemented a revamped binding contract of apprenticeship.[14] Technical education was one means for the Third Republic to gain control at the secondary level of the large number of young people, not members of the elite, who entered the workplace after primary school, between the ages of 11 and 14.

Others who supported increased state intervention took a somewhat different tack. Richard Bondam, a professor of political economics, for example, argued in Le Mal social et ses remèdes (1920) that ending economic inequality was the best cure for social illness. Writing in 1919, Bondam's argument largely ignored the effects of the war, but the reforms he suggested in part matched those of the Alliance. His medical analogy included support for better public control over children's moral, physical, and intellectual development, carried out through a combination of state subsidies and school reforms. Above all, his reforms were based on economic science, though like the Alliance, he

[14]Félix Ponteil, Histoire de l'enseignement en France: les grandes étapes, 1789-1964 (Paris: Sirey, 1966), pp. 346-354.

included the importance of medical and educational reforms. He contended that personal inheritances perpetuated inequality, and argued that the state should mitigate or do away with the practice. In its stead the state should provide a small lump sum to all French children when they attained their majority, a *pécule* for young men and a dowry for young women, giving them all an equal start in adult life. It was important, suggested Bondam, that as much as possible, children's chances for success be equalized through more frequent public examinations and medical inspections and through better support for meritocratic advancement on the basis of aptitude and desire rather than social maneuvering. Also, the substance of children's education needed to shift, from old-fashioned memorization of dry material, to teaching them to respond to opportunity, thus better preparing them for competition in the adult economic world. Bondam expected that such a system of reforms would eventually do away with poverty, which he argued was the root cause of France's degenerative social illness.[15] Bondam's democratic views did not take the war into account as a destructive event, and unlike the Alliance, he focused more on bringing the poorer segment of French society up to the level of existing bourgeois competition. Still, like the social hygienists, he considered France an organic entity with an illness, recovery from which needed to be grounded in state-sponsored and administered scientific reforms. He applied this "remedy" equally to all French children.

Social hygienists and others like Bondam who supported increased state intervention on the basis of science did not reject patriarchal French traditions, but they did see that a new way of structuring traditions and habits was needed in the aftermath of the war. Their arguments ultimately attempted to restructure French patriarchy, with the state taking on the duty of scientifically-based control over young people's lives, and especially over their education or training. In the face of wartime and post-war family disruption, the state would take over fathers' legal and customary duty to make decisions

---

[15]Richard Bondam, Le Mal social et ses remèdes (Paris: Société Mutuelle d'Édition, 1920).

for their children. The youth themselves were not given new choices to make; this restructuring would happen in a way that the next generation would take for granted.

Role of the Schools in Creating a Generationally Unified Community of Youth

For the social hygienists, restructuring the environment would retrain French youth to a more robust and healthy lifestyle. They foresaw that youth's experience would be painless and largely unconscious. For others, the patriotic commitment French children held for *la patrie* was the necessary psychological basis for the reformed world the next generation would help create. Schools were the primary institutions for fostering patriotic support for the nation and the state.[16]

The state's most important concern was providing all children with a properly French education, but one that was adapted to the current and changing needs of France. Legally and customarily, it was the father's right and duty to educate his children. In case of his death or negligence, the mother would take on this role, usually with family guidance. After the war, playing up children's and youth's patriotic loyalty seemed to offset the disruption of schooling and the lack of patriarchal guidance. Along with loyalty to the state and nation, young people were also encouraged to feel loyalty towards one another.

Marie Hollebecque, in a patriotic book written in 1916 about the role of schoolchildren during the war, compared their efforts to the Children's Crusade of the Middle Ages.[17] She argued that twentieth-century youth groups like the boy scouts did

---

[16]See Carleton J. H. Hayes, France, A Nation of Patriots (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), pp. 35-63. Hayes suggested that although by 1929 most school texts were considerably less belligerent and chauvinistic than they had been during the war, they nevertheless continued to be strongly nationalistic.

[17]Mme. Hollebecque, La Guerre et l'école: La Jeunesse scolaire de France et la guerre (Paris: Didier, 1916), pp. 33-35. In 1932, she asserted that France had no "juvenile societies" like those in Russia and Germany that functioned "regularly" and autonomously. "We should not, in effect, consider the societies of scoutism as true juvenile groups, because, created by adults, they impose on the child the will of his elders." M. Lahy-Hollebecque, L'Enfant: une cause d'avenir (Paris: Éditions du Sagittaire, 1932), p. 13. Marie Hollebecque also authored books under the name Lahy-Hollebecque.

not lead children to real war preparation. She denied, against common perceptions of the time, that youth culture carried within it the means to truly act in support of the war, no matter that children as young as 11 or 12 attempted to enlist as soldiers. The reason for this, she suggested, was children's nature. Her description clearly built on an image of very young children, applying it upwards to include older youth. "[T]he child, by his weakness at coordinating ideas and mental images, at organizing serial actions and at predicting the future, is ill-adapted to group life." She thus denied one of the aspects of patriotic duty that others tended to impose on youth: their sense of unity and commitment to serving the community, especially the large-scale community of the nation. Their sense of belonging to a collectivity was, in her view, weakened by their naturally childish intellectual capabilities.

Most images of youth, especially during the war, assumed that children felt the same sense of unity felt by older segments of the population.[18] This was especially true, of course, for the older youth who were themselves soldiers. Also in 1916, Raymond Thamin, the rector of the Academy of Bordeaux, wrote about the combined patriotic activity of students and teachers at the university level. He declared that the university was always, even in peacetime, a kind of union.

> [The university is a]*Union sacrée* in *Union sacrée*, which will survive [the war] as it has preceded it, which makes the University one of the most robust and most harmonious institutions of the country, a force not only for peace but for war, that has tackled it with the most diverse duties, and has appeared, in the face of it, like a great moral personage.[19]

For Thamin, the force of the institution created a heightened sense of collectivity among youth and teachers that was not mitigated by any less-than-adult intellectual capabilities. This moral force, in his view, extended down from the university level to encompass the

---

[18]Audoin-Rouzeau, La Guerre des enfants: 1914-1918: essai d'histoire culturelle, pp. 15-65, esp. 21-23.

[19]R. Thamin, L'Université et la guerre (Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1916), pp. 164-165.

primary schools as well, most of all through the duties and patriotism of primary schoolteachers.[20] When he described both male and female primary teachers, he focused on their clerical and moral duties to the state and the community during wartime, more than on their teaching duties towards French children.

In the first year of the war, enrollment in school at all levels dropped precipitously, but by 1915, when it had grown apparent that the war would not be over quickly, more than half the children up to the levels of the lycées and collèges who had left school had returned to their classrooms.[21] Large numbers of male primary schoolteachers enlisted, however, and female teachers took on nursing or administrative duties relative to wartime programs.[22] All national education schoolteachers were expected to contribute, and to encourage community contributions, to the national defense fund (Comité du secours nationale). Many school buildings were transformed to makeshift army hospitals or used for ministry affairs, and teaching duties continued to take second place to schoolteachers' civic and military war duties. The partial return to normalcy for the lower educational levels was not apparent at the university level. After an initial drop in number of students from 42,000 to 10,000, the university continued to be depleted, and the make-up of the student body changed from primarily young French men to nearly half women or foreign students.[23]

Despite this disruption of normalcy for schools, many intellectuals saw the war as an ideal moment to garner greater glory for the French school system. As Martha Hanna

---

[20]John E. Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, 1918-1940 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 4. In describing the difference between the French and English use of the term "university," Talbott notes that in French the word can refer to the entire educational system, though sometimes is reserved for only secondary and higher education.

[21]Albert Sarraut, L'Instruction publique et la guerre (Paris: Henri Didier, 1916), p. 59; Thamin, L'Université et la guerre, p. 135-136.

[22]Thamin, L'Université et la guerre, pp. 51-66; See also Barnett Singer, "From Patriots to Pacifists," Journal of Contemporary History, 12 (1977): 413-434.

[23]Thamin, L'Université et la guerre, p. 135.

has explained, the state "mobilized" French intellectuals in support of the French cause.[24] Too old to enlist, university professors willingly took on as their patriotic duty a sort of missionary status, using their prestige to press for support for their newly-enlisted students. Again, the French university system served as a model for extending ideas of patriotic unity and commitment down to lower educational levels. The wartime role of primary and secondary schools seemed to mirror, and therefore to support, older youths' enlistment and sacrifice.

Science and International Competition

One of the things French youth were expected to reform was the role of science in French culture. This was to increase France's international competitiveness, not merely for technology but also for pure or theoretical science. France's intellectual leadership would thus be regained through the next generation.

Rector Raymond Thamin supported the "mobilization of intellect" in the fight against German barbarism, and extended that mobilization to educating the next generation. He argued, similarly to traditionalist Paul d'Arc, that France needed to better develop "French science" to compete with "German science."[25] "Science is French, at least for the most part...we will continue to help ourselves to the methods that we have taught to the Germans...But at the same time we will attach the qualities that we have never succeeded in teaching them...We also will make a bigger place for professional education, without falling back into the fault of excessive imitation."[26] The notion that German science was at the base of German barbarism, but that the Germans had initially borrowed ideas from the French, especially from Descartes, and that the French should

---

[24]Martha Hanna, The Mobilization of Intellect: French Scholars and Writers during the Great War (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1996).

[25]See Chapter I.

[26]Thamin, L'Université et la guerre, pp. 157-159.

reappropriate science--minus the barbaric aspects--for themselves, reflected concerns about "Pangermanism," that is, the process of the spread of German culture outside of Germany.[27]

German "*Kultur*," especially its mechanistic and materialistic aspects, was set against French "*civilisation*." Despite France's need to internationally compete scientifically and technologically, intellectuals strove to come up with a definition of particularly French science that did not merely imitate German science. During the war, many intellectuals such as noted Germanist Charles Andler, for example, denounced German science but offered little by way of a specific, more civilized course for French science.[28]

The connection between applying scientific methods to education and supporting stronger education in science worked as a mutual support system geared towards a better future. Behind these reforms lay a sense of patriotism and love for *la patrie*--and hatred of Germany and German *Kultur*--which included teachers and students at all levels. Even very young children were encouraged both to engage in the war effort and to consider their own future role in making France a great nation.[29] The unified sentiment of patriotism was extended downward through the school system, connecting teachers and older students to their up-and-coming imitators.

## Glorifying French Education on the Basis of Science and Intellectual Community

One of the aspects of German culture that French intellectuals fought most strongly against was the structure of higher education. This was an issue about which professors and administrators offered some specific advice and commentary. Until World

---

[27]Hanna, The Mobilization of Intellect, especially pp. 87-93.

[28]See Hanna, The Mobilization of Intellect, pp. 85-105; Charles Andler, Le Pangermanisme: ses plans d'expansion allemande dans le monde (Paris: A. Colin, 1915).

[29]See Audoin-Rouzeau, La Guerre des enfants.

War I, the German university system seemed to be competing more successfully than the French university model. The United States, in particular, had for the most part followed the German university model throughout the late nineteenth century.[30] During the war, French intellectuals saw their opportunity to swing American sentiment in the direction of French-style education. There was a sense of ethical alliance between France and the United States, and some American and other foreign students were attending French universities at that time. This desire to foster an academic allegiance helped shape the way many thinkers described those characteristics of youth that pertained to national loyalty.

French scholars tried to make clear to Americans the benefits of the French educational system over the German model. Given the war-driven anger at Germany among the allies, disillusionment about the German system opened a doorway for the French to offer their system instead. Sociologist Émile Durkheim edited a book titled La Vie Universitaire à Paris, published in 1918 specifically for the edification of prospective American students. Durkheim made clear that one of the main purposes of the book was to explain to the American student the "order and clarity" of the French university system which might otherwise "seem confused."[31] Rather than declaring that the French university needed to become more scientific or rationally organized in order to compete with the German (and American) university system, Durkheim instead sought to show the underlying--and superior--logic of the French system. Descriptive both of the French university's history and its present, the book touted the quality of the French system, especially the Sorbonne. Unlike the many other books published during the war that glorified schools' wartime activities, this one offered a description of university life during peacetime, looking both backward to the past and forward to the end of the war.

---

[30]See Christophe Charle, La République des Universitaires, 1870-1940 (Paris: Édition du Seuil, 1994), pp. 9-12. Charle suggests that a "university" in the German or English sense was not "possible" in France.

[31]Émile Durkheim, La Vie Universitaire à Paris (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1918), p. 1.

Although Durkheim offered a comparison of the French and American systems, he wrote little about the German university. The sense of competition with Germany was implicit however, for example when Durkheim asserted that "the principle of academic liberty is no less important at French universities than it is at German universities."[32] In his account of the history of the French university, when describing its new incarnation under the Third Republic after France's defeat in the Franco-Prussian war, he indicated the role of the university relative to state and country. "All good citizens had but one thought: rebuild the country. To rebuild it, first it had to be instructed. A society that aspires to govern itself has, above all else, need of *'lumières.'* A democracy will be unfaithful to its principle if it does not have faith in science."[33] This need, Durkheim explained, led to the unification of diverse scientific institutions and their inclusion in the university system, to provide the sense of common enterprise and intellectual communion that was one of the key features of the French university. His history emphasized the way the French university was structured to meet the desires of French intellectuals. He suggested that it fed the nation's drive for knowledge, epitomized by the Enlightenment *Encyclopédie* and embodied in the university under the Third Republic. Ultimately, the university's organization around self-chosen "faculties" served both state and country, by supporting meritocratic intellectual leadership.[34] Clearly, Durkheim saw the role of the French university after World War I as similar to its position after the Franco-Prussian war, but sought to expand the scope of France's leadership to other countries, especially to America.

What was it, aside from the eventual military alliance of the United States and France during the war, that made some French intellectuals think that the U.S. would be

---

[32]Durkheim, La Vie Universitaire à Paris, p. 28

[33]Durkheim, La Vie Universitaire à Paris, p. 17.

[34]Durkheim, La Vie Universitaire à Paris, pp. 16-18, 24-27.

moved to follow France's educational model? Ultimately, this goal was not fulfilled. Even French involvement in the League of Nation's committee for Intellectual Cooperation in the interwar years did not place France in the position of international leadership her intellectuals imagined for themselves and the next generation. Yet, wartime efforts did help to solidify connections between French and American youth culture. Ironically, efforts to engage Americans in the French cause opened the door to a kind of international youth unity that later seemed opposed to French national values. In the 1930s, complaints arose about the influence of American youth culture, but these worries were not evident during World War I, partly because of assumptions about youth's patriotism. Such unity seemed unthreatening during the war because French intellectuals conceived of France as a leader, and the United States as a follower. They were not seeking to increase American influence in France, but rather, French influence in the United States.

The competitive efforts of French intellectuals and academic administrators during the war bore some fruit when they interested the New York Commissioner of Education and President of the University of the State of New York, John H. Finley, in bringing about greater intellectual cooperation between American and French universities. Finley published an account of a brief trip he made to France in the summer of 1917 (just after America's entry in the war) to further this cause, asserting that the University of the State of New York was "the institution of all in America most closely related in purpose and organization to the University of France, which embraces in its concern and control the institutions which I visited." He expressed his hopes in developing "our intellectual communion with France and other nations, both during the war and after, culminating in a world university or academy, out on that strip where our

men are fighting side by side." In his view, intellectual and educational alliance seemed closely connected to military alliance.[35]

Finley traveled to several different schools in France, taking tours and hearing speeches from various dignitaries. He went bearing letters from American professors, administrators, and students representing 600 colleges and universities. In exchange, he received a number of offerings such as letters, poems, and drawings to take back to New York with him to present to American students and faculty. The sense that American and French schools at all educational levels shared common values and goals, both cultural and political, underlay these exchanges. The French professors, administrators, and students who contributed did not bluntly ask for America's aid, nor put themselves in any way at her mercy, but rather portrayed France's fight as a universal battle that the United States had shown herself historically willing to support.

Finley's message was interpreted, as the dean of the Lyon law faculty, M. Josserand put it, as "the greeting of America, the great republic, which has joined hands with her older sister and which will not loosen this clasp, until at length our common aim shall be realized--the destruction of an unjust force by the triumph of justice which at last has become strong, by the triumph of right!"[36] The common cause of democracy, going back to the French Revolution's influence on the American Revolution, played a central role in the French view. Out of this commonality would arise, Finley and his supporters hoped, a new future intellectual cooperation between these two nations. Dean Josserand emphasized that following the French meant rejecting the Germans:

> ...the students of free America, the students of all civilized peoples, will not wish to go and ask for lessons in culture at universities where conventions are but scraps of paper, from philosophers who teach that 'Right is the politics of force,' that necessity knows no law. This terrible

---

[35]John H. Finley, Report of a Visit to Schools of France in War Time (New York: The University of the State of New York, 1917), inserted preface, p. 2 of 4.

[36]Finley, Report of a Visit, p. 72.

> war will at least have had this advantage, that of removing the masks and of offsetting civilization against 'Kultur,' the fetish of Force against the worship of Right.[37]

The unity felt and to be maintained between students and faculty at both nations' universities was a positive energy emanating from the disruption of the war.

Henri Bergson's speech on the last night of Finley's stay in France stressed the sympathy felt between two nations each supporting democracy, though he described American democracy as following a different path from the French. Americans were not at all materialistic, Bergson asserted, as many of the French seemed to think they were. On the contrary, they cared little for money, and based their patriotism on high idealism, even "mysticism." For Americans, democracy came about through a sudden application of "pure reason," compared to the French for whom tradition and reason together led more slowly to democratic principles. This difference, however, did not detract from American sympathy for the French cause. Based on Bergson's observations during his own trip to the United States, he explained that Americans loved and admired the French. This was especially true during the war, when Americans could see France defending justice uncomplainingly, with "childlike candor and simplicity." He went so far as to claim that loving France and worshipping justice were the same thing. Because of the opportunity the war brought, he prophesied, "something wonderful is going to be brought forth in the world."[38]

Raymond Thamin and Émile Boutroux were among those who greeted Finley or sent messages after his visit. Thamin, speaking as the rector of the University of Bordeaux (Finley made reference to Thamin's recently-published "notable" book on the university and war), and Boutroux, writing as a the President of the French Institute, both keyed on the ideal of right versus German aggression. They made few references to the

---

[37]Finley, Report of a Visit, p. 73.

[38]Finley, Report of a Visit, pp. 90-95.

patriotism of youth per se, instead referring to the great intellectuals and leaders who had historically fought for right. Thamin said that French and American professors "have taught the generations to reverence right as the firm foundation of all free commonwealths, and, in an uncertain future eagerly to be wished, as the unshakable basis of the league of nations for durable peace."[39] Boutroux gave a somewhat greater role to American youth, but only to the degree that they fulfilled their duty, especially as the United States came to reject its previously isolationist stance. "The time has come for a confession of [America's)] faith and a fulfillment of its duty. A voice has been heard, 'Thou must'; and Young America has answered, 'I can.'"[40] While these comments sounded with patriotic zest, they did not go as far in expressing the need for youth to feel patriotic nor to feel sympathy for the cause as did most of the other addresses and letters. Finley himself wrote more strongly:

> These messages in exchange between America and France, written, spoken, sung, are but the intimation of the new intellectual alliance which is ordained out of the mouths and hearts of the children, as well as prophesied out of the immortal valors of the soldiers and the counsels of the wisest men of France. It is through the children that the prophecy of the world freedom is to be realized. Into the *union sacrée* of the trenches our men have been admitted, but it is for these children of those who fight side by side to keep the spirit of this union of purpose after the inhuman warfare is over. And that is to be promoted first of all by such interchange of messages...[]Upon this better acquaintance of our children, one with another, and upon the companionship of those in common peril, the new intellectual alliance will fill the earth. It must have guidance, however, of the noblest minds, and it must have visualization in something which all can see.[41]

He wrote that "No-man's Land" should be transformed to "Everyman's Land" and that "the select youth" of the allied nations would come together there to study and

---

[39]Finley, Report of a Visit, pp. 97-98.

[40]Finley, Report of a Visit, pp. 100-101.

[41]Finley, Report of a Visit pp. 101-102.

memorialize those who had died defending the principle of right. He also emphasized the sense of community, represented by an exchange of messages, that would grow between the youth of both countries.

The students themselves may not have been especially moved by defending "right" defined as a democratic principle, so much as by their sense of mutual experience on the basis of youth. The women students at the University of Lyons later mailed Finley a small book of verse for their counterparts in America, which especially glorified the willingness of American soldiers to go to war for France's cause. One poem included the following lines:

> Now, America, at the blood of these victims,
> The blood of your children joins it, avenger of crimes;
> Also heroes, since they have no fear of suffering.
> ...
> It is not only on the fields of carnage
> But in the world that you can see what your courage can do;
> The warriors are not only those in the middle of combat:
> By your hardy efforts, men, children and women,
> who do not know the villages in flames,
> You all become soldiers![42]

The author, Thérèse Lion, a student of English, here used the term "*enfants*" twice to mean two different things. The first time referred clearly to the American soldiers as America's "children"; the second referred to those children on the homefront, but declared that along with non-military men and women, they had also become soldiers. This conflation of the two images applied the characteristics of youth-soldiers to others, including younger children, and reflected the ideals of generational patriotic unity through the schools prevalent in France at that time.

Like the Alliance of Social Hygiene, these educators and intellectual leaders saw the war as an opportunity to foster new programs and reforms; also like the Alliance, this

---

[42]Thérèse Lion, "À L'Amérique en armes," in Finley, Report of a Visit, p. 75.

did not require drastic changes so much as support for the forward movement already begun by the war experience. Both science and patriotism interwove these ideas. Where the Alliance's lecture series legitimated reforms more strongly on the basis of science, contributions to Finley's collection of messages tended to emphasize a sense of patriotism, based on protecting principles of right and democracy, as the foundation for new programs and a better future. Both of these legitimating sources for educational reform, in their anti-German sentiment and their assumptions about youth unity and sympathy, encouraged a stronger sense of generational community wrapped around an idealized future for the French nation.

Complaints about the French Education System

As the war came to an end, not everyone wished to glorify the French education system. A group of veterans exited the battlefields with a new call to reform the French university, accusing it of elitism. *Les Compagnons*, as they called themselves, complained that the French system, far from fulfilling the republican ideal of a comprehensive national education open to all, was divided in two. In 1919, the Compagnons published a manifesto titled L'Université Nouvelle in which they pointed to the heart of the problem: there was almost no way for children--primarily of the lower classes--who attended the national free primary schools to switch over to the private system.[43] It was only through the relatively expensive Republican *lycées* and private *collèges* that most students could enter the university. These schools had their own elementary classes that gave students whose parents could pay tuition a course of study directly preparing them for secondary school entrance.[44] The curriculum of the national

[43]See Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France; Jean-François Garcia, L'École Unique en France (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994).

[44]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, p. 18. Talbott suggests that many parents spent 20 to 35 percent of their annual incomes on educational expenses, including both tuition, books, supplies, and boarding.

primary schools did not provide a preparatory education. Thus most students' future academic achievement was determined by the age of six. The highest academic level national primary students could hope to achieve was attending a normal school and then becoming teachers in the primary schools themselves. The Compagnons offered a set of specific reforms designed to open this closed loop system, allowing students to advance purely on the basis of merit, requiring that they be able to cross over into the private system, or be given a free, competitive education based on a primary and secondary school curriculum comparable to that of the existing private schools. A small number of schoolteachers who met while serving in the military together, the group called for a national department of education. They concluded by demanding the creation of a new *école unique*, "the primary school for everyone, son of bourgeois, of workers or of peasants, the free and public primary school."[45]

The complicated and long-running debate about this reform, as historian John E. Talbott has shown, raised a number of important issues about school curriculum as well as class divisions. Whether the study of Latin was a necessary component of French education was one key argument that had existed before the war but was exacerbated by the *école unique* reform. The Compagnons demanded that all secondary students learn Latin, as it was so strongly woven into the fabric of French culture. This was not in keeping with Leftist views.[46] The social function of education came under question around this issue, as knowledge of Latin had long been at the base of elite intellectual privilege. It was also the language of the Catholic Church. The debate stirred up again the issue of the Third Republic's anticlericalism and secularizing efforts which had seemed to have been laid to rest with the official 1904-05 separation of Church and State. The non-interventionist policies of the Third Republic concerning the Catholic schools'

---

[45]As quoted in Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, p. 40.

[46]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, p. 79.

courses of study that went along with the state's cessation of subsidies for religious schools seemed threatened by any new efforts to create a homogenized mass curriculum. Many Catholics instead supported the idea of proportional funding for all secondary schools. Class and religious issues were thus conflated in the ongoing debate over the *école unique*.[47]

Not all Catholics opposed the reform, however. One young contributor to La Revue des Jeunes, edited by social activist Robert Garric, for example, lauded the plan on the grounds that this reform would return to the University the Catholic participation that the Third Republic had denied, as Catholics and secularists worked together to bring about the same task of educational renovation.[48] By 1930, a group of Catholics in Lille, encouraged by Mgr. Liénart, published a document that supported the *école unique*. There were twenty-five signers, among them Catholic Modernist A.D. Sertillanges and New Humanist Robert Garric. The Lille group sought to "show Catholic opinion that a democratic reform was possible without a monopoly of education; to dissociate the defense of the Church from the defense of bourgeois conservatism," and to make the "first sign of the curve to the left of Catholicism."[49] Even though the Lille group supported religious freedom in education and decried secularizing efforts, participants' support for the Compagnon's reform program drew opposition from the Catholic Right. Most of the signers of the 1930 document were relatively young (the exception being Sertillanges) and had little access to major organs of the press, but they did garner support from others like Francisque Gay, Jacques Maritain, and Jean Calvet, as well as La Vie Catholique, which had published the document, and La Revue des Jeunes, edited by

---

[47] Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, especially pp. 182-183.

[48] Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, cf. 52, p. 51.

[49] Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, cf. 38, pp. 192-193, my translation of "un premier signe du virage de gauche du catholicisme." Talbott cites this information from an interview in 1965 with Pierre-Henri Simon, secretary to the Lille group.

Garric.[50] Thus the reform precipitated argument between traditionalists and reformers among Catholics.[51]

Although the group's name evoked a position on the political left, and indeed repeated many ideas for academic reforms that had previously been advanced by left-wing politicians, the Compagnons' main weapon for reform was the relatively intellectual arena of the press. The Third Republic did not immediately move to fulfill the Compagnons' demands; the *école unique* was not legislated until 1938, when it became the Jean Zay Reform.[52] Support along the way from politicians, most notably Edouard Herriot and Léon Blum, came in large part because of articles the Compagnons published. The first volume of L'Éducation Nouvelle was initially published as a series of articles in the magazine L'Opinion.[53] The journal L'Éducation: revue d'éducation familiale et scolaire covered the debate in detail throughout the early 1920s. Numerous teachers, administrators, and pedagogues responded to the challenge presented by the Compagnons, for the most part in agreement to the group's calls for reform, but with many reservations or critical comments about specific details, especially the question of Latin study. Those who opposed the reform entirely, like Catholic editor of La Croix Jean Guiraud, did not contribute in this forum, though L'Éducation editor Henri Marty frequently added editorial notes pointing to the religious controversy as an additional concern.[54]

---

[50]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, pp. 196-197.

[51]Talbott uses the term "traditionalist" to refer to those Catholics supporting "*repartition proportionelle scolaire*," though that idea was in itself a reform, but one meant to maintain the freedom of Catholic schools to keep traditional teaching and entrance requirements. Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, pp. 52-54, 67, 77-78.

[52]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France; Garcia, L'École Unique en France, pp. 85-106.

[53]Garcia, L'École Unique en France, p. 43.

[54]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, pp. 51-52; On Marty, see for example, A. Miquelard, "Les Compagnons de l'Université Nouvelle," L'Éducation: revue de l'éducation familiale et scolaire, July, 1920, pp. 194-201, note from the editor, p. 201.

In 1921, for example, the Minister of Instruction, Léon Bérard, sent out a questionnaire to a group of educators on the Superior Council of Public Instruction, asking for their comments on a proposed reform making Latin and Greek obligatory at the secondary level. This reversed an earlier reform from 1902 that had created one "modern" path for higher education that did not require proficiency in classical languages. That path had proven to be less effective than the more traditional ones, and less respected. L'Éducation published some of the responses, which give an idea of the debate generated around parts of the Compagnons' reform. Although more than half the responses had supported the teaching of Latin to all students, the Council did not advocate a reform at this time. Nevertheless, and against the arguments of Herriot and Blum, Bérard went ahead with the reform in 1923.[55] Among the respondents published in L'Éducation, Émile Boutroux and Raymond Thamin supported Bérard, weighing in against allowing the study of modern languages to replace the study of Latin or Greek as a necessary basis for secondary school entrance. These two cited both tradition and the strong connections between classical and modern culture that would be lost without knowledge of Latin and Greek. Paul Soriau, of the University of Nancy, supported the modern baccalaureate that did not require all students to learn Latin. Soriau argued that forcing all children to learn classical languages, even those who had no aptitude nor desire, would introduce mediocrity to classical study, rather than raise the quality of instruction for all, as was intended.[56]

Socialist Ludovic Zoretti quite aggressively wrote that the Council was wasting its time with this questionnaire, because there was no question that it was the class-orientation of secondary education that needed to change, and that the study of Latin was beside the point. Zoretti supported the Compagnons' reform, though he had presented a

[55]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, p. 86; Félix Ponteil, Histoire de l'enseignement en France, pp. 335-336.

[56]"Le Projet de réforme de l'enseignement secondaire," L'Éducation, Oct. 1921, pp. 1-21.

reform plan of his own, differing in that he denied the bourgeois Third Republic's ability to fulfill the goal of an education appropriate for the masses, and sought instead syndicalist control. He wrote that students of the paying class who attended secondary school were shamefully mediocre, and even worse, they did not have to pay the whole amount, because the state subsidized such mediocrity. The cost born by the state was not merely financial, he asserted, because, "it is with these mediocrities that we make our lawyers, our doctors, our leaders, our elite." He added sarcastically, "Lovely elite." [57] Many different groups and parties had already realized the necessity of reform, he claimed, listing socialists, workers, and syndicates--and the republicans were finally beginning to understand it, too. Throughout the 1920s and 30s, Zoretti called for the creation of a new proletarian culture, free from bourgeois dominance. As Germanist professor Charles Andler noted in 1922, the brand of humanism produced in the traditional French curriculum was not useful for the masses. Andler patriotically pointed out that this was one area where, surprisingly and shamefully, the German university bested the French.[58] One of Zoretti's associates proclaimed in 1931 that proletarian culture needed to be anti-materialist and based on "the harmonious formation of the personality." The Compagnons disagreed with syndicalist efforts to focus on the development of a specifically proletarian culture, however, and stuck with their original calls for a single, unified curriculum, though one offering a variety of choices of study open to all students equally.[59]

Despite the egalitarian nature of the reform, the Compagnons remained committed to meritocratic elitism. Their ideal of a New University was not intended to displace the importance of intellectual elitism in France; rather, it was intended to replace the old

---

[57]"Le Projet de réforme de l'enseignement secondaire," p. 21.

[58]Charles Andler, L'Humanisme travailliste: Essais de pédagogie sociale (Paris: Bibliothèque de la 'Civilisation française,' 1927).

[59]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, pp. 59-61.

elitist system with a new, meritocratic, one. To this end, some process of meritocratic selection was needed, and it was indeed this idea that seemed most agreed-upon by the many different voices contributing to the debate. From the beginning, the Compagnons argued for *sélection* on the basis of student aptitude.[60] How should aptitude best be determined? The first step was exposure to different possible paths, encouraging a freer choice for students, then some sort of testing or evaluation. When the Jean Zay reform was eventually put in place, its focus was a year of orientation at the beginning of secondary schooling. Orientation involved exposing students to different careers and then using teacher evaluations and standardized testing to determine aptitude. As the Jean Zay reform was put in place under Blum's Popular Front government, Zay, then the Minister of Public Instruction, stated that the teachers' judgments, while they did not in any way rely on family involvement, would at least let families know their children's aptitudes.[61] By that time the question of career choice had become more clearly a matter of institutional evaluation, including through the use of standardized and psychological tests, than it was based on the student's or the family's desires. By the 1930s, the age of free and obligatory education had been raised to 14, as the Compagnons had suggested. This meant that the year of orientation would occur prior to students' school-leaving.[62] After the year of orientation, some students would enter technical education programs, some would enter apprenticeships, and some would continue on a more professional or academic path. Ostensibly, this allowed greater freedom of choice for students, though

---

[60]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, p. 41ff.

[61]Documents, vol. II of P. Chevallier and B. Grosperrin, L'Enseignement français de la Révolution à nos jours (Paris, Le Haye: Mouton et Cie, 1971), p. 353.

[62]W. D. Halls, Society, Schools, and Progress in France (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1965), pp. 104-106. Hall offers the English "guidance" as an approximate translation for "*orientation.*" Later the age for orientation was raised further; Garcia, L'École Unique en France, p. 47. René Viviani had proposed in 1917 that a "*postscolaire*" obligation be put in place, in two stages, from ages 13-17 and 17-20, but the Compagnons argued that it was unrealistic to expect students who had already received their school-leaving certificate to return to school.

the heavy degree of evaluation through teachers and tests, as well as numerous other social factors, including the availability of jobs in the students' chosen field, had a strong effect. The protection of family choice in the matter of children's education and careers was thus limited. Ultimately, the reform restructured career choice, placing it much more strongly in the hands of the state and its representatives and shifting responsibility from the family to the state, on behalf of young people.

Pierre-Henri Simon, a member of the Lille group of Catholics who supported the *école unique* reform and more generally, the reconciliation of Church and State, argued in the early 1930s that there should not seem to be conflict between the abstract entities of "The Family" and "The State." For Simon, reconciliation would take place as a sort of coming together of family and state interests on children's behalf. He called them "two equally helpful powers--I was going to say paternal--who wish the well-being of the same child."[63] His paternalist argument against familial distrust of the state's goodwill in taking on the issue of career selection shows that the state was indeed perceived as taking over paternal obligations in this regard.

The democratization called for in the Compagnon's reform was not intended to be homogenizing, but putting the reform into practice through the national education system naturally seemed to lead in that direction. Catholic, Traditionalist, and Socialist detractors all shared a distrust of the national system, whether on the basis of anticlericalism, democratic leveling, or a bourgeois and materialist outcome. The Compagnons' original efforts aiming at reconstructing a new intellectual youth elite to replace the youth soldiers and teachers lost in the war, however, remained a powerful incentive for reform. Under the Popular Front government in 1938, the Third Republic

---

[63]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, pp. 201-202. Talbott points out that the pluralism supported by Simon's brand of reconciliation had no counterpart on the secular Left: "The Leftist partisans of the *école unique*, who prided themselves on their progressivism and their tolerance, were, with regard to the school question, less progressive, less tolerant and much less inventive than the Catholics for whom Simon spoke."

did finally, after years of debate and modifications, put the *école unique* reform into place.

How did this reform fit in with other ideas of scientific or patriotic rebuilding after the war? Again, although the ideas contained in the suggestions of the Compagnons were not entirely new, the war provided the opportunity for a more fervent and compelling case to be made. Trench fraternity and the *union sacrée* seemed to support the concept of a "single" school and the blurring of class and religious distinctions for the benefit of the nation. Also, the Compagnons, in peacetime a small group of schoolteachers, had gained the right to be heard through their military experience.[64] As veterans, they spoke not only for themselves but for all French soldiers, both survivors and the fallen. In this way, their identity and experience served to blur political differences and their reform seemed to reach beyond its left-wing origins. Because they were teachers, they appeared (perhaps ironically) to speak as the collective voice of the youth-soldiers, and as such, demanded recognition.[65] The state responded by taking on a paternal role relative to their demands.

After the war, through the combination of obedience to social hygiene, patriotic love of *la patrie* and a natural as well as social engagement in the *union sacrée*, youth took on a new collective identity. Based on their similarity to one another and their cohesive role in bringing about a better social and cultural future for France, they began to be perceived as a distinct and undivided social group--one demanding public representation, especially in relation to education. The social, cultural, and political strength of this group, powerful enough to make collective demands on the state, was an

---

[64]Originally, the Compagnons numbered 7, aged 26 to 40, but by the time they published their manifesto, they had encouraged an additional 38 to sign; only one of these *universitaires*--Georges Duhamel--was yet a well-known scholar. Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, pp. 36-38.

[65]The Compagnons themselves referred to the fallen soldiers as fathers, and suggested that their reform was to allow those soldiers' sons to carry on the equality their fathers had experienced in the trenches. Garcia, L'École Unique en France, p. 45; Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, p. 40.

ironic by-product of wartime rhetoric glorifying youth's patriotic obedience. The Third Republic, sensing shaky ground even after its Pyrrhic victory, increasingly sought to maintain or increase its authority over youth, and especially control over young people's educational and career paths. The sense that even youth of different nationalities were similar because of their generational position in society persisted, and became increasingly threatening. In response, discussion of the social role of the French student became ever more narrowly and nationalistically defined, often based on scientific methods and justifications. Thus, at the same time that wartime patriotic ideals opened the door for a sense of international unity on the basis of youthfulness, they also served to more strongly nationalize French youth. Starting in 1914, the origins of this quality of unity lay in a combination of youth patriotism, represented by the youth-soldier, and the unifying function of the French school system.

Associating the younger generation with the sacrificed youth represented by French soldiers was one way that the war served as a stepping-stone for reconfiguring French childhood through the schools. Additional demographic pressure was placed on the family, as the next chapter will show, when the fallen or injured soldiers were old enough to be fathers. The relationship many French children had with the war was expressed not through patriotic imitation but through the loss of parental authority and protection. This was especially important when war losses threatened the French child's education. Following the first World War, these two ideals, of youth as future soldiers, and of soldiers as fathers, continued to intertwine through the themes of sacrifice and national duty.

# CHAPTER 4

## THE FATHER-SOLDIER AND THE WAR ORPHAN: SCHOLARSHIP AND THE SURROGATE STATE

The First World War's high casualty rate seemed to have irredeemably damaged French fatherhood, killing or mutilating a generation of fathers and potential fathers in sacrifice to the Republic and to *la patrie*. This inverted a long-standing tension between the French state and parents. Late nineteenth-century state intervention had been built primarily on a platform of protection for society against the potential criminality and illness of children who were judged to have criminal or ill fathers (or after them, mothers).[1] When the courts sat in judgment on parents' ability or willingness to fulfill paternal duties, the state effectively asserted for itself the right to force parents to conform with its definition of citizen fatherhood.[2] After the sacrifice of non-criminal fathers in the war, the victorious state seemed obliged to carry through with its pre-war position by stepping into those good citizen-fathers' shoes. If the state had been willing to take on such responsibilities towards criminal or potentially criminal children, it faced growing demand after the war that it be willing to do so for the non-criminal or "normal" French child. In the interest of such "normalcy" and in the absence of responsible fathers, the Third Republic became a surrogate father to all French children. Because the family's dutiful sacrifice for the state needed to be recompensed, the Third Republic was called upon to fulfill its paternal duties on a scale far beyond that which had existed before.

---

[1]See Sylvia Shafer, Children in Moral Danger and the Problem of Government in Third Republic France (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

[2]Sylvia Schafer, "When the Child is the Father of the Man: Work, Sexual Difference and the Guardian-State in Third Republic France," History and Theory, Beiheft 31, History and Feminist Theory, ed. Ann-Louise Shapiro (Wesleyan University, 1992), pp. 98-115. Schafer shows that under the early Third Republic, "the attribution of gendered and familial identities was intrinsic to a process of interpreting collective and individual experience in the context of a broad vision of the state and its historical relationship to the French populace. The masculine essence of these terms was most common in the administration's prescriptive and prognostic flights; gender identity was located in a future state of being" (p. 100). The interventionist State protected the masculine identities of both *la patrie* as the father, and the (male) child, a masculinity that was universalized to refer to all citizens and all children.

This had the effect of pulling the younger generation away from the family sphere and locating them in a more direct relationship to the state, in a new public and patriotic arena.

The state now needed to justify its ability to determine paternal responsibilities in the face of father-soldiers' sacrifice, while at the same time taking on greater control over the "normal" French family. A shift in state control mechanisms occurred, from police-state tactics and dependence on criminal courts towards more persuasive efforts through state subsidies and tax incentives. One program legislated during the war and put in motion just after the armistice awarded children the honor of being a *Pupille de la Nation*. Examining the stated purpose of this program shows one tactic used to redraw the relationship between French children and the government after World War I. This shift created new possibilities for the emergence of a youth culture no longer dependent on family relationships. It was based instead on a sense of national unity created through one shared childhood war experience--the loss of paternal guidance.

Wartime Family Disruption and Substitution

The *Pupilles de la Nation* program followed on the heels of wartime rhetoric that portrayed all French children as orphaned, and in need of parental, usually paternal, aid. The absence from home of males aged roughly 18 to 35 during the war and after--many never returned or returned disabled--effectively orphaned a large percentage of French children. During the war, French children were called upon to act as pseudo-parents themselves, by acting as "godparents" to French soldiers. Little girls would serve as "*marraines*" or "godmothers," sending food as well as letters to particular soldiers on the front.[3] Although in one sense these positions were in keeping with a kind of mystical

[3]Through a philanthropic program called "The Fatherless Children of France Society," Americans old and young were asked to act as "godparents" to French war orphans. One twelve-year-old boy from New York, for example, served as a "godfather" to a fatherless eleven-year-old French girl, sending her money saved from his paper route and payments for odd jobs, as well as occasional gifts. In this case, absent or fallen father-soldiers were replaced with non-age-specific, and even non-French, substitutes. See Marguerite

"fairy godmother" motif, these "godparents" clearly performed tasks that would normally and in peacetime be performed by biological parents. These philanthropic actions filled in the void in family relationships brought about by the disruption and loss of the war years, and reflected a blurring of age-based familial authority.

By early 1915, politicians with varied party affiliations began to suggest that the state should step in as a parent substitute for war orphans. Georges Berry declared, "The Republic has the duty in regard to war orphans to take the place of fathers fallen on the field of honor." All the deputies from the Seine co-signed a proposition stating that it would be "monstrous" to deny war orphans "a shelter and the protection of the Nation, that must be, that must become for them a mother." When the socialist Paul Constans weighed in, he asserted, "It is for the Nation to take up fallen or reduced paternity."[4] Constans' articulation that fatherhood itself was killed or reduced as a consequence of the war points to the abstract and collective nature of the father-soldier motif. Ambiguity about the gendered aspect of national protectionism for war orphans is well illustrated in these examples; what is clear is that the state as representative of the Nation was called upon to perform the damaged paternal function of absent or fallen father-soldiers, who had been sacrificed through their war service to the state.[5]

*Les Pupilles de la Nation*: Rhetoric

When the Third Republic stepped into the paternal void, it claimed for itself the ability to stand in as a father-figure whose authority represented not only the fallen

---

Bernard and Edith Serrell, Deer Godchild (New York: Publications for the Fatherless Children of France, M. E. Demetre, 1918).

[4]M. Laporte and M. Bot, Mlle de Gollville and M. Taillade, Office des pupilles de la nation: Lois du 27 juillet et du 26 octobre 1922, (Paris: Librarie du Recueil Sirey, 1934), p. 6.

[5]Diane Rubenstein has argued that the Nation is feminine and the State masculine. Diane Rubenstein, What's Left? The École Normale Supérieure and the Right (University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), p. 73. Around the event of World War I, however, this gendering is not entirely clear, particularly in relation to proposed social treatment of children on a national scale.

soldiers but also their children and the children's mothers. By 1917, with the support of *solidariste* Léon Bourgeois, the Third Republic announced a program called "*Les Pupilles de la Nation*" intended to "adopt" children whose fathers or family wage-earners had been killed as a direct result of the war. Although family wage-earners might include mothers, it was clear that the program was primarily intended to address the increased rate of fatherlessness created by the war. The state would pay subsidies primarily for education, and in some cases for living allowances as well. This was to be a new type of scholarship program, based on patriotic merit rather than on economic need. Prior to the war, the Third Republic did not offer many scholarships, and some were only half-scholarships. The great majority of secondary school scholarships had gone to students from middle-class families.[6]

It was not until after the armistice that the exact details for labeling children and for disbursing funds were determined. At that time, the coverage was extended to include those children whose fathers or caretakers were not dead but had had their wage-earning potential even partially reduced as a circumstance of the war. It became clear that some fathers were incapacitated in ways other than physical; children were eligible even without proof of "material incapacity," if they could prove some kind of "moral" infirmity.[7] State subsidies were to be pro-rated depending on the degree of loss.

The definition of children for whom this legislation applied continued to be expanded later. Subsequent modifications through 1927 extended the date of birth for those who could be considered war orphans to include children born up to three hundred days after the date of demobilization, and expanded the war service record of their fathers to include those who had died after the cessation of hostilities, for example, in Syria or

---

[6]Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, p. 19.

[7]René Cassin, Le Contentieux des victimes de la guerre: étude de la jurisprudence concernant les pensions de guerre et l'adoption des pupilles (1924-1925) (Paris: Éditions de l'Union Féderale, c. 1925), p. 27. Cassin was the honorary president of the Union Féderale des Assocations Françaises de Mutilées, Anciens Combattants, Veuves, Ascendants, et Orphelins de Guerre.

Morocco. In the early 1930s, attempts were made to expand the definition still farther to include children born after the war's end to fathers unable to fulfill their paternal obligation (since soldiers' infirmities did not necessarily prevent conception). The argument supporting such a modification was that the fathers were just as incapable of fulfilling their paternal responsibilities, no matter when their children were born.[8] These efforts failed, however, due primarily to financial concerns. This illustrates the extent to which the Pupils of the Nation program was designed to honor the state's obligation to children--at least those associated with wartime sacrifice--more than it was to honor its obligation to veterans, especially when some time had passed and the Third Republic was faced with other pressing concerns.

Throughout the 1920s the program functioned in a particular way to reshape the relationship between French children and the Third Republic. The wording legislators used for the process of becoming a Pupil of the Nation was that the child was being "adopted" by the state. Legislators argued that there was plenty of historical precedence for state "adoptions," though they had always been on a much smaller scale, pertaining only to a small handful of families whose special circumstances in sacrifice to the state, for example under Napoleon and again under the July Monarchy, were deemed important enough to warrant such an adoption. Under Napoleon, adoptees were housed separately from their surviving family members in two imperial palaces; their schooling was determined through the adoption, with two schools (one for boys, one for girls) designated. The boys' careers and the girls' marriages were decided by the state. Those children, whose fathers were soldiers killed at Austerlitz, were also given the right to use Napoleon's family name. Thus, as Emperor, he was considered personally to have been their adoptive father.[9] Under the July Monarchy, children whose fathers or mothers had

---

[8]Laporte et al., Office des Pupilles de la Nation, pp. 8-9

[9]Laporte et al., Office des Pupilles de la Nation, p. 7; Joseph Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France (Brussels: Imprimerie P. Dykmans, n.d.), pp. 124-125.

been killed during or as a result of the July Days could be considered as orphans, given a lump sum per year for their upkeep, and from ages seven to eighteen, be raised and educated towards a particular career in public institutions at the state's expense. The Pupils of the Nation program was different in that it was applied to a very much larger number of "orphans" or fatherless children and, importantly, did not take the children away from their families. Adopted children obviously could not inherit from the state, nor demand sustenance after reaching their majority, as real adoptees could do. Use of the term "adoption" was heavily debated, but used in order to present the program as a French tradition, thus minimizing its reformist nature.[10] Legislators went to great lengths to assure families that this adoption program was different from the type of state intervention that was traditionally associated with criminality or even simply with poverty, since most families would reasonably perceive that as stigmatic. Instead, becoming a Pupil of the Nation was presented as an honor, a recognition of patriotic wartime sacrifice for the country.[11]

In 1917 an announcement of the program set out the rhetorical basis for the new legislation.

> French women! French men! The law of July 27, 1917 on the Pupils of the Nation, voted unanimously by the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, is a law of Liberty, of Fraternity, and of mutual Respect, of social Harmony and Solidarity. It will be applied in this spirit.
>
> It is a law of Liberty.--The Nation, in adopting the war orphans, does not want to take the place of their mothers, nor that of their guardians [tuteurs naturels]; it will not take back any parental rights, it only adds its protection to theirs. In addition, the State authorises and offers sufficient

---

[10]Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France, pp. 124-132.

[11]See Laporte et al., Office des Pupilles de la Nation; Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France; Mlle Sabine Mauny, Les Pupilles de la Nation: Comment on devient Pupille de la Nation, Avantages que confère ce titre, doctoral thesis, University of Poitiers (Poitiers: Imprimerie "L'Union," 1923); also numerous articles in L'Enfant and L'Écho de Paris from 1917 through the 1920s.

funding to all the existing charitable programs (*Oeuvres*) to exercise their patronage towards the orphans.

It is a law of Fraternity and not of welfare (*assistance*).--It is made for the rich as for the poor. The State has contracted a holy debt towards the pupils of the nation. The law assures to these children, unequal by fortune, the same title of honor. It connects one to the other with a certificate of nobility that is conferred on them and recalls the sacrifice of their fathers fallen in the common effort.

It is a law of mutual Respect.--The will of the defunct (*defunt*) father, or, in its default, the will of the mother, will be rigorously observed. Their traditions, their beliefs, their feelings, will be scrupulously respected, especially concerning the type of education to be given to the child. The law will be forced to maintain above all the traditions of the French family, whose rights will be safeguarded and of which it supports the rebirth.

It is a law of social Harmony and Solidarity.--It has as its essential aim practicing the *union sacrée* in accomplishing the most noble of missions: the protection and the formation of the child. Is not the best way to honor those who are no more, to continue this union, the integral part of the moral strength of the nation, born in a profound love of *la Patrie* and sealed by the blood of battles?[12]

Clearly, legislators wished to frame this program as simultaneously in accordance with Republican traditions and with older family and religious traditions--but just as clearly, this combination led to ambiguity and the potential for conflict. Senator René Viviani, addressing the knotty issue of school choice, said reassuringly, "The man who has fallen for his *patrie*, the man who has left his family weaponless (*désarmée*), since it counted on his arms and on his brain to continue to live, should at least have this consolation, at the moment of closing his eyes to the light, of telling himself that, no matter what his religious belief or his independent thinking, the French State would take it upon itself to safeguard it in the soul of his children."[13] The idea that the state was faithfully replicating the father's own individual thinking and desires remained an important counter to

---

[12]As reprinted in L'Enfant, April 15, 1919, no. 237, p. 94.

[13]As quoted in Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France, p. 72.

concerns that the Pupils of the Nation program was just one more interventionist inroad, increasing state control.

As M. Grosseau pointed out in one parliamentary debate, the program did effectively accord greater rights to the state, patriotic rhetoric notwithstanding. Grosseau argued, "It seems, in truth, that the main preoccupation has been to augment the state's rights, the administration of the state, in place of finding out the best means of assuring the war orphans' future."[14] Grosseau and several other representatives abstained from the otherwise unanimous vote passing the legislation in 1917, because, he said, although he sympathized with the program's protectionist aims, ambiguities in the text of the law rendered it highly defective. He said he hoped that after subsequent debate and modification, the unanimity supporting the program would be "more complete."[15] Joseph Nisot, attaché to the Belgian foreign ministry, commenting on the program, concurred, arguing that the Pupils of the Nation legislation was just another "phase in an evolution that, for many years already, moves towards placing all authority in the hands of the state."[16] Yet the Third Republic worked hard to reassure parents and protectors of family rights that this was not so.

The wording of the initial proclamation for the law specifically claimed to be supporting the "rebirth" of family rights. The resurrection of a paternalist tradition would guarantee the child's place in the social order through the mediation of the family. The Republican values of Liberty and Equality were represented in this document, though they applied to the rights of the parents rather than the child. The rhetoric made clear that this legislation was not intended to further state interventionism of the sort to which the French had become accustomed: instead of forcing parents to serve the state by

---

[14]As quoted in Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France, pp. 126-127.

[15]Laporte et al., Office des Pupilles de la Nation, p. 8.

[16]Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France, p. 127.

conforming to its definition of fatherhood, the Pupils of the Nation program intended to put the Third Republic at the service of parents. The father's right to decide his children's future was, in principle, to be carried out; for many children the father's wishes would already have been expressed and could be fulfilled posthumously. The mother's decision, or after her, the child's legal guardian's or the Board of Guardians', would be followed in case of default by the father.[17] In this way, the father, even if he were dead, would not be cut out of the picture of traditionalist family values. At the same time, the soldier-fathers' equality in death in the trenches served as a metaphoric base for the republican program. Equality for their children was expressed through mutual respect and honor, however, rather than through a leveling of material status. That the intent of this law was not to provide upward mobility for war orphans became clearer as the state successively refined the law's applications.

Enactment of the Legislation: Honor vs. Need

We can see how the program's supporters justified their proposals by examining a speech by Emile Leven, Member of the Council for the Pupils of the Nation program and vice-president of the Committee of the Entente of War Programs. Leven invoked familial tradition to legitimize the program's efforts. He also argued that he wished to stay away from pure theory and from technicalities, and instead approach the issue in a purely practical vein. He emphasized the unanimity of feeling concerning the program's goals, in their application exclusively to war orphans. After the age of 13, he argued, if a boy's working-class father were living, in former days his future would have been assured by his acceptance in his father's workplace, where he could have moved up the ladder by learning over time to be a "good and solid worker." The situation for war orphans was utterly different.

---

[17]Documents Officiels, L'Enfant, Feb. 15, 1919, no. 235, pp. 28-29.

> There is no longer a father to guide them, the poor wives are quite thrown into confusion, the least rational advice is given them, and above all, this time of expensive living and necessity does not allow them to wait, they hasten to see their children earn as much as possible, for themselves and also to help the mother, the brother and sisters who too often lack the essentials.[18]

This statement made ambiguous use of personal pronouns, not clearly differentiating between mother and child. Not merely the sons but also the wives were in need of guidance from the father of the family--without it they were unable to make good choices. Wives and sons appeared to have parallel ties to the husband/father, especially in relation to rational decision-making. Later in the same sentence, as Leven described the relationship between the mother and son, he painted the mother as needing financial support from the son as she had from the father. Women were thus additionally depicted as having parallel economic ties to fathers and sons. Financial need, Leven worried, would limit apprenticeship, which did not offer the same immediate benefits to the family as plunging the eldest son into the workplace--and the latter was not truly in the best interest of the son. Leven sought to portray the Pupils of the Nation program as a dualistic stand-in for the father, both in relation to sons and to wives/mothers.

Although the choice of career was legally the father's or mother's, Leven argued that the child needed to be happy with the choice. Those administering the grant needed to provide encouragement and the basis for pride in the apprenticeship in order for the child to do well, just as a schoolchild needed such support to succeed in his classes. This, Leven advised administrators, was true even when it appeared that the choice had been made based on minor or unimportant grounds, perhaps following advice from his comrades or parents. "If the child turns his condition into poetry, if he believes he will find contentment, if he thinks he will succeed better there than elsewhere, do not

---

[18] L'Enfant, April 15, 1919, no. 237, pp. 73-76.

extinguish his enthusiasm, and try to second his efforts," Leven advised.[19] If the administrators felt that the child's choice was truly an error, they could try to convince him, by suggesting, for example, that the profession was over-burdened, or could point to the closing of various workshops, or suggest to him that he lacked the physical strength necessary for the job, or point out his lack of intellectual culture. They should nevertheless offer him a specific position not far from the one he had chosen himself. "We insist *very much* on the choice of career," Leven declared, "it is at the very base of apprenticeship; the whole life of the worker depends on it and you can therefore have on this life an influence like that of conscientious friends that you are to our orphans and you will not feel too heavily the moral responsibility that falls to you by this advice."[20] He concluded by saying that once a choice had been agreed upon between mother and child, the *patron* would take on the responsibility for assuring that the decision was the right one. Clearly, Leven was attempting to ensure that in practice, the wishes of the family would indeed be respected by those who offered apprenticeship grants to war orphans. That such grants were at the discretion of the administrators of the Pupils of the Nation program should not appear to offer them control over the child's career choice. Government advertisements for administrative positions reiterated the notion that conscientiousness and scrupulous respect of the family's wishes on the part of the administrators was required for the program to succeed in its efforts.[21] This rather backpedaling explanation suggested that *only* administrators' conscientiousness would mitigate what effectively amounted to the state's increased control over educational and career choices.

---

[19] L'Enfant, April 15, 1919, no. 237, pp. 73-76.

[20] L'Enfant, April 15, 1919, no. 237, pp. 73-76.

[21] L'Enfant, March 15, 1919, no. 236, pp. 66-67.

The administrative structures set up to carry out the program were carefully constructed, with an eye to differentiating it from public assistance. There was initially some debate as to which ministry or state institution should head the program, including the Ministry of Justice, the Legion of Honor, and Bourgeois' suggestion, the Council of Ministers, but it was decided to leave it in the hands of the Ministry of Education.[22] That the Ministry of Justice might head it made sense given that it already handled cases concerning removal of parental rights for "children in moral danger," but it implied a possible criminal negligence on the parents' part. With the Ministry of Education leading it, however, the potential for secularizing coercion was more likely to become a problem. Therefore, a separate National Office of Pupils of the Nation was created, headed by a "*Conseil Supérieure*" or Superior Board of Guardians The Board's job was to determine how the law was to be administered once pupils were admitted to the program, and how the local Departmental Offices would judge children according to "the age of the children, their intelligence, their tastes, their aptitudes for taking on this or that career."[23] The Council, headed by the Minister of Public Instruction, had 99 members, including senators and deputies, representatives of various philanthropic organizations, and two doctors, one from the Academy of Medicine and one from the Institute of Medicine. A minimum of three women were also required to be on the council. Members of the Council received no pay. The Departmental Offices were regularly required to report to the Superior Council on their activities. At the departmental level, the number of women had to be one third the total; many were schoolteachers or representatives of philanthropies. Additionally, there were *Sections Cantonales* made up of representatives

---

[22]Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France, pp. 59-62.

[23]Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France, p. 56.

appointed by the Departmental Office so that the administrators of the program would be local and not need to travel.[24]

Despite the complete separation of this complicated administrative structure from public assistance programs, the Pupils of the Nation program had to rely on another less stable structure, the *conseil de famille*, or Board of Guardians, as welfare and "child in moral danger" cases did. A Board of Guardians was appointed for children whose fathers had had their parental rights removed because of the charge of neglect or moral endangerment, and also in cases where the father had died. The Board generally consisted of several members of the child's family, or perhaps the parents' friends. Even if the mother had been awarded custody in lieu of the father, a Board of Guardians was often appointed to offer her advice on the children's upbringing, especially concerning their education and their marriages.[25] The legislators of the Pupils of the Nation program pointed out that it had been shown historically difficult to convene such Boards as needed, and often enough a judge would step in to decide issues that were under debate or about which family members disagreed. Furthermore, bringing together a Board would undoubtedly prove difficult given the dislocations and disruptions of the war; this set-up would therefore be inadequate for Pupils of the Nation, whose families were intended to have greater protection of the law than did children on public assistance. In this case it was important to ensure that the courts did not trespass on family rights, as no criminal action had taken place that the courts needed to redress. The new legislation for war orphans therefore required absolutely that a Board of Guardians had to meet, and the judge had to ensure this. As well, however, the judge needed to make sure that the Board appropriately represented the child's best interests. If there were not enough people available among family or friends, the judge could add one of the departmental or

---

[24]Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France, pp. 47-72.

[25]Schafer, Children in Moral Danger, pp. 34-35 and 130-132.

cantonale representatives to round out the Board.[26] Despite efforts to tread lightly, it seems clear that the judicial system had a large role to play.

Women could provide greater service within this program than they previously had been allowed. Prior to this legislation, women could not serve on Boards of Guardians. With the Pupils of the Nation program, some women could now serve: women representatives from the Departmental Office could serve as long as their husbands did not serve on the same committee; and sisters, grandmothers, aunts, and great-aunts could serve, as long as they were single or widowed. In other words, women could serve as long as such service would not come into conflict with their husbands. Similarly, the law stated that if an orphan's parents were both dead, the mother's testamentary wishes could be followed, as long as her husband's (presumably, previous) testamentary wishes did not disagree, in which case the husband's would prevail. The traditional dominance of the father or husband was maintained. Even though women were involved, it was the soldier-father's thinking that was to be replicated by the state, as the state took on a more direct paternal status towards war orphans.[27]

One Pupil of the Nation, Henri Queffélec, wrote in his autobiography of childhood that when his father died of pleurisy contracted in the trenches, his mother subsequently raised her sons according to their father's wishes, never ostensibly taking the responsibility herself for choosing their education or careers. Queffélec, only 6 years old when his father had died, looking back on his mother's actions, doubted that she really could have simply followed his father's wishes throughout all his years of upbringing. He even expressed some cynicism about what his mother always told him were his father's last words: instead of having his sons follow him in a soldier's career, he wanted them to learn Latin and Greek. His mother set up a shrine to her dead husband in the house, and

---

[26]Nisot, Les Pupilles de la Nation en France, pp. 76-77; L'Enfant, Sept-Oct. 1919, no. 241, pp. 219-223.

[27]L'Enfant, July-Aug. 1919, no. 240, pp. 197-198.

glorified his soldierly memory, yet she guided her children in a different direction than he had taken. Nevertheless, everything she did she claimed to do on behalf of her husband. Queffélec wrote:

> I was raised by my mother in what she called "the" memory of my father. The notion combined the personal memories that my mother kept of her husband with the ideal memory that a family and a country had to keep for a man who had died defending them. As much as she detested grandiloquence, she fluently declared that my father had served *la patrie*. That he had been a servant. He had given his life to France.[28]

In this way, his mother neatly fit the profile that the Third Republic sought for mothers in relation to the Pupils of the Nation program. She understood her own parenting responsibilities in the same terms that the state expressed mothers' duties: the father's sacrifice to *la patrie* justified continuing to behave almost as if he were still alive. Like the politicians who supported the program, Queffélec's mother justified her actions on the basis of a dead man's desires. Since the dead fathers of the Pupilles could no longer actively participate, however, it seems clear that in the practical application of such paternal choices, new substitutes had a great deal of interpretive leeway.

Making Application Easy

The process for applying to the program clearly depicted the link between the family's sacrifice for the state and the child's right to state support, carried out jointly by the state and the remaining family members. The father, mother, family member, or legal guardian of eligible children, with approval from the Board of Guardians when necessary, had to provide proof of damage done to wage-earning, through death, disease, or wounding caused by or aggravated by the war. These requests were sent, requiring no postage, to the Procureur de la République in each arrondissement, and then the cases were decided by the civil court. The Tribunal would decide the case without requiring

---

[28]Henri Queffélec, Mémoires d'enfance: La Douceur et la guerre (Paris: Seguier, 1988), p. 28.

the child's representative to be present, though the representative could offer verbal evidence if they wished. If passed, the child would be designated as a "Pupil of the Nation." Other evidence that would support the application included "decorations, citations, and, in general, all that would make more apparent the merit of the sacrifice of the missing or wounded."[29] Clearly, state authorities were bent on tying governmental support for children directly to their fathers' support for the Republic.

Assimilating All French Children to "Orphan" Status

The Pupils of the Nation program initially took into account only children whose father or mother or both had died, and did not consider cases where both parents might still be living. "Adopting" children whose parents still lived clearly generated difficulties; in these cases, the law stated that the Third Republic's primary purpose was "patronage of the war orphans," indicating a protective stance. A delegate from the Departmental Office would make sure that funds were appropriately spent, and that school attendance was strictly adhered to, though the choice of school would ultimately remain with the family. As Bérard explained it, the delegate would "enlighten and advise parents and guardians on the direction to give to the child, on the career where he will find the best use of his aptitudes."[30] The legislation requiring delegates replaced an earlier idea to create a "social guardian" whose job would be to impose more strongly on fathers and mothers. Despite this tempering of the delegate's authority, many families still resented the delegate's role.[31]

---

[29]Documents Officiels, L'Enfant, Feb. 15, 1919, no. 235, pp. 28-29.

[30]John E. Talbott, The Politics of Educational Reform in France, 1918-1940 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), pp. 78-83.

[31]From a report in 1921. Mauny, Les Pupilles de la Nation, p. 50. See also L'Enfant, Sept.-Oct. 1919, no. 241, p. 221.

When this legislation was expanded to include non-orphans, that section of the law addressed "children assimilated to orphan status."[32] The idea that non-orphans could be treated as if they were orphans shows how the state was expanding its role. According to this program, all French children seemed to have metaphorically taken on a kind of orphan status due to the circumstances of the war, even if both parents were still living. It also enhanced the state's control over "normal" nuclear families. One legal commentator, discussing the state's duty to administer reparations (funded ultimately by the Germans--the enemy--she asserted) indeed suggested that the country had a common cause to raise French children according to "normal child development."[33] This nationalist duty was tied simultaneously to paternal choice and to patriotic unity, resulting in a homogenized image of the French child. Ironically, the family in need of educational subsidies seemed "normal" in the sense that it was not criminal or aberrant, and at the same time necessarily in need of "normalizing" due to the disruption of the war. Such "normalizing" was also a replacement of patriarchal authority and responsibility lost through the war. The state stepped in as a new type of father-figure even while it rhetorically claimed to be fulfilling biological fathers' wishes.

## Philanthropies

The role of philanthropic organizations, though officially recognized within the new program, was not as great as it would have been had not the state intervened. One charitable association in particular, the Patronage of Childhood and of Adolescence, founded in 1890 by Henri Rollet, a lawyer and later a judge for the court of appeals, supported the legislation but was dismayed over the legislators' decision to organize the program through state institutions rather than through existing philanthropies like his

---

[32]Documents Officiels, L'Enfant, no. 236, March 15, 1917, pp. 66-67.

[33]Mauny, Les Pupilles de la Nation, p. 52.

own. Starting in 1919, L'Enfant, a free monthly journal sent to supporters of the Patronage, carried explanations of the new law and followed the progress of decisions made concerning eligibility and funding. This *oeuvre* or philanthropic organization for providing aid to "the child in moral danger" provided shelters and work programs, especially through apprenticeship, for children who were removed from their families by the court because of criminal charges brought against the parents. In 1911 the state recognized it as an "establishment of public utility," which worked closely with the court system but was privately funded and administered.

> The *Patronage de l'Enfance et de l'Adolescence* is an association that has for its object the protection of children in moral danger, that is to say the children who, if they are not protected early enough, seem destined to become bad subjects and to wind up in houses of correction or prisons. It is therefore not merely a work of goodwill that must have the sympathies of charitable people, but moreso a work of social preservation that must interest in the highest degree all respectable people (*honnête gens*).[34]

The Patronage had acted as a traditionalist mediator between the child and the state in lieu of responsible (or respectable) parents. Although the organization's stated aim was protection for children, in depicting "respectable people" protecting them from becoming "bad subjects," the priority of protecting society from children's potential degeneracy was clearly implied. The organization made the effort to maintain traditional values, especially concerning children's preparation for work, and its activities were clearly directed towards working-class children and adolescents, not "elite" youth.

The association apparently attached itself to the Pupils of the Nation program to increase the possibility of reciprocal support for the Patronage. By March 1919, however, legislators had decided that the administration of the program should go, for the most part, directly through the Departmental Offices, rather than through the *oeuvres*. The Patronage bemoaned the "hastiness of equality that pollutes all official welfare," and

---

[34]This was printed at the front of every early issue of L'Enfant.

urged the remaining involved oeuvres to diversify their action so as to respond to need rather than to provide small payments to too broad a group.[35] Although such philanthropic organizations continued to play a role in administering the program, they lost their more traditional familial mediating role in the face of the Republican effort to represent all French children on behalf of the soldier-father.

The French Child as the Link between the Dead Past and the Redemptive Future

Despite disagreements and difficulties concerning the administrative workings of the program, as well as ambiguities concerning rights and authority, the Third Republic maintained a consistent rhetorical front while representing the benefits of the new legislation. Commemorative ceremonies on November 1, 1919 (The Day of the Dead), for example, celebrated the honor and glory of the Pupils of the Nation. The daily newspaper Le Petit Parisien carried a front-page story detailing the ceremonies. After a visit to the Père Lachaise cemetery, the President of the Republic and other officials, Parisian adoptees and their mothers gathered at the Sorbonne. The children themselves were seated in rows in front of the dais, and their mothers were seated separately, emphasizing the direct relationship between the "orphans" and the paternal state. Religious representatives, including Catholic clergy and a Jewish rabbi, were present, as well as *universitaires*, including Maurice Barrès. The President gave a speech emphasizing both the fathers' sacrifice in the war effort and their trust in the Third Republic to take care of their children after their deaths. Like many political and commemorative speeches after the war, this one used the device of the dead father speaking, making his wishes known.[36]

---

[35] L'Enfant, March 15, 1919, no. 236, pp. 58-59.

[36] Jay Winter describes people's intense desire after World War I to be able to communicate with their dead loved ones, and the use of the device of the dead soldiers speaking or leading people, though he does not address the use of such rhetoric by politicians. Jay Winter, Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning The Great War in European Cultural History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 204-207.

> My children...your father, leaving you again to follow the army, gave you a last kiss the memory and emotion of which some of you who were not too young have kept and will always keep. What that supreme embracing signified, your heart has understood and retains: "If I do not return," you have said, those who have left, "if I die down there, it will be so that France can live; it will be so that, you also, you will live, that you will live freely in a reconstructed country. Make sure at least that your life will dignify my death; make sure that it is not vain, inactive, and sterile; make sure it is active, made productive by labor, and profitable to France."[37]

The father's last kiss, an inarticulate expression of paternal love, thus became a very specifically articulated last wish for all the nation's children, interpreted through the knowing sympathy of the paternalist state.

Marshal Foch's speech that day emphasized the heroic quality of the fallen, and the concomitant debt owed to families by the state. He called the children "heirs of our heroes" thus suggesting the children's own potential for heroism, and at the same time declared the "solicitude of the entire country" articulated through the Pupils of the Nation program. He called it the country's "sacred debt."[38]

Even the music played at the ceremony reiterated the main rhetorical themes for the program: Beethoven's funeral march from the *Heroic* symphony, Saint-Saens' *Funeral March*, and, significantly, Franck's *Redemption*.[39] The soldier-fathers were heroes in their deaths, the children were heroes in their survival and in their future potential, and the social role for the next generation articulated around the Pupils of the Nation program was one of redemption.

Bourgeois' speech (though he was not present; the speech was read on his behalf) emphasized the immediate necessity for families to assert their right to be honored: "All hesitation, all resistance would be criminal; it should not happen that a single one of these

---

[37] Le Petit Parisien, Nov. 2, 1919.

[38] Le Petit Parisien, Nov. 2, 1919.

[39] Le Petit Parisien, Nov. 2, 1919.

orphans should get up one day and say: 'France, my mother, abandoned me!'"[40] He thus placed the responsibility for enacting the law in the hands of the family. His reference to France as a mother reflected a whole community of mothers who, Bourgeois urged, should demand on behalf of their children that the state step in to fulfill paternal duties. Bourgeois thus seemed to consider the nation as female and the state as male. At the same time, however, the November 1 ceremonies attempted to show the entire country, represented in their unity by the state, enacting paternal responsibilities towards all French children. Le Petit Parisien concluded its description of the ceremonies by declaring that "the whole country, on the day when we celebrate our dead, through various manifestations affirmed the most pressing duties of human solidarity, that of watching over the feeble, who are the strength of tomorrow."[41] The Third Republic attempted to ensure that "the whole country" was represented by the state just as the state had sought to represent all France during the war. The reciprocity between fathers' sacrifice and the duties of mothers and children supported that effort. For mothers, their duty to represent the state would be fulfilled by demanding its protection for the sacrificed soldiers' children.

Response

In 1923, one General Curmer complained in an article published in L'Enfant that not enough mothers were enrolling their children in the Pupils of the Nation program, especially in the provinces. L'Écho de Paris had reprinted the rules for eligibility and application, emphasizing especially that portion of the program that conferred a "title of glory," which was a "kind of moral nobility" for rich and poor. "To the act of the father's death, 'dead on the field of honor,' must be answered the act of the birth of the child as a

---

[40] Le Petit Parisien, Nov. 2, 1919.

[41] Le Petit Parisien, Nov. 2, 1919.

'Pupil of the Nation.'" Despite this kind of explanation, Curmer complained, mothers in the provinces were not demanding their children's "adoption" because they did not understand the purpose of the program. They seemed to fear that it was designed to trespass on their parental rights and subsume their children to state control. By 1925, just two years after Curmer's article, the number of Pupils had reached 725,000,[42] but Curmer focused in 1923 on a recent statistic that suggested that at least a hundred thousand children were eligible who had not yet applied to the program. He suggested that there were two reasons that these children could easily be included. First, any veteran father who was still living and had successfully applied for a disability pension could almost automatically enroll his children; the process for ensuring the pension was nearly identical to that for registering the child, even when the disability was slight. Second, the time limit for the children who counted as "war orphans" had been determined from the date of demobilization, which was after the armistice: October 23, 1919. Any child born or conceived before that date was therefore eligible. With so many children eligible, Curmer asked, why did so few mothers apply?

> It is with regret that I still hear mothers say that given their social situation, they did not want and did not believe in the duty to bring about the adoption of their children: of these mothers, there are more in the provinces where prejudice reigns than in Paris. These women do not understand either the letter or the spirit of the law. When one knows well that, as M. René Viviani so rightly said, the law on the Pupils of the Nation is a law of justice illuminated by tenderness. The spirit of the law can be summed up in two words: to permit families as much as possible to raise their children as if the father were still there, or as if the father had not been diminished in his capacity to work by his wounds or by illness.[43]

It is interesting to note that Curmer placed the blame entirely on mothers even as he stated that the law applied to families where the father had survived the war. Like

---

[42]Cassin, Le Contentieux des victimes de la guerre, p. 3.

[43]Général Curmer, "Les Pupilles de la Nation," L'Enfant, Nov.-Dec. 1923, no. 266, pp. 212-214.

Bourgeois, Curmer asserted that it was the mother's duty to demand paternal protection for their children. This reflects both French custom and French law concerning paternalism within the family. The mother acted as a moral supplicant on behalf of her children, but did not take on the full duty for their well-being herself, beyond representing them to their father. Thus, although the right and duty to education still remained first and foremost the father's, after the war it was the mother who carried the burden of making sure that duty was fulfilled. This should be carried out "as if the father were still there"--now represented directly by the state.

While French children were to be the heroes who regenerated and redeemed French society after World War I, they were also seen as weak and in need of protection. The Third Republic played both sides of this coin when it protected children precisely because of their heroic sacrifice of their primary protectors--their fathers. Rather than seeing mothers as a group of willing and able substitutes for familial patriarchal authority, the state portrayed them as dutiful in their role of supplicant to the father or father-figure on behalf of their children. In depicting the Nation in the mother's role, the state asserted its own ability to represent the French people, both as a governmental entity protecting the Nation in wartime and as a moral person protecting the next generation in peacetime. Ambiguity about the gendered aspect of familial authority was simultaneously supported and controlled through the increased state control over the "normal" French child articulated through the Pupils of the Nation program. The sense that the Third Republic owed a debt to the French people for their wartime service was fulfilled by adopting metaphorically fatherless war "orphans." New state institutions took over a philanthropic and therefore apparently caring role towards French children and their families even while they effectively augmented governmental control. The Pupils of the Nation program drew on diverse versions of France's past and future, but it relied most of all on a pseudo-traditional patriarchal family motif to shift adult authority over all French children from parents to the surrogate state.

While the Third Republic was creating new relationships between French children and state institutions, especially through education, other ways for young people to relate to the rest of French society, and to one another, were also created in this period. State initiatives like the *Pupilles de la Nation* program, along with other educational reforms, competed with other influences over the increasingly separate and distinct cultural space of French childhood. The next two chapters examine how both youth groups and the youth press also sought to redirect the French child's relationships to other French people.

# CHAPTER 5

## YOUTH GROUPS: SCOUTING AND THE ÉQUIPES SOCIALES

Wartime patriotism, mandated through adult guidance, continued after the war's end to foster greater awareness of unity among youth themselves. Youth groups played an important part in raising the collective consciousness of youth in France during the interwar years.[1] Outside of the school system, youth groups served to educate French young people to particular sets of values, to shape their friendships and their activities. Organized and directed by adults, most groups did not foster youth autonomy, however. Understanding the groups' imagined social and cultural strength for shaping the future sheds light on broader conceptions of youth's social and cultural role in relation to France's recovery from World War I. Youth groups functioned to mediate young people's relationships both to one another and to the rest of French society. This was partly due to family disruption caused by the war and partly because of the idea of the *union sacrée* as applied to young people, as well as related ideas about supporting communication between youth. Every group's ultimate goal was to maintain or improve young people's grasp of the values of *civilisation*--however defined--thus improving France's future. This applied on two levels: within the nation and on a cooperative and/or competitive international scale.

At their core, youth groups provided an education, sometimes in conjunction with familial education or the school system, sometimes outside of or in conflict with official sources of education. Some groups had relatively straightforward goals: Christian youth groups, like the Jeunesse Ouvrier Chrétien (JOC) and the Jeunesse Agricole Chrétien (JAC) for example, sought above all to instill Christian values in group members and to

---

[1]Antoine Prost, "Jeunesse et Société dans la France de l'Entre-Deux-Guerres,"Vingtième Siècle 13 (Jan.-March 1987): 41-42.

extol such virtues to the nation at large.[2] Some groups, like the extremely popular scouting movement, or the considerably smaller Équipes sociales run by New Humanist Robert Garric, were more complex, particularly in terms of the nature of the reforms they sought to bring about. The Boy Scouts were generally supported by the Third Republic, but the Équipes sociales sought more strongly counter-institutional ends, and did not gain state support. A comparison of the underlying philosophy and the practices of these two groups illuminates competing sources of authority over youth culture during the interwar years. Whereas authority within the school system was, by the 1920s, fairly well-determined, extracurricular activities remained more open to different ideological forces. The Boy Scout movement reformulated a combination of French traditional and new scientific views of childhood, while the more radical Équipes sociales sought to provide a new experiential and humanist base for youth development.

## The Éclaireurs: Early Initiatives

The French were introduced to the Boy Scout movement just before World War I. This occurred through a combination of events, beginning with press coverage of the British movement founded by Colonel Robert Baden-Powell in 1908, and including personal contacts between the British scouting movement, sometimes directly with its founder, and several French men, among them Protestant pastors and military officers, who carried the movement back to France. Small imitative groups immediately sprang up throughout France, with largely divergent interpretations but always with a distinctly French twist given to the movement's aims. Most early groups in France were both religiously-oriented and paramilitaristic in some combination. The smaller groups' leaders, many of them Catholic, gave a variety of names to their groups, such as the Milice Saint-Michel, the Avant-garde Saint-Lazare, the Intrépides du Rosaire, and the

[2]See Gerard Cholvy, Histoire des organisations et mouvements chrétiens de jeunesse en France XIXe-XXe siècle (Paris: Les Éditions de Cerf, 1999).

Diables blancs[3]. The largest groups to spring up used the French translation of "scout"--*éclaireur*--to denote the boys aged 12 to 16 who were the primary focus of the movement.[4]

By 1912, both the Protestant Éclaireurs unionistes and the laic Éclaireurs de France were officially launched, drawing more than 12,000 boys by the eve of the Great War.[5] The Catholic groups either joined the laics or remained autonomous. Catholic groups were not pulled together into a single organization until 1920. The delay was due in large part to opposition from the Church (though not necessarily the French clergy) based on the Protestant nature of the British movement. There were also many pre-existing Catholic youth groups, and some Catholic clergy felt no need for more.[6] Yet the ideals of *scoutisme* were attractive to the majority Catholics as well as French Protestants, Jews, and secularists. Many Catholics joined the laic movement, which despite its commitment to toleration and unity for the movement, was led in part by Catholic clergy and devout laymen. Many of these were particularly enamored of the paramilitary aspects of the Scouts, admiring the systematic and ordered nature of the organization.[7] The Protestant Unionistes also had a strongly militaristic self-policing component.

An article in Le Matin from March, 1914, clearly shows the paramilitary profile of the French scouts even before the war, as well as a perception of the scouts' policing

---

[3]Philippe Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France: l'évolution du mouvement des origines aux années 80 (Paris: Cerf, 1985), p. 64.

[4]See Pierre Kergomard and Pierre Français, Histoire des Éclaireurs de France de 1911 à 1951 (France: Éclaireuses et Éclaireurs de France, 1983); Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France; Jean-Dominique Eude, Les Fondateurs du scoutisme Catholique en France (Chambray-les-Tours: C.L.D., 1992); and Cholvy, L'Histoire des organisation et mouvements chrétiens, esp. Chapter 6.

[5]Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France, p. 57.

[6]Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France, p. 62.

[7]Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France, p. 44-46.

function among youth.[8] The headline read, "The Little War of the Scouts," and detailed the clash between one Parisian troop and a band of *apaches*, the nickname for youths belonging to street gangs. The scout troop, comprising about sixty boys between the ages of 11 and 18, were on an outing to visit a monument to the Franco-Prussian War. Marching in the street on the way there, they exchanged insults with a gang of street toughs, but were quieted by the scout leader--their *commandant*. On the return journey that evening, as dark was falling, the two groups met again, and this time both sides were prepared. A ten-minute melée ensued, with the scouts wielding their batons, their bugles, and their camping knives, while the apaches fired revolvers. When more apaches showed up, the scouts, outnumbered, "made a retreat" to a nearby police station, while shots continued to be fired (note the lack of "civilized" conduct of the enemy). The apaches fled before the police arrived at the scene. The tone of the article was admiring: the scouts had no deaths and but a single wounded, a bugler who had been shot in the thigh. When the bicycle-riding police arrived at "the battlefield," they discovered dozens of caps, three lambswool vests, two revolvers and a piece of an ear. Mixing metaphors somewhat, the author then referred to the street boys as "*fuyards*," or deserters, who were long gone, having removed their wounded themselves. The article described the apaches' losses as more serious than those of the scouts, and clearly portrayed the boy scouts/soldiers as the victors in this "little war" because of their military order and their higher degree of civilized conduct.[9]

In addition to militarism, and often in conjunction with militarism, as the "Little War" illustrates, the Boy Scout movement appealed as a way to develop moral character.

---

[8]Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France, p. 26. Laneyrie points to Baden-Powell's "realist" efforts to engage the Boy Scouts in service to the police, and that the British costume imitated the uniform of the South African police. Colonel Baden-Powell was involved in the siege of Mafeking. Laneyrie also cites a 1913 incident, much-publicized in France, when a British scout troop captured an "authentic poacher" in the Epping forest.

[9]Le Matin, March 5, 1914.

The French thought of this as a form of education and thus subject to pedagogical theory. The religious component, especially among the Protestant scouts, also had missionary appeal, as part of a process of Christianizing youth, and subsequently, French society as a whole. The Éclaireurs Unionistes rose directly from an existing Protestant movement called the Union Chrétien de jeunes gens, and thus easily filled the ranks of their burgeoning scout troops.

Another important element in formation of character was the interest of one scout leader in particular, Pierre de Coubertin, who was involved with the Society of Popular Sports, and was well-known as the restorer of the Olympic Games in the 1890s. Under the influence of English progressive ideals like those of Thomas Arnold and also of the more permissive interpretation of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Émile, Coubertin saw organized sports, and especially the value of teamwork, as an ideal way to form the moral character of French youth. He successfully incorporated a degree of sports participation among the laic group of Scouts, the Éclaireurs de France. His attack on traditional pedagogy, however, also earned him some opponents, and the sports angle of the scout movement never went as far as Coubertin would have liked.[10] Nevertheless, a "*congrès-challenge*"--a combination sporting event and general assembly--held in 1920 by the Éclaireurs de France in response to Coubertin's efforts added to the organized nature of the scout movement in France.

The French Boy Scouts as an Organized National Movement: Henry Marty

It was the interest of pedagogues, rather than militarists, religious leaders, or sports aficionados, that emerged to carry the Boy Scouts forward in the years following the war.[11] Two of the leaders of the laic movement, Georges Bertier and Henry Marty,

---

[10]Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France, pp. 47-48.

[11]Kergomard and Français, Histoire des Éclaireurs de France, pp. 52-53.

were especially well-known as the directors of the École des Roches, a private school that had been founded just before the turn of the century in imitation of British "new education" schools. Additionally, Bertier and Marty edited a journal titled L'Éducation which contained articles and reviews (national and international) about numerous aspects of education and legislation concerning children and adolescents. Marty was named international commissioner at the scout congress of 1920, with the goal of bringing together the three major groups of French Boy Scouts--the Éclaireurs Unionistes, the Éclaireurs de France, and the newly formed Catholic group, the Scouts de France--and connecting all these groups to the international scout movement headed by its founder, Colonel Baden-Powell.[12] The effort took several years, but by 1924 the organization was in place. Because Marty was an English teacher, he was able to communicate easily with Baden-Powell, a major reason for his election to the post. Marty also proved to be an ardent publicist of the scout movement, publishing articles in L'Éducation and L'Enfant touting the program's social value.[13]

Marty's vision for the French Boy Scout movement shows some surprising twists. Because both the École des Roches and the Éclaireurs de France were laic organizations, it should not be assumed that Marty's attitude was, therefore, anticlerical. He was a fervent, publicly practicing Catholic whose highest standard for youth was obedience to order, authority, and hierarchy. His devotion to new education (*nouvelle éducation*) did not necessarily suggest an interest in "progressive" pedagogy as practiced in England. In an article written in 1918, he argued that the war had awakened the teachers who had

---

[12]Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France, pp. 51-52.

[13]Marty's support for *scoutisme* was attacked in the pages of L'Éducation Familiale, when Jean Véhennes argued that Marty was trying to replace parental and extended family authority with that of the scout leaders. Véhennes wrote that "the normal milieu of the child is the complete family." Marty responded that for families that were capable of overseeing their children's vacations and holidays, the scouts were unnecessary, but that for many families, it was much needed. For reprints of this debate, see Jean Véhennes, "Les Boy Scouts et le Scouting," L'Enfant, July 1913, no. 213, pp. 133-135; Henri Marty, "Les Boy Scouts et le Scouting," L'Enfant, Sept. 1913, no. 215, pp. 166-168; and Jean Véhennes, "Les Boy Scouts et le Scouting," January 1914, no. 219, pp. 13-16.

served in the army to the importance of hierarchies and the need for order and authority. This would bring about a reform in the schools, he suggested, as teachers began to implement their new perception within the educational establishment. From a system where teachers and students seemed to be on different sides, divided by the complete authority of teachers on the one hand and the complete lack of authority among students on the other, a new hierarchical continuum based on "natural" leadership would arise. Although reformist, Marty's vision did not support youth autonomy or permissiveness.

> Authority and real order flow from nature itself and the living conditions of this society in miniature that is the school. The most recent theories, those of Dewey, for example, see in the school a social grouping well-characterized by and bringing out the constant relations that it has with society itself. Nothing is more true, and it is still in that society of war that is the modern army, that in a concrete fashion we see how these apparently archaic ideas of order and of authority are essential for the functioning of our scholarly organism and how they agree with our ideal of the free and joyous blooming of the faculties of the child.[14]

Marty thus described *nouvelle éducation* as a pedagogical model that encouraged young people's efforts within an authoritarian yet meritocratic kind of hierarchy, emulating French society and especially the continuing influence of the military. He also argued that the French Boy Scout organization had the same pedagogical goals.

Georges Bertier had started a group of scouts at the École des Roches in 1911, and was instrumental in founding the laic Éclaireurs de France; in 1921 he became the president of that organization. Coubertin, whose complaints with traditional educational practices included dislike of religious education, found that organization not laic enough, and in turn helped found an alternate laic group, the Éclaireurs Français. This group, backed by the Ligue d'éducation nationale, was both more strongly secular and more nationalist and militarist, rejecting the nationalistically British aspects as well as the

---

[14]Henri Marty, "L'Éducateur aux armées," L'Éducation, March 1918, pp. 25-29.

religious aspects of the movement.[15] Bertier and Marty supported religious education, but in a broad and tolerant fashion, encompassing whatever religious beliefs young people (and their families) might hold. Bertier's original troop was made up of the relatively well-off bourgeois students of his school, and this undoubtedly helped to shape his and Marty's views of the organization's "civilizing" component. He and Marty saw the scout movement as a panacea for all social ills, and argued that its pedagogical methods were the same as those of the École des Roches.

When Marty was elected to the post of international commissioner in 1920, he became the sole representative of the French Boy Scouts within Baden-Powell's international committee. Although his nomination was made from within the laic group, the other groups attending the congress assented. When the bureau interfédéral du scoutisme français was created a short time after, Marty was again elected, confirming the laic group's choice.[16] Both nationally and internationally, Marty was a spokesperson for the Boy Scouts generally, and not merely for the laic group, yet clearly his understanding of the movement and its aims was marked both by his involvement with the "new" but not necessarily progressive École des Roches and with the laic but not secular Éclaireurs de France.

## The Scouting Movement as Social Cure and Preventative: Hierarchy and Leadership

In the same year that Marty was elected to the international office, a scouting "jamboree" was held in England. Marty described the glory of scoutism's internationalism in the pages of L'Éducation. In Marty's description of the event, we can see how the scouting movement was simultaneously national and international, having two nested levels of organization. With almost 900,000 scouts worldwide and

[15]Many years later, in the 1960s, this smaller group did join with the much larger Éclaireurs de France. Philippe Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France, pp. 51-52.

[16]Kergomard and Français, Histoire des Éclaireurs de France, cf. 2, p. 69.

representatives from twenty-three countries present at the 1920 London celebration, Marty saw the jamboree as an amazing and modern phenomenon.

> While Europe still boils and its wounds are gaping, while the League of Nations, poorly established, vacillates before taking form, we have been witness to the realization of an extraordinarily lively union between young boys eleven to nineteen years old, gathered around their national standards, abdicating nothing of their particular national ideal, but having found a singularly strong connection, vivified by the eternal spirit of youth which, the heroic tombs freshly dug, comes out more beautiful and purer and which is otherwise stronger than the treaties and the alliance pacts drafted by politicians and diplomats.[17]

Marty proposed to his readers that scoutism should be examined for its particular application in France. The paradoxical aspect of the French taking on a nationalistic youth movement developed in another country was thus explained by Marty through an image of international unity represented also (though more weakly) by the League of Nations, where each country retained its own character and sense of identity but came together in commitment to a higher ideal. The way that the scouting movement would help French youth develop moral character would support, not efface, the particulars of national identity.

In a 1921 article for L'Éducation, Marty extolled the benefits of open-air camping. In reference to the variety of camps available at the time, including the relatively new *colonies de vacances*, Marty argued that merely focusing on physical health was not enough. Imitating American "summer camps," he suggested, was a good idea, but, he asked "Is that to say that it is ideal?" The problem, he argued, lay with the camp directors' difficulties in forging appropriate *discipline* and *surveillance*. This was especially true for open-air camps, with many and distant tents scattered about the countryside. Although such camps did represent a type of *nouvelle éducation*, "it is sometimes dangerous to put old wine in new flasks." Like a student coming out of a

---

[17] L'Éducation, Nov. 1920, no. 7, pp. 304-306.

traditional school and going to a "new" school like the École des Roches, who suffered a "fatal setback," a camp with campers who were unprepared for the experience would fail. It was not that he condemned such camps, he strongly asserted, but that the camps needed something more. They required an overarching national organization, nested similarly to the organization of the international boy scout movement expressed through the London jamboree.

> But over these tents we must float a pavilion that, next to the national flag, next also to emblems of religious beliefs, will show that they are inhabited by children prepared for this free life and capable of appreciating its charms as well as submitting to its beneficial and profound influence.[18]

According to Marty, the Boy Scout camps, as well as all those camps that followed the same method, had such a pavilion--a metaphorical super-tent encompassing all the smaller religiously- divided tents--suggesting both the building of an organization and evoking the ideals of chivalry popularly connected with the boy scouts.[19]

> If we attribute a greater valor to the scout camps, it is because they are an organ of a complete and coherent education...of responsibility, voluntary and spontaneous discipline, life in hierarchical patrols, continuous activity and above all adhesion and submission to the scout law and to its high ideal of individual perfection and of social service.[20]

Again, Marty emphasized the notion of adhering to particulars of cultural identity and yet coming together in support of a higher ideal.

Despite his own involvement with the laic group, Marty cheered the creation of the Catholic Scouts de France. In recounting an article written by a Catholic scout leader in 1921, Marty suggested that the Catholic adoption of scouting principles would strengthen the religion. Although the Catholic Church was still uneasy about scoutism,

---

[18]L'Éducation, Nov. 1921, no. 2, p. 71.

[19]Laneyrie, Les Scouts de France, p. 105; "Message de M. Georges Bertier aux Éclaireurs de France," L'Éducation, Feb. 1922, pp. 197-199.

[20]L'Éducation, Nov. 1921, no. 2, p. 71.

many of the French Catholic clergy supported it. Marty agreed that scoutism was not truly English nor even new, but rather came from the history of chivalry, a Christian idea as old as the Middle Ages. The distrust of British pedagogy by some Catholic leaders was echoed in their fear of the Boy Scout movement, a distrust Marty sought to dispel all around. In the same issue, Marty wrote a review of a book on education by the Abbé Béthléem which included some criticism of new education. Marty wrote respectfully that the Abbé did not understand that the École des Roches had *adapted and transformed* the British theories, that *nouvelle éducation* did *not* follow the suggestion that obedience, respect, and filial fear were bad for children's development.[21] He stalwartly defended the pedagogy of both *nouvelle éducation* and the Boy Scouts on the grounds that it was Frenchified, that is, adapted to France's particular traditions and needs.

Baden-Powell himself focused on the idea of the method of the Boy Scouts rather than its specific content, and encouraged the use of the scouting method in schools, including at the university level, in all the countries participating in the international movement. He especially praised the American scouts and schools. This scouting method that the Americans followed especially well, according to Baden-Powell, most importantly encouraged self-development and good habits.[22] Bertier, like Marty, focused more heavily on the notion of leadership and the development of the group into a "natural" hierarchy. In an article titled, "How to Form Chiefs?" Bertier described a leader as someone with self-control, "confident without presumption, optimistic without illusions," loyal, honest, and useful. He is constantly in action, consistently creative, and although proud of his acts, doesn't rest on his laurels.

> He has learned authority in the school of obedience; complete chief that he is, he knows how to obey and his will imposes itself that much better on those who depend on him that it shows itself more disciplined in relation

---

[21] L'Éducation, May 1921, no. 13, p. 565.

[22] L'Éducation, July 1922, no. 10, pp. 487-489.

> to those on whom he depends. He knows men, knows how to choose his collaborators and place them where they should be; he knows their strength and their weakness...[23]

According to Bertier, this kind of natural leadership quality arose from among the students themselves, so that in schools like the École des Roches, there were school captains just as in the Boy Scouts there were chiefs. These school captains were from among the eldest students, ready to move on to take their place in a Grande École, prepared to engage in the life of the country through their work. They understood better than the teachers the moral mission they filled in relation to the younger students. They understood that their efforts were not for themselves as individuals, and kept the group's well-being constantly in mind, especially relying on the concept of teamwork and common goals.

Leaders arrived at this ability through experience of the natural hierarchy of the school, stretching in a continuum from the students to the teachers.

> Thus, from childhood, begins a hierarchy of functions for which each is adapted to the age and experience of the child and that constantly prepares him for the responsibilities that he will have to carry as a man.[24]

Bertier commended Baden-Powell for having developed this system that worked just as well in a village as in a city, for poor families as for wealthy, and predicted that this was the way to form future leaders for France.

Another proponent of scoutism, Michel le Bourdellés, concurred, arguing that democracies needed leaders--an elite--and that the Boy Scouts would furnish such an elite through the creation of chiefs and of cadres. He argued that the bourgeois and aristocratic sons had an obligation to become such chiefs, but that current educational methods did not produce good ones. Boys from the more "democratic" classes could also become chiefs if they merited it. The lower middle classes, which had shown themselves so

---

[23] L'Éducation, July 1922, no. 10, pp. 489-495.

[24] L'Éducation, July 1922, no. 10, p. 489-495.

strong during the war, were particularly in danger of having too much power while yet lacking the proper French character for leadership. Scoutism would ameliorate France's youth, no matter to what class they belonged, and the best among them would rise within the scout hierarchy to prepare for leadership in France's future.[25]

Another scout proponent, M. J. Salomon, pressed for scoutism to reach down to the primary school level, to begin preparing young boys early for such leadership. At that point, they could belong to the "*louveteaux*" (in the United States, the "cub scouts"). Salomon suggested that all opportunities for "self-government" should be offered, though at that age, the teacher would need to work harder to maintain discipline and would serve as the chief. This would require that more boy scouts became teachers as they grew older, as they would be best prepared for such a position. Salomon commented that older scouts were taking scoutism into the normal schools (teacher training schools), which was a good thing, because if it were not explained properly and on the basis of experience, the movement might be considered militarist and nationalist, when in fact it was peaceful and taught children to love and serve their country.[26] Unlike Marty, Salomon saw the order and natural authority of the scout movement as disconnected from war itself. In his description, the civilizing capability of the scouts was aimed inward, towards developing moral character and leadership abilities among French youth for the betterment of the country. Whereas Marty drew out the military order inherent in the movement's organization, Salomon was not so approving of the military experience, separating authority in the scouts from what he saw as an arbitrary and absolute authority in the military, and separating chivalric activities from martial preparation.[27]

---

[25]L'Éducation, Oct. 1922, no. 1, pp. 30-32. Bourdellés also argued that scoutism "adapts itself to all the races," and that French scoutism was a national movement. L'Éducation, July 1922, no. 10, pp. 498-499.

[26]There was a section of the Catholic Boy Scouts unique to France called "Les Routiers" which involved older, university age youth. Aude, Les Fondateurs du scoutisme catholique en France, p. 77.

[27]L'Éducation, Jan. 1925, no. 4, pp. 219-222.

In 1923, Marty published a short article in both L'Éducation and L'Enfant relaying a statement made at the 1922 International Congress of Scoutism, and explaining the role scoutism played in preventing and combating juvenile criminality. He gave an example from the director of a reform school in Denmark where a scout troop had been established, saying that the boys had not committed any serious acts of misconduct, fought, nor used rude language. Marty extended this success to similar possibilities for abandoned and delinquent children in France.[28]

A proponent of the female scouting movement, Renée Sainte-Claire Deville argued similarly for the youngest of the girl scouts, the *petites ailes*, or little wings, for girls 6-12, part of the single feminine scout group, the Fédération Française des Éclaireuses. "At mid-path, between healthy childhood and guilty [*coupable*, or delinquent] childhood, there are many little beings that constitute 'childhood in moral danger,' well-deserving of our attention for an energetic preventative action." Sainte-Claire Deville pointed to the ability of the scout movement to keep children off the streets and under proper adult supervision at all times, even when parents were working or otherwise occupied. She focused on activities that taught girls to be moral servants to those in need and those that developed their coordination and teamwork through sports.[29]

Several years later, Claire Halphen-Istel, addressed the First Congress for the Study of Questions Relative to the Organization of Teaching in the Second Degree, held in the spring of 1936 at le Havre, and argued similarly for the moral benefits of scoutism and the parents' role in supporting the movement. She urged families to stand behind their children's interest in the movement, and not pull them in a different moral direction, on the basis that this was best for the child and upheld the scout ideal of peace rather than argumentation. There was an increasing generation gap between parents and children,

---

[28] L'Éducation, Feb. 1923, no. 5, pp. 342-343; L'Enfant, March-April 1923, no. 262, p. 61.

[29] L'Enfant, Feb. 1923, no. 261, pp. 22-24.

she argued, that the Boy and Girl Scouts could bridge, if the parents were accepting of the moral values of scoutism.

> Scoutism is an excellent means to channel [*canaliser*] a natural need for independence, inherent in a certain stage of childhood development.--Even if he has brothers and sisters, the child wants to have the impression of choosing friends of his age; he wants to fly under his own wings. The vigilant mother of a family should be careful not to let him fall into the danger of mediocre friendships. If he is an adherent of scoutism, what moral relief for his parents! Under the direction of a Chief or a Chieftaine, often creatures of the elite or raised above themselves by the ideal of their task, the child will find friends of his own age and will work with them to develop himself and to make himself useful to others. He will thus acquire a social spirit that will later elevate him above his own personality, like his Chief or her Chieftaine.[30]

She outlined the basics of the ideal of the Éclaireuses, which she said was the same as that for the Éclaireurs, and argued that "scoutism forms strong characters and proposes an ideal at the same time general and personal." She described an ideal social environment to which individualism is subsumed but which did not "squelch the individual ideal." As with other descriptions of individualism in the scouting movement, Halphen-Istel assumed that the hierarchical leadership in scoutism encouraged individual development while at the same time maintaining the good of the social group as its highest goal. Ultimately, what was good for society was for parents to give in to the educational or developmental role of the scouts. This was especially important for children at that stage of development where the *appearance* of individual choice of friendships mattered, presumably the years between 12 and 18 or so. Scouting thus seemed to pick up the slack at the stage at which parental control was potentially weakest.

Halphen-Istel, like Marty and Bertier, was a proponent of the "new" educational methods of Decroly and Montessori, especially in their respect for the individual, but such programs, she complained, were not, for the most part, available at the secondary

---

[30]Claire Halphen-Istel, "Le Scoutisme et la Morale" in 1er Congrés pour l'étude des questions relatives à l'organisation de l'Enseignement du second degré, 31 mai au 4 juin 1936 au Havre, Section IV, no. 37.

level. It required a strong family life to combat the dangers to development that this represented, but, she asserted, such a family life was extremely rare at that time. Thus some kind of after-school organization was needed. Hallphen-Istel contributed another paper at the same Congress that called for an after school "Library Club." Its purpose would be to provide a place where children could do homework and leisure activities under adult supervision. Similarly, she suggested that this was important especially in families where the mother was too much occupied with work or with younger children to oversee her older children's activities. She argued that the role of the professor in the lycée was limited, and divided between too many children in a class to offer effective guidance that would extend beyond the classroom. Most students found secondary schooling to be like a "barracks," where the thing to do was to become just like all the other students. She asserted her belief that a Library Club "could be a wonderful *préventorium* against crime: the delinquent child is not, most of the time, anything other than a child left without supervision during leisure time." Her use of the word "preventorium," evoked an institutionalized sort of preventative, and indeed that neatly fitted her conception of the need for specialized children's libraries with organized supervision linked to the schools but more individualized than the schools.[31]

This institutionalization of the secondary schooler's leisure time, including homework, reading, physical games and companionship, would result in, "healthy, strong, good citizens, capable of raising again the physical and moral level of France." Clearly, Halphen-Istel saw this Library Club as filling a role similar to that of the Scout organizations, though the hierarchical organization of the former would be clearly adult, whereas the scouts developed leadership among the youth themselves, though in a continuum under adult leadership.

---

[31]Claire Halphen-Istel, "Adaptation du projet d'un Club-Bibliothèque à L'Enseignement secondaire," in 1er Congrés pour l'étude des questions relatives à l'organisation de l'Ensiegnement du second degré, 31 mai au 4 juin 1936 au Havre, Section IV.

Halphen-Istel also described the scouting movement as having a strongly spiritual program, though tolerant of whichever religious belief a scout held. Despite Halphen-Istel's assertion that the Girl Scout ideal was the same as that for the Boy Scouts, for girls that spiritual mission aimed to educate the French woman, to form her as a being "conscientious about her duties as mother, as wife, and as (female) citizen." She would learn to be obedient as well as to command, to be well-organized and to make do in the face of challenges, to cook, and ultimately to "extend her conception of the family to the whole human family." This would be to "form a French woman more feminine than all others, not falsely coquettish and preoccupied with petty questions." All this would prepare her to make the world a better place by doing the best she could within her own "little sphere." Apparently this type of spiritual mission rose above and encompassed religious differences, and was specifically set against the image of the frivolous woman and the *garçonne*, or boyish woman, as well as against delinquency.[32]

Much earlier, Marty had similarly argued that the scout movement would aid pronatalist efforts, but in its capacity to form good fathers. In an article in L'Éducation in 1921, he specifically explained how scoutism would aid efforts to raise the birthrate in France. The cause of this problem, he suggested, was not merely economic but clearly corresponded to a lowering of public morality. To be a good father was to be both physically and morally capable of "founding" a family. The physical benefits of scouting would prevent morally degenerative fatherhood.

> Who could not see the connection between this education and the problem of natality? To whom will these laws or these exhortations apply if the future heads of families are sedentary anemics, urban weaklings, men sapped since childhood by artificial (*fabriqué*) poisons that debilitate civilization?[33]

---

[32]Claire Halphen-Istel, "Le Scoutisme et la morale."

[33]L'Éducation, Nov. 1920, no. 7, pp. 450-454.

Added to physical health would be purity of heart, because "the ideal of the Scout is an ideal of virility and self-mastery" which will urge the young man to recognize the pure and healthy joy of family well-being "based on duty strictly accomplished." Such duties were, Marty complained, opposed by the demoralizing quality of "the spectacles of the street and of the establishments so-called artistic, by the book, the magazine or the example." The Boy Scouts would create a disgust of such low things, which "would certainly contribute to national recovery (*relèvement*)." Scoutism would teach boys to internalize moral values, to take responsibility, to take risks, and to be willing courageously to accept the sacrifices of founding a large family. The patriotic element of scoutism would lend to those sacrifices an understanding of higher purpose. Additionally, like Halphen-Istel, Marty emphasized the way scoutism could take some of the burden of moral upbringing off parents of large families by taking charge of children's leisure time. He quoted Royet's dedication to mothers in his manual on the Boy Scouts, which read "Entrust us with your sons, we will make them better for you, stronger and more loving." He ended with a rousing call to pronatalists, urging them to support the Boy Scouts because "the duties of the father of a family are clearly exposed to young Éclaireurs."[34] Despite Marty's and others' emphasis on the newest pedagogical theories, their understanding of the role of scoutism remained strongly traditional.

The gendered organization of the scouts, along with ideals of hierarchy and leadership, sacrifice and selflessness, was intended to create a new generation that would restructure France by doing what the older generation had been taught to do, but better, more completely, and more wholeheartedly. Above all, scouts would learn to submit to hierarchical authority willingly, for the benefit of society as a whole, because of the "naturally" meritocratic nature of leadership within the scout movement. They would "freely" learn self-mastery, will power, and the glories of selfless sacrifice, and in

---

[34] L'Éducation, Nov. 1920, no. 7, pp. 450-454.

exchange they would reap the approbation of both their leaders and their peers, and prepare themselves to undertake roles of responsibility. Also, they would be prepared to move--to the degree to which they had merited or achieved it, and in reflection of existing French social values--into positions of authority. The notion of the competent, respectful, and caring commander was the most important concern of French scoutism, a new method to create a new elite, a need that seemed especially important after World War I.

The Équipes Sociales: Reforming the Bourgeoisie through a New, Spiritual Humanism

At the same time that the scouting movement became nationally and internationally organized, another youth group grew up with the same goal of discovering and promoting a new youth elite, but which used different methods. The key to New Humanist Robert Garric's Équipes sociales, founded in 1921, was the idea of "intereducation."[35] This movement's goal was far more intellectual and philosophical than that of the scouting movement. The Équipes were organized like classes, with an atmosphere more closely paralleling that of the schools, and placed no emphasis on physical development nor on leisure or vacation activities. The kind of education received in these classes, most often taught in the evening and on weekends, offered an alternative cultural experience to that of the schools. Like the scouts, the Équipes were intended to create a new kind of citizen/subject for France and for the civilized world. Rather than devise an organization with a strong hierarchy and a powerful sense of order and authority, however, Garric built on his experience of trench fraternity to conceive a plan whereby youth would educate one another, in an environment of equality and mutual respect.

Garric, only 22 years old at the end of World War I, had already followed a distinguished academic career, despite a year spent in war service. He received his

[35]R. Garric, P. Tézenas de Montcel, P. Deffontaines, R. Lambry, Les Équipes sociales: Esprit et methodes (Paris: Éditions de la Revue des Jeunes, Desclée et Cie., 1924), pp. 12, 23.

*agrégation* in 1919 and took a professorial post at a private school in Neuilly.[36] That same year, he became involved with the *cercles d'études* run by the Sisters of Saint Vincent de Paul. For the benefit of the working classes, these study circles provided further education, especially of a professional or vocational sort, to young workers whose formal education had ended. While involved with this program, Garric had the idea of expanding the classes and better organizing them, in an effort to bring together members of the bourgeois educated elite youth and the working class youth. He envisioned it as a way to end future class warfare by creating greater sympathy and mutual respect between classes, and engaging all French youth in the common goal of restructuring French society.[37]

He hoped to recreate the camaraderie and teamwork that he had experienced with working class soldiers in the trenches. In an interview many years later in the early 1960s, Garric explained his youthful enlightenment as a soldier, saying that he realized that all the soldiers he had met, including the working class soldiers, had demonstrated a hunger for a professional, general, human culture. The working class soldiers had a "philosophical curiosity" and "great possibilities for personal reflection." After the war, he felt that both workers and bourgeois intellectuals would benefit from "this new humanism" that he had discovered on the front. The Équipes sociales seemed to Garric to fulfill this promise. He asserted that workers managed in three or four years to catch up to regular university students, because of their enthusiasm and diligence. He also said that he thought the teachers--professors, engineers, artists, *industriels*--were "no longer able to consider their working companions as other than friends whose psychology and

---

[36]Madeleine Danièlou ran this school, where Emmanuel Mounier later also taught. John Hellman, Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left 1930-1950 (Toronto and Buffalo, University of Toronto Press, 1981), pp. 26, 43.

[37]See "Hommage à Robert Garric," Revue de la Haute-Auvergne, Jan-June 1968, and "Robert Garric et son milieu intellectual entre les deux guerres," Vie Sociale, Nov.-Dec., no. 6, 1997. Put out by the Centre d'Études, de Documentation, d'Information et d'Actions Sociales, this special edition contained a combination of a special conference on Garric and a selection of his writings from the interwar years.

needs they understood."[38] This "understanding" Garric saw happening primarily on the part of bourgeois youth, who, like himself prior to the war, had lacked sympathy for workers. Although Garric has sometimes been accused of attempting a kind of embourgeoisement of the working class, his own assertions suggest that it was the bourgeoisie he thought most needed reform.[39] Unlike one of his literary heroes, Péguy, Garric sought to effect such reform from within, on the basis of fraternal love and greater knowledge of lifestyles, work, and perceptions between classes.

Religion: Spiritual Commitment and Mutuality of Feeling

Garric was a Catholic, and the initial push for his movement stemmed from a Catholic organization, but the Équipes sociales were a non-confessional group, like the laic Boy Scouts, supportive of whichever religion participants had. Garric's sense of fraternity was of a distinctly Christian sort; he spoke eloquently to his students about Jesus and His mission, and it was mainly Catholic youth who were drawn to the group.[40] One former équipier later remembered Garric making it clear that he wanted only Catholics to be teachers in the group; at one time Garric turned away a group of Protestants who approached him, saying that he would help them to organize a separate Protestant group parallel to the Équipes, but he that did not want any specific identity ascribed to his group because it was important to maintain the specific religious beliefs of each participant in the Équipes. Given that Protestant groups at that time, for example, the Protestant Boy Scouts, did incorporate an evangelical or proselytizing component in

[38]Michel Manoll, Entretiens avec Robert Garric (Paris: Les Éditions de l'Épargne, 1970), pp. 52-59.

[39]Some contemporary critics of Garric's, as well as some historians, have suggested that Garric's efforts to rise above political struggles was a blind spot on his part and that by ignoring that fundamental aspect of working-class life, Garric was automatically led into prescribing values for them with an underlying bourgeois quality. See "Robert Garric et son milieu intellectual entre les deux guerres," pp. 60 (556), p. 64 (560), and p. 103 (599) for examples and commentary; see also Cholvy, Histoire des organisations et mouvements chrétiens, p. 146.

[40]Cholvy, Histoire des organisations et mouvements chrétiens, p. 145.

their activities, Garric's comment could be interpreted as having been an effort to maintain the non-confessional nature of the Équipes, rather than to limit it solely to Catholics. Garric spoke years later of wanting to allow into the movement any young people whose spiritual views were "analogous" to those of the Christian fraternity and spirit that Garric extolled.[41] This aspect of the nature of Garric's movement remains open to different interpretations; it seems such disagreements existed at the time. Still, clearly the group's mission was not a Christianizing one, and despite support from some Catholic Modernist priests especially, such as Père Sertillanges, Garric made no effort to engage his youthful flock with the Church itself. The équipiers' mission was above all a humanist one.[42] Unlike Henry Marty's vision of the Boy Scout camp with various religious emblems denoting separate religious groups within the larger movement, there were no flags flown nor religious icons paraded within the Équipes themselves: at Garric's insistence, respect for individual religious belief remained internal and on a personal level.[43]

After becoming editor of the Catholic La Revue des Jeunes in 1924, Garric used the magazine to advertise his new movement and to explain the philosophy behind it.[44] It has been noted that when Garric took over editing this magazine, its tone and content seemed to undergo a dramatic change from a strongly Dominican stance under its former

---

[41]Michel Manoll, Entretiens avec Robert Garric, p. 55.

[42]"Robert Garric et son milieu intellectual entre les deux guerres." The question of Garric's religion was raised among the conference participants, but no clear answer emerged as to whether Garric himself had a particularly Christianizing mission; it seems clear that his group was always considered more social than religious. See esp. pp. 27-34 (523-530) and, for Roger Dumaine's comments about the Catholic nature of the group, 71-72 (567-568).

[43]One thing that was clear was his admiration for Pascal, seemingly focused more on Pascal's emphasis on inner, intuitive faith, rather this his philosophy's more Jansenist component.

[44]See Chapter 3.

editor.[45] In 1924, Garric published a series of articles which were subsequently published as a book, that detailed the history and the methods of the program, extolled its virtues, and described its success to date. He also used the book to encourage more young people to join.

> Have you sometimes thought, when your work is done, that all around you, other work is being accomplished, work of the metallurgist in the workshop, the employee in his office, the electrician? that you generally ignore all of this profession, of these conditions of life as you frequently ignore the work and the life of the medical student or the student of Central who are not in exactly the same courses as you? Do you think that in today's life it is necessary to make these partitions fall? To allow all your neighbors to profit from your experience and to profit from theirs? To make an exchange of thoughts and of hearts, that will bring together all the young people of the same generation in a common work, in a lively friendship? To know you and to love you, to come to your mutual aid? Come to the Équipes sociales.[46]

Even the rhetoric Garric used to propagandize emphasized the mutuality of feeling among youth, asking if prospective participants *already* felt committed to the goals of the movement before joining it. He gave frequent public lectures and publicized the Équipes sociales through the press. Simone de Beauvoir, a student of Garric's at the Institut Sainte-Marie, said in response to his call, "I drank in his words; they did not rock my universe to its foundations, they were not at variance with my own ideas, and yet they seemed to strike an absolutely new note."[47] Although it is unclear just what struck Beauvoir as a "new note," Garric's personal charisma, perhaps even more than his written articles, moved young people to join in his mission.

---

[45]"Robert Garric et son milieu intellectual entre les deux guerres," p. 31. Rudolfo Rossi declared himself a student of the earlier incarnation of La Revue des Jeunes, and expressed his uncertainty about Garric's stance, merely that it clearly differed from the style before his editorship.

[46]Garric, Les Équipes sociales, pp. 32-33.

[47]Simone de Beauvoir, Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter, trans. James Kirkup (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1959), pp. 190-191.

Ending Class Warfare by Redefining Humanity's "Social" Existence

By blurring the class boundaries between different kinds of work, Garric sought to create a social environment where equal respect for diverse occupations led to a stronger sense of common commitment to a higher cause. The idea of equal respect for varieties of work, though commonly a basis for communistic humanism, for Garric was not a materialistically leveling proposal. He did not argue that different kinds of work should receive equal pay, but merely that all kinds of workers should recognize that work of any sort, done to the best of a person's ability and using their best skills, ultimately benefited society at large.

The classes taught in the Équipes, though they included professional and vocational subjects, also included the humanities, and it was in this way that they most strongly differed from the earlier cercles d'études. Garric was himself a professor of literature, and a proponent of the beauty of the French language especially. He believed that when young people shared their thoughts about literature, they would learn more about themselves and about one another in the process. This was true for other humanistic subjects as well. His interest was not so much to teach the content of literature, for example, but to use the study of literature to develop good critical thinking skills, without which, Garric argued, the best of technicians would be lacking. "General" culture allowed the young worker, in addition to being skilled in his profession, to "reflect and to judge, to discuss the advice of his professional journal like those of his colleagues, in a word, to have a *personality*."[48] The goal of developing each individual's personality, as with Garric's friend Léontine Zanta's insistence on the need for all humans (including women) to develop their *personne*, would come about through the Équipes by critically engaging with other youth, not through dogmatic or rote learning in a traditional

---

[48]Garric, Les Équipes sociales, p. 23.

classroom. In this, Garric seemed to echo the ideas of Bertier and Marty, and, like them, he felt that individual development ultimately benefited society.

The major difference between Garric's efforts and those of proponents of French nouvelle éducation, however, was that Garric did not see individual growth as *subsumed* to social development, but rather, as acting in concert with the progress of *civilisation*.[49] He asserted that all humans are social beings, and that *engagement*, of a civic rather than a political nature, lay at the heart of civilized society.[50] He cited one of his heroes, Marshal Lyautey (well-known for his colonial policies in Morocco): "One is social, one is not socialist." Garric always denied belonging to any particular political party.[51] If not committing to Socialism. and indeed decrying its aggressive, materialistic, and revolutionary stance, then, what did it mean to Garric to be, above all else, a "social" creature? The answer to this lies in another admonition Garric said he borrowed from Lyautey: "find the common denominator."[52] Underneath political and religious differences, Garric believed, lay a common human essence that would serve as the platform on which a loving and sympathetic humanism would be constructed. The Équipes sociales would begin the process of finding that common denominator between the bourgeoisie and the working class, and instead of a constant state of warfare, the two classes could work together, in a mutually transforming way, to restructure society without reference to specific political or religious views.

---

[49]Garric's view was in some ways similar to that of German phenomenologist Edmund Husserl, who wrote in the 1920s that the individual and society both placed limits on one another; in terms of social reform, this kind of view, for Garric, emphasized social interaction and experience that would support development of the individual and society at the same time.

[50]Manoll, Entretiens avec Robert Garric, pp. 54-55, 70. Garric saw the motivation for engagement as spiritual rather than political.

[51]"Robert Garric et sa milieux intellectuel entre les deux guerres," p. 30.

[52]Dominique Auvergne, Regards catholiques sur le monde (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1938), p. 136.

Such a restructuring would occur on the basis of action--social action motivated by spiritual understanding and commitment to civic life. For the équipiers, such a commitment stemmed from intellectual culture.

> For us, culture and intelligence are not just the games of dilettantes and the clever--nor scholarly exercises; they prepare for *action*, they direct it and *orient* it. We want to make intellectual culture the most precious auxiliary of action. We also have not ceased to develop in all our groups *the spirit of initiative* and *tenacious will* that are obstinately attached to the chosen goal: we have not ceased to propose to our friends the ideal of this complementary formation acquired during leisure hours, and in view of a superior goal: not solely to individually "climb" the social ladder, not just *arrivisme* and a mercantile taste for the "good job" (*"la belle situation"*), but a generous effort that allows all a man's valor to spread, so that when his job is acquired it will advantageously spread his influence, and give to the *cité* chiefs and to his brothers affectionate and sure guides...[53]

The kind of development that people would achieve through the Équipes that would enable them to become "chiefs" or members of a new French elite thus differed from the sort practiced in the French Boy Scouts. For Garric, social action was defined as a kind of social productivity, a kind of work, rather than merely being based on meritorious achievement leading to authority and the ability to rule.

What precisely did Garric have in mind when he conceived of the "spread" of influence a cultured and intelligent citizen would engender? Like the personalists of the 1930s such as Emmanuel Mounier and Denis de Rougement (both "young" intellectuals who edited magazines aimed at their peers and those up-and-coming younger members of French society), Garric offered an image of the intellectual, engaged, socially active hero. Unlike those later personalists, Garric envisioned such heroes as apolitical, committed to a higher social good but not expressing that commitment through adhesion to any particular political party or group. The key element of social identity that young people would find motivating was, for Garric, simply the fact of their youth itself.

---

[53]Garric, Les Équipes sociales, pp. 25-26.

Although Garric did not describe youth as needing to throw off all the concerns and traditions of older generations, he did describe them as creative and productive, engaging in social action as a means of reform. Like Halphen-Istel in relation to the scouts, Garric hoped that parents would be supportive of the group's goals, and to this end he held some classes that involved parents-- *conférences familiales*--to "prepare the passage from one generation to the other, the young habituating themselves to love the older ones who help them and the older becoming conscious of their responsibility."[54] This, he hoped would keep the family from becoming an obstacle to the group's aims.

Reconciliation of Authority and Liberty

Yet it was important that youthful heroes would take reforming action, helping to open new possibilities for the advancement of *civilisation*. One of the key features of the classes in the Équipes was that they followed the tastes and desires of the students, even for the very youngest among them. This was seen by the équipiers to be a kind of friendship, an open acceptance of the realities of the working class students rather than an effort to force them into a preset, bourgeois mold. The most important first step for the elite youth who served as teachers in the group was to get to know their students on a personal and individualistic level. It was not only the students' judgment and reasoning that was to be formed, but their imagination and their creativity. This meant that the classes were quite variable, and that the working-class students would contribute to discussions as well as the elite teachers. They might even lead a class: for example, a mechanic might one day describe the details of his work. Garric described the elite teachers learning in turn:

> We, passionately curious, listen to them. Here is a neighboring reality that we have before ignored; this life of the mechanic, what do we know of it? A few "terms of the trade" heard by accident and to which we attach but a

[54]Garric, Les Équipes sociales, pp. 23-24.

> vague significance, some impressions gathered here and there...It seems to us that our horizon of "specialists" expands, at the account of this worker...The barriers that seemed to separate the tasks fall, and if our curiosity is satisfied, our social sense is refined. The multiple reality of work is presented to us, in its everyday detail and its true grandeur.[55]

From this collaborative effort, without which the class would become "nothing," a new culture would arise, encompassing each individual's thoughts and feelings.[56]

In order to achieve this, Garric explained, it was necessary that the circle be "free," that authority and liberty be reconciled. The leader's role "is not to think for them and to dress them in the same uniform, but to accustom their minds to drive themselves and to play freely." This would ready them for difficulties and obstacles, the arguments that they would encounter in life, and give them confidence in themselves so they could defend their own views. Garric warned against separating education and life, a practice he considered disastrous because it resulted in a sense of two selves, each sterile and isolated. Intellectual life would be dry and bloodless, while daily work life would be amorphous and banal. The free play of students' minds on any and all subjects would avoid such a split.[57]

> If we form such minds, vigorous and personal, if we give them consciousness of their valor, we have not only the joy of seeing strong and just thoughts ripen, to spread, and to see the young people take more taste in all that is around them and feel the force of Beauty and of Truth, we also have taught them that they were not raised only for themselves, that in their turn they have become debtors, accountable for what they have received and charged with returning it. They rose only so they could help others to climb and to see clearly, to be in their turn shining influences. Thus a well-formed thought can have a thousand repercussions around it and this hard work of forming the elite can have distant extensions.[58]

---

[55]Garric, Les Équipes sociales, p. 52.

[56]Garric, Les Équipes sociales, p. 55.

[57]Garric, Les Équipes sociales, pp. 56-57.

[58]Garric, Les Équipes sociales, pp. 60-61.

This new elite, rising from the working class as well as the bourgeoisie, would see their social action as a duty, as a debt to be paid for their acquisition of culture. Although the way in which their authority would be acquired differed from that of the scouts, the Équipes similarly prepared teachers to repeat the method of their own education for those younger than them, as an important part of their leadership abilities.

Each participant, Garric explained, would take what he had learned into his own walk of life. Working class youth, however, were not likely to become elite leaders of the bourgeoisie, who, rightly or wrongly, claimed the right for themselves to be in positions of elite power. This problem lacked significance for Garric, because he perceived social action arising from collaboration to involve commitment to a single goal, a higher purpose of social betterment. He foresaw and incorporated the idea that everyone would not agree on specifics; indeed he sought to teach eloquence so each student could effectively support his or her own view. Ultimately, though, he had faith that all students given such a "free," collaboratively constructed cultural education would engage with society out of a selfless motivation, in an attempt to reform and better the world around them. The friendship that would arise between bourgeois and working-class youth through the process of intereducation would lead to a lasting mutual respect and understanding; in Garric's view this would suffice--over time--to bring an end to class warfare.

The Experience of the *Équipiers*

Simone de Beauvoir became an équipier in the mid-to-late 1920s, teaching for 3-4 years in Belleville, the working-class neighborhood where Garric had his headquarters. Initially idealizing Garric, she became cynical and disillusioned about the program's methods. She complained that he never had anything to do with the separate feminine

sections of the movement, and she was frustrated in her efforts to gain his attention.[59] "By his personal example he had encouraged me to uproot myself from my past, from my environment; condemned to solitude, I had followed him headlong into the heroic life," she wrote in her memoirs. It seems she heard Garric's call to action as an invitation to become an intellectual missionary, to campaign for bourgeois humanistic education for the masses, without ever recognizing the nature of intereducation as he explained it.

> Garric was greatly mistaken if he imagined that I was providing them with Culture; and it was distasteful to me to follow instructions which called upon me to talk to them about human dignity or the value of suffering: I would have felt I was mocking them. As for friendship, here too Garric had misled me. The atmosphere at the center was a fairly happy one; but between the young people of Belleville and those who, like myself, had come to teach them there was neither intimacy nor anything in common....if I felt that the Groups were something of a humbug, I was all the same a victim of that humbug. I thought I was in real contact with "the people"; they seemed to be friendly, deferential, and willing to collaborate with their privileged superiors. This fake experience only served to aggravate my ignorance.[60]

Beauvoir apparently was not transformed by her experience as a teacher as Garric had had faith the bourgeois elite youth would be. Other teachers had experiences closer to Garric's own, however, and the Équipes continued to enjoy popularity through the 1930s, with centers throughout France and also in Brazil, where Garric taught in the mid-30s.[61]

Originally intended for teenagers and young adults, the movement expanded early to include younger children, aged 8-13. Although the idea of intereducation worked differently with children of that age, some of the principles applied to the older circles also applied for the younger ones in the "*Coin des Gosses*" or Kid's Corner. R. Lambry, of the École des Beaux-Arts, described his involvement as an extremely satisfying

---

[59]The first feminine section was started in 1923. Cholvy, Histoire des organisations et mouvements chrétiens de la jeunesse, p. 145.

[60]Beauvoir, Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter, p. 236-238.

[61]See "Hommage à Robert Garric," Revue de la Haute-Auvergne, Jan-June 1968.

experience. To keep the spirit of the Équipe intact with younger kids, Lambry argued that teachers had to get down to the children's level. In order to be a friend, and to encourage the kids to develop character as individuals, teachers had to "insert themselves in the milieu of the little ones (*gamins)* that they teach, seeking to think like them, see like them and with them, know their tastes, their preferences, their emotions, partake of their joys as well as their happiness at being young and just beginning in life."[62] It was also necessary to accept the working-class kids as they were, wearing odd clothing, using uncouth language, even perhaps smoking. It was best to meet them in the street, and tell them stories outside, where they were more comfortable than in a strange building, Lambry suggested. The pedagogical method to follow was similar for that with older students; the important thing was to appeal to the students' curiosity, to give them an enthusiasm for learning, to get them to open up and contribute. For little kids, their contributions might consist of drawings depicting their favorite part of a story, or it might consist of a group discussion where the kids could make up their own ends to stories the teacher began. After piquing their imaginations, the teacher would lead the class towards a more analytical level, yet always maintaining their enthusiasm. Lambry gave examples from his own experience, expressing his surprise and joy at how well this kind of teaching worked among the "*gosses*."[63]

Léontine Zanta, philosopher, teacher, and friend of Garric's, helped publicize the movement, especially using her reputation as a feminist to persuade girls to join the feminine sections, as well as encouraging younger children to support the group's ideal.[64] She occasionally contributed a feature in the children's magazine Les Enfants de France, and in 1929 wrote a couple of articles explaining Garric and the Équipes. The first article

---

[62]R. Lambry, "Le 'Coin des gosses' aux Équipes sociales" in Les Équipes sociales, p. 96.

[63]Lambry, "Le 'Coin des gosses' aux Équipes sociales," pp. 95-121.

[64]See Chapter 2.

featured an imagined conversation between a female philosopher (Zanta herself) and a young man named Jacques who introduced himself to her as "a candidate at l'École Centrale, and my social calling, *équipier* for life." Jacques explained the founding of the Équipes, and pointed to Garric's war experiences as his central motivation. A young girl named Monique joined the conversation, interjecting to point out that there were almost as many female équipiers. Zanta gave the total number of équipiers as ten thousand. She concluded the piece with the philosopher's calm approval of "the spirit of the Équipe," saying "it is the spirit of the future."[65]

A few months later, Zanta again wrote about the movement, but this time as narrative rather than as a dialogue. She described a well-organized family returning from vacation, unloading the car with the spirit of the Équipe. She explained that the Équipes included young students in schools, in lycées, at the universities, professors, young women who "had passed the venerable age of emancipation," and young *industriels*. Whenever the workers needed knowledge, she claimed, Garric would put out a call to the *équipiers*, and match up the desires of the workers with the teaching ability of the intellectuals. A time and place would be agreed on, and unlike the relationship between professor and student, the learning would take place in a friendly atmosphere, with all involved "on the same level, with the same preoccupations." She asked her readers to imagine on the one hand, the "intellectual worker...who by the hazard of fortune or of family situation has benefited early on from a literary and scientific formation of the first rank," on the other hand, the "manual worker who because of the necessity of his career had to, at 12 or 13 years old, for example, leave school without satisfying the needs of his avid intelligence." She concluded that the mutual exchange of knowledge marked a spirit

---

[65]Léontine Zanta, "Le Coin des philosophes: Jacques au téléphone," Les Enfants de France, Oct. 1, 1929, pp. 1222-1223.

of "true human fraternity, that is to say a Christian spirit in the true sense of the word."[66] The article was aimed both at adolescent students who might be interested in joining the group as teachers and at younger kids; her description of the family scene involved all the children in the family carrying in luggage, the load varying according to each child's size.

These depictions of the Équipes show both the variety of emphases different people pointed to, but also the overall importance of the appeal to a new type of youthful spirit. Youth's passions would motivate the movement as well as be formed by it. Although having classes emphasized the intellectual nature of the movement, its goal was to develop a new kind of cultural intelligence driven strongly by feeling and intuition, basically democratic and meritocratic.

World War II and Vichy

Although it seems the response to the movement was mixed, Garric never lost sight of his ideals, and never stopped trying to recreate the spirit he had felt in the trenches of World War I. He published three books in the 1920s and 30s, which he said all followed the same path, attempting to find "the secret of human communication." He said that Belleville, Albert de Mun, and Le Message de Lyautey, were one for him.[67] At the start of World War II, however, Garric left the movement behind--perhaps confident that it would continue to run on its own. He prepared first to serve again as an anti-aircraft gunner. Later he took on the leadership of a social service organization called the *Secours national* which had been implemented during World War I and was then brought back after France's defeat in World War II.

Although Garric was a supporter of Pétain, he was known to be completely anti-German. Apparently he agreed to head this relief program because people were in need

[66]Zanta, "Le Coin des philosophes: Retour de vacances. - L'Esprit d'Équipe," Les Enfants de France, Jan. 15, 1930, pp. 1410-1411.

[67]Auvergne, Regards catholique sur le monde, p. 136.

and action had to be taken; he was accustomed to taking such action. He maintained throughout an apolitical, social focus. Some of the former équipiers moved right into the resistance, and Garric himself was cleared of any wrongdoing during the purge of Nazi collaborators after the war, despite his support for Pétain and for Uriage, the leadership training school put in place under Vichy.[68]

In the spring of 1939, before war had been declared, Paul Archambault edited a book of essays by young intellectuals titled Options sur demain: tâches nouvelles, nouvelles équipes, which suggested that the movement had come to a turning point. Archambault, of the same age as Garric, called for their generation to step down, to give up their leadership of too many diverse movements to make room for the next generation. He referred to the newest wave of young Christians as the "New French Équipes," and declared that above all, their dominant political ideology was democracy. Archambault declared that his own generation had made two major errors when attempting to lead the world to rebirth after World War I. The first was a lack of mobility, the second a tendency to be overly facile; the result was a series of lost opportunities. But, he declared, fresh troops were arriving. The contributors to the book were several young intellectuals (including Emmanuel Mounier's colleague, Jean Lacroix) born after the turn of the century, who were or had been members of youth groups and had begun in the 1930s to edit magazines aimed at a youthful and intellectual audience.

> These young men...accept the solidarities created by history, but intend to make an end of errors and illusions...This lack of mobility, this tendency to be facile about which we have spoken, they would vomit like a lukewarm tide: they demand the brew of the strong, the creators, the conquerors. They agree with the principles, and keep the guiding ideas, but put elsewhere in front of other realities, search for other applications,

---

[68]For discussion of Garric's intentions and whether or not his work for the Secours national constituted a fascist political stance, see "Robert Garric et son milieu intellectual," pp. 65-77 (561-573).

other modalities and other fields of action. It is their right. It is their duty.[69]

Archambaut complained that the "prodigious possibilities" of youth-driven reform had been suspended in the late 30s. "Who will liberate them? In spite of the inertia of the mass, a group of determined men, placed in a good position, could suffice for it. Who? These ones here, I believe....And since there are new équipes, *Vivent les Nouvelles Équipes Françaises*!"[70]

In Etienne Borne's contribution to Options sur demain, it was clear that the Nouvelle Équipes would no longer remain apolitical. Borne, a former équipier, emphasized the importance of Christian democracy, not a democracy as it was generally practiced at that time, he asserted, but a true democracy that followed Christian principles. He complained that earlier efforts had been insufficient, that unity and convergence of opinions were important for responding to new realities. He advocated focusing on the most debated aspects of social issues and seeking a synthesis there, a universalism that would arise from a kind of divine truth discoverable through surface discord. "Our hope is no longer that heroic hope, without felt proof, that was going to content our elders," he wrote. Instead, a new youthful generation would take over the tasks of the present, for the future, by more actively seeking reconciliation that would lead to true democracy. Such unity might seem to be achievable only under an aggressive and expansive sort of politics, but that sort of government was not actually tolerant of any kind of universalism other than imperial universalism. This Borne decried, calling instead for a government that put itself at the service of the human person.[71] Clearly, Borne was referring primarily to German politics, from Bismarck to Hitler.

---

[69]Paul Archambault, Étienne Borne, Jean Lacroix, Marc Sherer, Georges Hourdin, Louis Terrenoire, Options sur demain: tâches nouvelles, nouvelles équipes (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1939), p. 9.

[70]Archambault et al., Options sur demain, p. 13.

[71]Étienne Borne, in Archambault et al., Options sur demain, p. 60.

Another contributor, Louis Terrenoire, saw the forces of nazism succeeding in unifying Europe, though under the wrong ideology. Still, he hoped that what the nazis started, humanists could complete. Terrenoire could see clearly the threat that nazism represented; he saw that Italian fascism had been turned to racism through collaboration with Hitler, for example, and he expressed his horror at anti-Jewish actions propelled by nazi ideology. He had read Mein Kampf, and made frequent references to it to show how extreme Hitler's goals really were. At the other extreme, he placed Bolshevism, working from the opposite direction. He wanted to avoid war, but knew that appeasement was not possible; instead "hitlerian hegemony" would have to be broken. He also sought to avoid repeating the false peace that seemed to extend from the end of World War I, as well as he sought to avoid the errors made by his elders. In laying out youth's task for national recovery after a potential second world war, Terrenoire wrote that they should not wait, that they should immediately get to work to build the bases for future reconstruction.

> To convert the home, to remake France and then Europe, it is not necessary that the hurricane has destroyed everything and decimated the ranks of young men. One can repair and construct just as well when the wind of bad days blows.[72]

He was sure his generation would be willing to die if war came, but wanted to make sure that future generations would have a strong foundation on which to rebuild France.

Between the extreme and imperial nationalism of fascism and nazism on the one hand, and the extreme internationalism of communism on the other, Terrenoire suggested that a middle road would in the future be achieved. He pointed out that Bolshevism had already turned back towards nationalism. "Thus one can make out, along this progressive correction of systems situated at the extreme points of the trajectory of the pendulum, towards what point of equilibrium it tends." Creating a true Society of Nations, a true sense of friendship and collaboration between nations, a united Europe that nevertheless

---

[72]Louis Terrenoire, in Archambault et al., Options sur demain, p. 195.

maintained the sense of identity and dignity of each member nation, was Terrenoire's goal. He argued that it would not be perfect, not ideal, but during the transitional stage of nazi domination, although "the common denominator has not yet been found," it was essential that youth "keep their eyes always fixed towards the misty riverbank where we would like to land." Ultimately, like Borne, Terrenoire believed that Christianity, in the sense especially of fraternity and respect, would produce for all nations, Christian or not, "the most solid guarantee of their human dignity."[73] Terrenoire himself first fought in the war and then joined the Resistance, was arrested by the Gestapo twice, the second time tortured and sent to Dachau, from which he was liberated after the war. He went on to become the editor in chief of the magazine l'Aube and to become active politically in the MRP under the Fourth Republic and later vice-president of the Republicains populaire indépendant.[74]

Although they maintained many of the original ideas for the Équipes, some of the youthful participants grew to differ with Garric's insistence on apoliticism. They also developed more strongly the Christian element of the movement. Some équipiers, like Simone de Beauvoir, after a brief commitment to the movement, simply turned to other endeavors. Some, like Edmond Michelet, continued to believe in the "profound idea that gave birth to the Équipes," seeing it as having a quality like "dynamite."[75] The thousands of young people who participated in the movement through the 1920s and 1930s were part of an experiment designed to end class warfare. Their mission was to create a new humanism led by youthful creative productivity and sense of friendship for one another, but that maintained individual differences. Ultimately, the movement's spiritual mission failed to produce the "common denominator" among classes or among youth, though it

---

[73]Louis Terrenoire, in Archambault et al., Options sur demain, pp. 198-199.

[74]Dictionnaire biographique Français contemporain (1950), pp. 472-473.

[75]Manoll, Entretiens avec Robert Garric, p. 10.

did draw some thousands of youth together in new ways and offer them an albeit vague common goal of social improvement.

The highly idealized vision of a new kind of moral order, a new phase for *civilisation*, and the creation of a new elite did not really pan out as the founders and directors of either the Boy Scouts or the Équipes sociales hoped. Nevertheless, the movements did serve to create a strong sense of youthful identity among their participants, diverse yet passionate in their beliefs and commitments, and confident about their role in reconstructing France's future after both World Wars.

In 1942, France Libre, the journal put out by the Free French in London, published an article about what the youth groups in France were doing in response to France's defeat, Germany's occupation, and the aims and propaganda of the Vichy State under Pétain.

> Youth's natural reaction to the defeat has been a national reaction. After the first weeks of discouragement, all who in France are active, young, have sought to limit the consequences of the disaster, to disengage France's responsibility as such, to raise in its own mind and in the eyes of the world the image of the French. Since the beginning, French youth has therefore been anti-German and anti-collaborationist.[76]

Frequently citing articles that had been published in various French magazines, the article detailed just what the youth groups were doing in relation to the Vichy National Revolution and to the influence of nazism and collaborationism. On the whole, the article claimed, youth were resistant, despite propagandist efforts. They did not really receive the collaborationist or nazi ideas the way that Pétainists intended, because each youth group remained above all true to its own methods and goals. It was important that throughout this time, the French youth groups maintained their diversity. They were never pulled together into a single organization, as was Hitler's youth group in

[76] "L'Organisation de la jeunesse Française," France Libre III, no. 16, Feb. 16, 1942, p. 330.

Germany.[77] The major exception to this was those groups on the political left, whose activities were curtailed by the nazis' anti-Communist efforts. The nationalism of the remaining groups was intended to keep France strong, however, and not to aid collaboration by offering a weak resignation to defeat.[78]

The Boy Scouts, especially the Catholic Scouts de France, achieved great success under Vichy, as their conservative methods seemed to fit well with the Pétainist National Revolution. According to France Libre, the scouts were the first youth movement to be officially recognized by Vichy in 1940. In the southern, unoccupied area, the number of scouts went from 40,000 immediately after the armistice to 120,000 by early 1942. By far the greatest number were drawn into the Catholic Scouts de France. Under Vichy, however, all three major groups, the Catholic Scouts de France, the Protestant Éclaireurs unionistes, and the laic Éclaireurs de France were brought under one leader. France Libre described the laic group as having been a leftist movement, and indeed it was not as popular as the Catholic movement, but it did continue to have large numbers of participants.[79] Under Vichy, it was clearly pulled into a right-wing position. As we have seen, despite the laic and republican nature of the Éclaireurs de France, its goals and methods had always been close to those of the more religious and conservative scouts, in any case. The group did not have to make major changes to its program to fit its new role.[80]

The Équipes sociales foundered during the war years. Although France Libre still offered it as a possibly resistant movement, by 1942 it was no longer in the news at all.

---

[77]See W.D. Halls, The Youth of Vichy France (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 140-141. Halls also argued that some youth groups seemed like army reserves, p. 303.

[78]"L'Organisation de la jeunesse Française," France Libre, p. 33.

[79]"L'Organisation de la jeunesse Française," France Libre, p. 33.

[80]Hellman, Emmanuel Mounier, pp. 165-166. Hellman shows that one of the new youth groups under Vichy, the Chantiers, was heavily influenced by the Scouts; many of its leaders were former Scout leaders.

France Libre also pointed to Vichy's leadership training school, Uriage, which carried forward some of the ideas of the New Humanists, as a place where plurality was respected.[81] "The Youth of France resist. It resists today in spirit, by preserving its liberty of judgment, and thus prepares for the wars of liberation," the article proclaimed. Only a few, clearly fascist, groups were singled out by the article as being anything other than patriotically resistant.[82] Apparently the nazis agreed; when Hitler moved into the previously unoccupied southern section after 1942, he closed down many of the youth movements, and Uriage was abandoned.[83]

The emphasis on youth's liberty of judgment, as we have seen, had been viewed as a part of youth's heroic social role, developed in part through youth movements, from the end of World War I. The nature of the relationship between authority and meritocracy, individualism and collective identity, however, had many, sometimes subtle, variations. Tradition, science, and intuitive philosophy all came into play as sources for envisioning youth's social role in recovering from World War I, and later, in preventing, resisting, and recovering from World War II. Youth groups offered an alternative to the family as a source of identity for youth; this identity had religious and patriotic roots, even while a sense of toleration and internationalism was touted. Although on one level the French Scout movement differed greatly in its methods and goals from the Équipes *Sociales*, both movements were a part of a larger shift in understanding the nature of youth as key members of French society. Working in an extracurricular arena, these youth groups and the sense of youth identity they fostered helped move forward the development of a distinctly non-adult, yet nationally-delineated, French youth culture. Youth groups were aided in this process by the youth press, as the next chapter will show.

---

[81] See John Hellman, The Knight-Monks of Vichy France: Uriage, 1940-1945 (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993), for a different view.

[82] "L'Organisation de la jeunesse Française," France Libre.

[83] W. D. Halls, The Youth of Vichy France, pp. 323-324.

Periodicals directed at a young audience similarly encouraged a sense of community and fostered new relationships between French young people and adults, but worked within a more abstract cultural space than did the activities organized by French youth groups.

# CHAPTER 6

## THE YOUTH PRESS: CREATING A NATIONAL COMMUNITY OF YOUTH

Along with the wave of new youth groups in the 1920s discussed in the previous chapter came a rise in popularity of the youth press. These two often went together, with youth magazines supporting the agenda of numerous youth groups. Many independent, commercially-oriented magazines also flourished, both through newsstand sales and by subscription. Styles ranged from the purposefully shocking and slapdash like L'Épatant to the more culturally elite quality of Les Enfants de France and Les Jeunes de France. Periodicals that claimed no particular political or religious agenda attempted both to cater to youth's tastes and to instill French cultural values. These media vitalized the newly distinct youth culture of the interwar years by providing a forum for a variety of different adult messages to young people. Though their content and message differed, they presented to young people a new, collective sense of identity on a national scale.

The youth press functioned like the youth groups: it helped young French people imagine themselves as members of a large community, in this period, the nation. The role of the press, as Benedict Anderson has argued, is especially important when a community is on a scale too large for its members to experience personal connection with all the other members.[1] This is the case with an imagined nation. National consciousness can grow around the periodical press, including, of course, the youth press, even without nationalist content or rhetoric. The process of writing and reading newspapers and magazines made an important contribution to the growth of a new national youth identity in France in the interwar years.

---

[1] Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (New York: Verso, 1991), pp. 6-7. Anderson argues that communities differ from one another according to the "style in which they are imagined," and that even the largest nation is imagined as limited (not "coterminous with mankind"), sovereign, and a community because it is "always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship."

Belonging to the Nation as a Family

Part of the shift after World War I from imagining social identity as members of particular families or classes to belonging to a nation involved extending family relationships outward to a larger, more abstract community. Youthful members of a national community could most readily understand their connection to one another if they imagined national relationships as pseudo-familial.[2] Many of the magazines, their editors, and their contributors sought to encourage a sense of relationships between national community members that paralleled family relationships. In the youth press the effort to build a family-like relationship with children was reflected both in the subject matter of stories and articles and also in the personae represented by the editors and authors. Magazine writers and editors, for example, commonly presented themselves as aunts and uncles. Although aunt or uncle figures did express authority, they were frequently portrayed as more jovial and sympathetic to children than parental figures.

Sometimes the familial relationship appears to have been invoked to convince parents of the respectability of the periodical's contributors, without seeming to impinge on parental authority. After the war, however, some of these personae began to circumvent parental authority and attempted to develop a stronger rapport directly with young readers, thus contributing to a shift in children's allegiances. Although it maintained a vertical, hierarchical ordering for members of the national community, even while it circumvented paternal authority this style of imagining also allowed a wider sense of horizontal, filial and fraternal connectedness between all French children.[3]

---

[2]This way of understanding the nation is discussed in Francine Masiello, Between Civilization and Barbarism: Women, Nation, and Literary Culture in Modern Argentina (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992).

[3]This is similar to Jürgen Habermas' account of a shift from vertical to horizontal information flow in the press as the first step in the rise of bourgeois consciousness. Jürgen Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995), p. 15.

Pre-war Family and Community in the Press: Le Journal Rose

Evidence of the methods used to create a sense of belonging to a club and receiving family approval was found in journals produced before the war.[4] One example is Le Journal Rose, aimed at young girls. In 1914, Le Journal Rose had an editorial persona calling herself Auntie (*Tantine*) Jeanne. Although this editor did not usually sign any of her own articles, as did the editors of many other journals, she did edit a page dedicated to correspondence with and between the journal's readers. The correspondence page was divided into two parts. The first was for the editor's responses to letters written to the her, apparently exchanging compliments and asking for advice. Auntie Jeanne's replies were written in a sort of journalistic shorthand, using short phrases and abbreviated words, suggesting a coded and private communication. She often ended her responses with phrases expressing sentiment, such as "affectionate kisses," "best kisses," or "kindest regards" (*amitiés*), commonly used to close letters between friends and family members. Most of her messages offered a horoscope character and fortune-telling reading or handwriting analysis, which seemed to give her a mystical, personal knowledge of her readers.[5]

The second half of the page was devoted to pen pal exchanges and requests between "godchildren." This designation for the journal's readers suggests that "Auntie" was intended to be a sort of courtesy title for the editor, appropriate for a non-biological family member. To be a "godmother" was to have a particular kind of authoritative relationship to the youth readers, one that involved offering advice and taking charge of children's social activities much as a real mother might do. A godmother was customarily

---

[4]For accounts of "literary communities" in the 19th century in Britain and the United States, see Gretchen R. Galbraith, Reading Lives: Reconstructing Childhood, Books, and Schools in Britain, 1870-1920 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), p. 54; James Marten, ed., Lessons of War: The Civil War in Children's Magazines (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1999), pp. 1-32.

[5]Le Journal Rose: Magazine illustré des fillettes, vol. VII, nos. 183-200, June 10, 1914 to August 8, 1915 (Paris: Éditions et Publications Jules Tallandier, n.d.).

appointed by the child's parents, precisely because of her respectability and especially her religious or moral character. These numerous "godchildren" (dozens in each issue) used pseudonyms, often affecting names like "Star of the East" or a flower name, or a short, romantic phrase like "Lily of the Valley with Shaking Bells." Although Le Journal Rose was clearly intended for a very young readership (most of the characters in the stories were aged 5 to 10), the correspondence page reflects the interests of a considerably older readership. Some of the pen pals wished to exchange postcards or poems, and the ages they sought to correspond with often ranged from 14 to 20. A few of the correspondents were boys. The influence of this journal thus extended beyond its primary audience. One young writer offered membership in the "Club of Roses" for girls aged 8 to 14, which required that each member take the name of a kind of rose and write one letter per month to the president or vice-president of the club, who promised to answer all their mail. This idea imitated the function of the journal's correspondence feature. Auntie Jeanne herself would send personal responses to readers who included their address and a stamp in their mail to her. To be a reader of this particular journal was thus effectively to belong to a club with a friendly and knowledgeable aunt/godmother as its leader.[6]

The stories contained in the journal, though somewhat adventurous, were strongly moralizing.[7] One, for example, was the story of two children, a boy (Lulu) aged six, and a girl (Didine) aged five, who skipped school for a day at Lulu's urging. They became lost in the woods in a thunderstorm and, frightened, were rescued by their schoolteacher. Calling them "little villains," she promised to punish them the next day for their transgression. The children were taken home to their parents, ashamed and worried about their upcoming punishment. The moral of the story was:

---

[6]Le Journal Rose.

[7]On the gothic and romantic in the 19th century children's press, see Alain Fourment, Histoire de la Presse des jeunes et des journaux d'enfants 1768-1988 (Paris: Editions Eole, 1987), pp. 35-38.

> Free! to be free, maybe that is a beautiful dream! but then again, to how many dangers is one exposed when one courts adventures! I do not believe that Lulu will be in a hurry again to become an apostle of Liberty!!![8]

Similar stories told of children alone in the world, runaways or orphans, who were kidnapped or abused by cruel adults, ending with a welcome rescue and return to the protecting arms of their family, albeit in disgrace. One such story was about a young boy kidnapped while on a leisure outing with his family who then lived several years in the countryside with a superstitious peasant, and finally was returned to his bourgeois city family. The child's joy in his return and his happiness in learning more civilized behavior clearly supported bourgeois values.[9]

The journal's 1914 *bande dessinée* (the French form of comic strip), like the more popular "Bécassine" in La Semaine de Suzette, humorously presented a city/country opposition. "Babylas Porceau" portrayed a country pig who went away to school with a variety of more savvy animals and a donkey schoolteacher, only to be cruelly picked on for his simplistic rural ways. The cartoon creator framed the story to make the provincial and naive misfit funny rather than sympathetic. This *bande* was not the cornerstone of Le Journal Rose as the *bandes* in some other magazines were, and the content was aimed at relatively young children. The little pig in Le Journal Rose, perhaps even more clearly than Bécassine, was not a role model for the readers. He was constantly exhibiting pig characteristics like gluttony, and weeping and squealing unappealingly whenever he was tricked by the other "children." Obedience to values and knowledge of the ways of urbane bourgeois society would clearly be preferable to his tribulations. In the end he returned to the country, having failed to finish his schooling. As in the other stories in this magazine, characters' relationship to their families also clearly marked their class

---

[8]Sofia Herrmann, "Vive la Liberté," Le Journal Rose, pp. 221-222.

[9]G. Bozel and Th. Lafargue, "La Maison de Croquemitaine," Le Journal Rose, first installment, pp. 97-100; last installment, pp. 196-197.

identity. The little pig was finally shown grown up, having married the girl next door and become just like his father.[10]

Didacticism, Children's Tastes, and Collective National Consciousness

In addition to paralleling the sense of belonging to a particular family, a second means of imaging a nation through the press is the sense of simultaneity projected through the wide readership of periodicals, Anderson has noted. When reading a newspaper or magazine, it is possible to imagine others like you doing the same thing at the same time. The sense of a collective audience is heightened, even when the other members of the audience are not visible.[11] This sense of collectivity stems from a degree of homogeneity in reception. After the war, youth magazines' clamored both to speak to and to represent *all* French children simultaneously (though none of the magazines achieved this goal). This suggested that French children already existed as a collective body with distinctive cultural beliefs and tastes. The purpose of the press as a vehicle for creating a sense of national identity was thus blurred with the press's role in responding to the cultural needs and tastes of a pre-existing national collectivity of youth. As we have seen, the patriotic rhetoric of the war laid the base for conceptualizing French youth on a national scale. After the war, the ideal of a national collectivity functioned more than ever through the periodical press, as a larger number of magazines competed over the loyalty of youthful readers.

By appealing to youth tastes, Benjamin, Les Enfants de France, and Les Jeunes de France competed with one another and with more sensationalist periodicals like L'Épatant and, increasingly, American or American-style youth magazines and comics. In doing so, the more respectable magazines did not ignore the importance of parental approval.

---

[10]"Babylas Pourceau, au collège et a l'école," Le Journal Rose, ongoing through 1914.

[11]Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities, pp. 34-35.

Throughout the nineteenth century, most youth periodicals, like youth literature, had a strongly didactic and moralizing quality.[12] In the interwar years, advertisements to adults, especially to the parents who would purchase magazines for their children, still contained strongly moralizing messages. Yet the newer idea that youth culture needed to fulfill youth's special needs by appealing to their tastes was advertised to parents as well.[13] Pressure was brought to bear on parents so they, too, began to desire for their children more from leisure activities such as reading than a simple dichotomy between didacticism or mere "distraction." The ability of the press to function as a moralizing or identity-forming medium increasingly rested on its success in persuading its youthful readers to be a willing, involved, and loyal audience.

Around the turn of the century, some periodicals had begun to cater more strongly to youth tastes through *bandes dessinées*.[14] Most of these *bandes* still exhibited a somewhat didactic quality. Despite this, many of the children's magazines were popular particularly for the *bandes* they contained, usually taking up two full pages per issue. "Les Pieds Nickelés" in the journal L'Épatant began in 1908 as a notable and popular exception to continuing didacticism. Other *bandes* from this time combined appeal, especially through humor and adventure, with more didactic, moralizing messages.[15]

Despite all the efforts to persuade young people to reader loyalty, it is unlikely that children and youth chose their reading material themselves.[16] Clearly, parents and

---

[12]Maurice Crubellier, L'Enfance et la jeunesse dans la société française 1800-1950 (Paris: Armand Colin, 1979), pp. 358-360; See also Alain Fourment, Histoire de la Presse des jeunes.

[13]See, for example, Paul Hazard, Books, Children and Men, trans. Marguerite Mitchell (Boston: The Horn Book, Inc., 1944), pp. 1-5.

[14]Crubellier, L'Enfance et la jeunesse, pp. 365-366.

[15]Henri Filippini, Jacques Glenat, Numa Sadoul and Yves Varende, Histoire de la bande dessinée en France et en Belgique: des origines à nos jours (Paris: Jacques Glenat, 1979), p. 13. See also Louis Forton, Les Pieds Nickelés en Amerique (Paris: H. Veyrier, 1969.

[16]Ludmilla Jordanova, "Children in History: Concepts of Nature and Society" in Children, Parents and Politics, ed. by Geoffrey Scarre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 5 and 12. Jordanova argues that there can be "no authentic voice of childhood speaking to us from the past because the adult

teachers played a large role. It was possible, however, because magazines and newspapers ere inexpensive enough, that some children and youth could purchase them for themselves. Between 1904 and 1939, 62 new journals came into existence, and most were inexpensive. A 1924 article in the Catholic journal for adolescents and young adults, La Revue des Jeunes, asserted that young people split their allowances between candy and magazines, and probably preferred the magazines.[17] Some of the more appealing journals, especially because of their *bandes dessinées*, were objectionable to parents and teachers. Young people who bought such magazines often hid them from their parents for fear of confiscation if discovered. Other magazines, with more morally acceptable *bandes*, offered subscriptions and advertised as family fare. Less didactically moralizing than Le Journal Rose, La Semaine de Suzette's "Bécassine" was one such *bande*. Starting in 1907, "Bécassine" presented the benefits of bourgeois urbanity through the clownish, misfit antics of a young woman from the country who came to work as a maid for a bourgeois family.[18] Such respectable journals attempted to appeal to their young audience, especially through humor, though most also sought to reassure parents that theirs was not a periodical destined to contribute to juvenile delinquence.

Many authors, editors, and educators maintained that French youth were homogeneous in their reading tastes, and that a single standard could be developed that would both appeal and uphold French social and cultural standards. In this view, French youth's homogeneity constituted a special cultural world. Prior to the war. writers and editors needed knowledge of morality above all else (thus Auntie Jeanne's role as "godmother," for example). After the war they needed special knowledge of the child's

---

world dominates that of the child," and that even such personal accounts as autobiographies and diaries must be carefully and critically interpreted.

[17]Livre, mon ami: lectures enfantines, 1914-1954, Catalogue edited by Annie Renonciat, with Vivianne Ezratty and Françoise Lévêque (Paris: Agence Culturelle de Paris et Annie Renonciat, 1991), p. 24.

[18]Margaret Higonnet, "War Games," The Lion and the Unicorn 22:1 (1998), pp. 3-4.

world in order to produce appropriately appealing books and periodicals. Some people argued that only adults with childish qualities could write for children.[19] Some, like pedagogue Roger Cousinet and primary schoolteachers Célestin and Élise Freinet, went so far as to argue that only children could write effectively for children.[20] Some argued that producers of children's literature and the press also needed to keep their sights set on standards that would didactically inform readers of youth's social and cultural identity. The balance between didacticism and appeal varied with different periodicals, but the producers of youth periodicals increasingly presented themselves as experts in the field of youth culture. While imagining themselves as members of a collective reading public for each periodical, readers were also encouraged to engage in a seemingly personal relationship with the editors, authors, and artists who presented themselves as having special knowledge of the homogeneous world of children.

Throughout this time, the youth press and juvenile books had a close relationship. Many of the contributors to periodicals published books for children as well. A number of adult authors also produced serialized stories and articles scaled down to youthful dimensions, often published only in periodicals. In the 1920s there were few new fiction books produced for children and adolescents in France, and translated foreign-produced books did not fare well. Beginning in the 1890s, most youth publications simply imitated older French "classics" like the stories of Jules Verne or the Comtesse de Ségur.[21] With new, brighter-colored images and serialized, cliffhanging stories, along with a lower price, new magazines attracted and held youth's attention. "Albums" or hard-bound copies of back periodicals were also successfully marketed, especially to subscribers who

---

[19]Paul Hazard, Books, Children and Men. Hazard suggested that the British author A. A. Milne had such a childish quality.

[20]Livre, mon ami, pp. 61-62.

[21]See Jean de Trigon Histoire de la littérature enfantine: de Ma Mère l'Oye au Roi Babar (Paris: Hachette, 1950).

wished to back up to the beginnings of serialized stories when they became new readers. This offset the usually more ephemeral quality of the magazines, and provided a format that further blurred the distinction between regular books and the press.

During the war, although many older magazines ceased publication, the ones that survived, along with new periodicals, turned towards patriotism. The ideal of a French *union sacrée* was as evident in the children's press as in the adult press throughout the war years, and this nationalizing trend continued into the post-World War I period. A new kind of hero came into being who was less individualistic and more collectively-oriented, as existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre recalls lamenting as a child.[22] Very few journals ignored the call to patriotic mobilization, and some new magazines were created just to meet the propagandist need of wartime.[23] Children were encouraged to think about Frenchness in a militarized way, with young boys portrayed as soldiers, young girls as nurses or "*marraines*," (godmothers), sending letters and care packages to soldiers on the front. Defending France became youth's prime directive. Young people's identity as specifically French youth remained a key component of most journals after the armistice, and continued to build throughout the 1920s.

The call to national feeling was not as dogmatic as pre-war moral admonitions because presumably all French children tended already in the direction of feeling appropriately patriotic. They merely needed encouragement, guidance, and moral support to "do the right thing" as French youth. The shift to persuasion rather than dogmatism, sympathetically playing on young French people's feelings, continued into the period of post-war recovery. Diminished adult authority in the press combined with the push for young people to feel a sense of national belonging to create a cultural environment supportive of youths' sense of themselves as members of a generational collectivity in

---

[22]Jean-Paul Sartre, The Words, trans. Bernard Frechtman (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), pp. 210-212.

[23]See Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau, La Guerre des enfants 1914-1918: essai d'histoire culturelle (Paris: Armand-Colin, 1993).

French society. As the youth press shifted in the interwar years from top-down authority to a (seemingly) horizontal exchange of information, it facilitated the development of group consciousness among youth that moved beyond the smaller scale of family association to a larger national scale.[24] The relationship between members of French youth and French adults outside the family, whether or not conceived as pseudo-familial, became more important. At the same time the relationship between youth and their peers was strengthened.

Belonging to the Club: The Nickel-Plated Feet Gang

One peer-related alternative to advocating new adult-youth relationships was encouraging the sense of belonging to a community of same-aged magazine readers. "Les Pieds Nickelés" in L'Épatant, a journal probably aimed at boys aged 8 to 14, advocated counter-cultural values, but also maintained a sense of belonging to a club, or to a gang. This magazine did not use the device of imitation family relationships, but did offer role models, especially through its extremely popular *bande dessinée*. The heroes of this *bande* were a small gang of three middle-aged, scruffy French men named Ribouldinge, Croquignol, and Filochard. "Les Pieds Nickelés" means "Nickel-Plated Feet Gang," a description of these characters' stubborn "refusal to budge." Always keeping an eye on their own interests, the gang was strongly "*débrouillard*," or self-sufficient, no matter the cost to others. The strip began in 1908, and until the war Les Pieds Nickelés engaged almost entirely in silly but criminal antics, frequently escaping from the police or the ire of respectable citizens through some sort of slapstick diversion. During the war, like characters in the other popular *bandes dessinées*, they became soldiers. In keeping with their earlier persona, though becoming more violent, they began tricking and creatively attacking a new enemy. From making fun of stuffy

[24]See Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.

bourgeois and inept police, they began more aggressively ridiculing Germans and Austrians, even killing them. They also, however, were disrespectful of the French army. In one storyline, for example, they stole a general's car and then, when questioned, claimed to be acting under secret orders from higher up.[25]

The publishers, Les Frères Offenstadt, specifically wanted to produce a magazine that would appeal to children's tastes by its very offensiveness.[26] Opposing didacticism with vulgarity marked an important change from earlier attitudes towards children's reading material, giving rise to a particular notion of youth tastes that persists to this day. The rebelliousness inherent in "Les Pieds Nickelés, anarchic in political terms, specifically pitted youth's tastes against adult moral authority.[27] This journal was one that young readers would attempt to hide from their parents. The *bande dessinée* made no effort to play along with adult ideals for moral didacticism, and instead strove for a highly cynical (and humorous) tone. In his autobiography of childhood, movie director Marcel Pagnol described reading "Les Pieds Nickelés" in the bathroom, the water running to create an illusion of obedience when he was supposed to have been washing up; at night his younger brother kept L'Épatant under his pillow.[28]

Despite the anarchic quality of "Les Pieds Nickelés," they did exhibit a dedication to Frenchness, and offered readers an example of French identity to follow. Being *débrouillard* became a hallmark of strength and patriotism during the difficult times of the war, especially for those on the homefront who lacked many basic necessities, and

---

[25]Audoin-Rouzeau, La Guerre des enfants; Higonnet, "War Games," The Lion and the Unicorn, p. 3. Louis Forton, Les Pieds Nickelés s'en vont en guerre (Paris: Henri Veyrier, 1979).

[26]Michel Pierre, La Bande dessinée (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1976), p. 27; Trigon Histoire de la littérature enfantine, p. 173.

[27]Pierre Couperie, A History of the Comic Strip (New York: Crown Publishers, 1968), p. 33.

[28]Marcel Pagnol, Memories of Childhood, trans. Rita Barisse (San Francisco, 1986), pp. 43, 48. In an autobiographical novel, Jean Cayrol also described the strip as one that would be read surreptitiously. Jean Cayrol, Les Enfants pillard (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1978), pp. 49, 76.

had to "make do" in whatever way they could.[29] Until the war, as with the characters in Le Journal Rose, the strongest identity the gang expressed was class-oriented. After the war they moved to a more strongly nationalistic position. In 1920, the Pieds Nickelés, escaping from the French army's pursuit to get back the general's car, accidentally drove the car off a cliff and onto the deck of a boat bound for America. Their level of violence dropped once again and they returned to more standard slapstick antics, as they traveled through several major cities in North and South America. From poking fun at prohibition in Boston, they moved to attacking racism in New York (taking on, temporarily, a fourth member of their gang, a black boxer named "John Jackson"). They continued their tour to ridicule U.S. politicos in Washington DC, the Amish, and eventually revolutionaries in Mexico and on to South America. All along the way, they created situations where they could bilk or ridicule "respectable" people, and have fun at others' expense. Sometimes they were caught, but managed to escape before any severe punishment was meted out, leaving their captors perplexed or stunned, occasionally unconscious. After the strip's brief hiatus from 1924-1927, the gang continued their travels in other areas of the world. After the war, their enemy had shifted yet again from Germany and Austria, particular wartime enemies, to a more undifferentiated national "other."[30]

By then "Les Pieds Nickelés" had an almost cult following, which was reflected many years later in a revival in the 1960s, when the adult-oriented, nostalgic "Pied Nickelés Club" was founded.[31] Members received bound albums of back issues of the *bande* itself, without including the rest of the journal L'Épatant, attesting to the importance of the strip in drawing youth's attention.[32] Introductory material glorified the

---

[29]Charles Rearick, The French in Love and War: Popular Culture in the Era of the World Wars (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 8.

[30]Forton, Les Pieds Nickelés en Amerique.

[31]Pierre, La Bande dessinée, p. 27.

[32]By the late 1920s L'Épatant was marketing bound albums of the strip by itself.

role of the *bande* in its early decades, claiming it as an accurate reflection of the attitudes of young French boys at the time. Nostalgia for "Les Pieds Nickelés" played up the clear-sightedness of the three heroes, who despite their selfish and criminal actions never let social values blind them to harsh truths of human nature.[33]

Imitation of Adult Patriotism: Benjamin, or Junior Membership

Towards the end of the 1920s, some periodicals steered away from the use of sensationalist *bandes dessinées*. One was Benjamin, started by Jean Nohain in 1929. This was a traditionalist effort to provide for children a scaled-down version of an adult newspaper. In "large format," it was intended to give children the sense that they were consuming the news just as their parents did. Readers of the newspaper were called "Benjamins" and "Benjamines," meaning "junior," "youngest member," or "youngest son or daughter." The first issue included a letter from the editor, M. Jaboune (Nohain's pseudonym), who had been the editor of the children's "Page du Dimanche" in the adult journal L'Écho de Paris, where, he explained, he had had the opportunity to "enter directly into rapport with the tens of thousands of 'Benjamines' and 'Benjamins' aged seven to sixteen." This notion of "direct rapport" with thousands of readers legitimated M. Jaboune's authority while encouraging readers to imagine themselves as members of a very large audience of communicative youth. This idea was reinforced by a weekly feature supposedly written by a 13-year-old boy named "Benjamin" under the title "What Benjamin Thinks." Readers were encouraged to correspond with this representative youthful persona, sending him their "little ideas" about a variety of issues, which "Benjamin" would relay back to all the newspaper's readers. The first of Benjamin's articles was about an experiment he had performed with mailing letters to imaginary readers all around the world, with the plan of charting how long it took for the letters to

[33]See, for example, Forton, Les Pieds Nickelés en Amerique; Pierre, La Bande dessinée, p. 27.

be returned. Apparently this was meant to be an example of the kinds of "little ideas" readers might have, though it was also a didactic set-up for a geography lesson as well as suggesting an international scope for Benjamin's influence. Unlike "Auntie Jeanne" of Le Journal Rose, Benjamin closed his "letter" to the readers with the impersonal "au revoir." This periodical thus used a combination of authoritative personae. M. Jaboune acted as a sympathetic yet respectable and paternalistic adult figure, while the obviously imaginary "Benjamin" more directly represented young readers. Although Jean Nohain went on to become a radio celebrity, he continued to use the name Jaboune when writing for children, thus conjuring up a particular persona for the task.[34]

Benjamin reflected a traditionalistic and paternalistic tone more forcefully than it represented youth's interests or desires. One issue included a listing of political figures (Doumergue, Tardieu, Briand, and Poincaré) noting whether or not they were fathers. The article concluded, "But if a 'Minister of Benjamins' were created, let's hope that the post would be given to a married *monsieur* and father of a family." Benjamin also printed a letter from Marshal Lyautey, "President of Honor of the Federation of Scoutism," encouraging young Benjamins to join the Boy Scouts, "this modern form of French chivalry." In the same vein, the newspaper promised a regular column written by the head of the Cub Scouts (the Boy Scout division for younger children).

Benjamin held a contest for adults, asking them, "*Monsieur*, how did you become who you are?"

> The passionate and moving poll that we are going to begin publishing will be a magnificent lesson of energy, of courage, and of will for all the Benjamines and for all the Benjamins. Learn, my dear friends, how one becomes "somebody."[35]

---

[34] Benjamin, Nov. 14, 1929.

[35] Benjamin, Nov. 14, 1929.

Along with this clear push to provide paternalistic and successful role models for young people, readers were encouraged to send in their own journalistic efforts for publication, for which Benjamin would pay by the line, as they would adult professionals. Additionally, they included a weekly feature with brief biographies of sports figures and aviators, which included some women. All of this combined suggests that the "junior members" of French society were primarily engaged in imitative activities ultimately leading to successful adult social and cultural roles.

Benjamin also had a page for girls, titled "The Page for Benjamines." This was edited by "Aunt Sophie," and was primarily directed at encouraging young girls to become good mothers. It took into consideration feminist efforts at developing girls' equality, but it suggested that such efforts would lead to unhappiness. Aunt Sophie said of herself:

> I once was, like all of you, a little girl. There were already, in that time, two sorts of little girls: good little girls who were very wise and hard-working, and then the little girls who were insupportable and lazy. I believe that it will become necessary to invent for myself a third category: the category of insupportable but hard-working little girls...and in so doing pay attention to me,--because, listen well, this has definitively relegated me to the group of children of whom nothing can be expected...a bit like the little Sophie in "Misfortunes of Sophie." Thus, it has never been wished that I should marry, because it has always been thought that I would give a bad example to my children! Therefore I have but nephews and nieces, and I hope to have more of them beginning today.[36]

Aunt Sophie, therefore, was a woman whose lack of obedience kept her from having children; yet her aunt role provided her with a kind of legitimating authority. Her readers were to become additional nieces and nephews. Unlike the earlier figure of Auntie Jeanne in Le Journal Rose, Aunt Sophie came across as a repentant "New Woman" for whom editing the girls' page of Benjamin would serve as a redeeming act. Likening

[36]Benjamin, Nov. 14, 1929.

herself to the character in a moralizing story about a disobedient young girl's tribulations, she presented herself as a grown-up version of the girls whom such moralizing tales were intended to rehabilitate. The function of the girls' page of Benjamin was similar to that of Le Journal Rose, however, in its efforts to provide a sense of social identity for young girls, in part through developing a sense of belonging to a club, as Aunt Sophie explained.

> Now that I have introduced myself, I will tell you briefly the goal of this "Page for Benjamines." You all know as I do that most of your friends like the books and the games of boys...Tell them strongly that we will make ourselves the same sort as the boys and will be the first to read "our" page...: your cousin Gildas will swear by [*pariera*] our interviews, your brother Olivier will give us advice on the choice of our dresses...[37]

In this way the girls' page was intended to give back to girls a sense of gender identity lost through feminist imitation of boys, though girls' interests were described as deserving of equal respect to boys'. The stories and features on the page supported separate feminine interests, in dolls, clothing, and cooking. It also carried a regular feature called "Ask Doctor Benjamin" designed to prepare girls for the nursing duties they would face as mothers. Although there was no specific reference to the doctor's gender, the authority of the medical profession was clearly established. Various remedies and practices were described for the treatment of minor ailments, but each column ended with a description of when to call in the doctor for expert care.

Within a few years, the girls' page of Benjamin became a separate newspaper called Benjamine.[38] The journal also published a yearly "almanac" for its subscribers with daily calendar pages for readers to fill in their "things to do today." Some of those things were already filled in, included the performance of regular hygienic practices and

---

[37]Benjamin, Nov. 14, 1929.

[38]Benjamine, December, 1934.

"good deeds" to others.[39] In 1938, the publishers of Benjamin temporarily attempted another spin-off, called Junior, which was shorter but otherwise quite similar to the original newspaper.[40] Perhaps the use of the English word was an effort to compete with the increased popularity, by that time, of imported American magazines and comic books. Benjamin continued to thrive despite increased competition from abroad.[41]

"France, My France": Intellectual and Moral National Belonging

Successful competition with American fare was not the norm for most other French youth periodicals, especially those that were unattached to an established youth group. Les Enfants de France and Les Jeunes de France were two somewhat similar magazines that started in the late 1920s and early 1930s and struggled later in the 1930s. Both attempted to provide a particularly French sense of identity to youth. Unlike Benjamin, the magazines themselves were not described as being a sort of club to which youth belonged. Instead, they assumed that their readers belonged to a much larger and already defined community of French youth. These journals each sought to represent the community of youth, and as such they steered away from a didactic tone. For this reason, these journals went much farther in the direction of a horizontal exchange of information between youth than Benjamin had done, and made a stronger effort to efface adult authority in their pages. Les Enfants de France went further in this direction than Les Jeunes de France, and apparently was the more successful of the two journals. In the mid-30s, the two journals joined together because, the editor claimed, the audience for both these journals was the same: French youth between the ages of 7 and 15. Despite this assertion of homogeneity among their readers, the journals did not start out with the

[39] Almanach-agenda de Benjamin, 1931.

[40] Junior, 1934.

[41] See Michel Pierre, Le Journal de Mickey, in Olivier Barrot and Pascal Ory, ed., Entre deux guerres: la création française entre 1919 et 1939 (Paris: Éditions François Bourin, 1990).

same ideological base. Les Jeunes de France had a distinctly royalist and authoritarian cast, whereas Les Enfants de France conveyed a more meritocratic ideology.

Les Enfants de France began in 1928, and declared itself to be responding to the complaint that adults had nothing to give children to read. "We need a collection that offers varied reading, in turns amusing and instructive, responding to the state of mind so different from the past, created by today's atmosphere." The stories, articles and illustrations Les Enfants de France would publish would be written especially for children, by a list of well-known adult authors and artists. These included Gyp, Collete Yver, Edith Wharton and Stella Mead, as well as Henri Bordeaux, André Lichtenberger, René Doumic, André Maurois, and Pierre Mille, among others. New Humanist philosopher Léontine Zanta also figured in the magazine's list of great names.[42] This magazine provided a forum for her ideas about the way young people needed to develop their *personnes*, and was in keeping with the generational reformism outlined earlier in Chapter 2.

This collection of great names did not as a whole denote any particular ideological position, but it did support the importance of intellectual and artistic elitism. Children were deserving of the same quality of reading material as adults. "Never anything of the pedant; but in a well-done publication, there circulates a spirit that little by little forms characters and prepares children to become men. It is in this way that Les Enfants de France hopes to be useful and complete the work of families." No particular type of story or subject matter was left out. Adventure stories, fairy tales, fantasy, and history would be mixed in with science, sports, medicine, and news about the Boy Scouts, the cinema, and current events. This, the editors hoped, would satisfy youth's "undeniable need to be up-to-date with all the innovations of their era." In all, Les Enfants de France emphasized that the younger generation had special needs best met by those who were at the forefront

---

[42]Les Enfants de France (Paris: Édition du Figaro Revue de la jeunesse) March 1, 1928.

of intellectual and artistic achievement, and that their special cultural world should not be distinguished from the adult world by a diminishment of quality. The youth of France needed to adapt, with adult guidance, to the changed atmosphere of modernity, in which they were growing up.[43]

Youth's heroism, often contrasted favorably with the moral and intellectual strength of adults, was reflected in Léontine Zanta's stories in her irregularly published feature "Le Coin des Petits Philosophes" ("The Little Philosopher's Corner"). Her feature regularly championed youth's intellectual creativity, as in the story recounting fourteen-year-old Marthe's passionate and articulate argument against traditionalist adult attitudes that decried childhood's irrational and innately sinful condition.[44] Zanta emphasized young people's ability to engage in more just social relationships than the contemporary adult world supported--and she propagandized for the youth group the Équipes sociales, encouraging that organization's goals. Through Les Enfants de France, Zanta's philosophy was extended to relatively young children. Both Christianity and classical democratic ideals of social justice were evident in her New Humanistic and personalistic philosophical teaching. Her articles were in also in keeping with this magazine's efforts to encourage the meritocratic development of a new, intellectual, youth elite.

Les Jeunes de France made its appearance in January, 1933. This magazine's editorial introduction presented quite a different view of the condition of the youth press and literature in France than did Les Enfants de France just five years earlier.[45] By that time, the French youth press was experiencing strong competition from foreign, especially American, journals and comic books. Disney creations had made their

---

[43]Les Enfants de France, March 1, 1928.

[44]See Chapter 3.

[45]Les Jeunes de France, Jan. 1, 1933.

appearance in France.[46] Les Jeunes de France's introductory presentation asserted that there had never been a journal like this one, even in foreign countries. Yet it also reassured adult readers that this new magazine was not setting out to compete with the existing journals that, in different ways, affirmed the same ideals. The *raison d'être* for Les Jeunes de France was specifically to meet the needs of "the category of families we solicit," based on "the moral hierarchy of this country." Although some other periodicals also attempted to support the same ideals, this newest effort would respond to those among that "category" who requested a less expensive magazine, even if it meant using inferior paper, because, they asserted, the Depression (*la crise*) demanded it. Despite this, they did not want to skimp on illustrations.

> But above all, if we have maintained our decision to endow our children with a fully illustrated review such as they have never yet seen, it is because we want to raise them up, and because the education of the eyes is inseparable from that of the mind. It all holds together, in the same place. Therefore we are going to be educators. Oh! Don't worry. Nothing of the commonplace, nothing that repels the smile, nothing that makes the dear little mouths that we love so much yawn.[47]

Unlike Les Enfants de France, the editors of Les Jeunes de France did not offer "quality" literature written by those who were famous for their adult writings. Instead they argued that authors "must *know how* to write for children." Not surprisingly, their emphasis on illustrations did not include sensationalist *bande dessinées*. It was possible, they suggested, to make grave errors, and the readers would be the judge as to how well Les Jeunes de France succeeded in its task. Readers were encouraged to write letters expressing their opinions and their suggestions. "We will always pay attention to your letters, if not right away, at least in the near future." It concluded sententiously, "Paris

---

[46]The Disney movie, "Steamboat Willie," appeared in France in 1928, and there were a series of Disney-inspired magazines, the first being Le Journal de Mickey, which was sold in France starting in 1934. Pierre, "Le Journal de Mickey," p. 121.

[47]Les Jeunes de France, Jan. 1, 1933.

was not built in a day." Clearly, the readers being addressed here were not the youth themselves, but the adults who were judging whether this new magazine was worthwhile reading for their children. Support for aristocratic privilege, conservative ideology, and religious morality came through clearly. This traditionalist trope was addressed solely to adults judging the new magazine's merits.

Parents were intended to read no farther, or so it seemed. Beneath this introduction, under a large-size heading "To the 'Jeunes de France,'" was an address to the youth themselves.

> This is for you *alone*, my dear friends: don't breathe a word to *anybody*. After today, it is with me that you will communicate (*vous aurez affaire*). Pay attention! We will be just what we deserve *you and I*, good pals or...the opposite. I will receive mountains of little letters, I'm very sure. You will give me your most varied, most disconcerting, most unexpected confidences...*Not one of these letters will remain unanswered*. Some of them will be published in the journal if they merit it. If you have good ideas, don't hesitate. You will not waste your time. Nor will we. We need you to collaborate in making Jeunes de France a cool (*épatant*) journal, *the best of all*.[48]

Like Auntie Jeanne in the pre-war Le Journal Rose, this editor suggested that correspondence with him was secret and exclusionary of adults. Unlike "Benjamin," the youthful persona of Benjamin, this editor appeared to be an adult who was sympathetic to the world of children and youth. He seemed to be independent of the producers of the journal who provided the initial message to parents. He called himself "Passe-Partout," meaning "goes everywhere," suggesting omniscience, or a fly-on-the-wall position relative to the youth readers. What would make Les Jeunes de France "cool," clearly in competition with the journal L'Épatant, would be the disconcerting or surprising secrets of child life, which Passe-Partout would apparently understand and pass on to the other readers. He would also judge youth's ideas and choose, on their merit, to publish those

---

[48]Les Jeunes de France, Jan. 1, 1933.

that he deemed best. Thus Passe-Partout was a strangely in-between character, not lacking authority, yet able to read and understand childish things. And he would do so in a way that would satisfy parents, clearly unlike the popular yet considerably more worrisome L'Épatant or American comic books. That he took a pseudonym that was not even a human name but an abstract idea seemed to efface his age and give him a metaphysical, even god-like, kind of authority.

The stories and articles in Les Jeunes de France ranged from moralizing tales about children helping their parents and "giving back to God" to biographical accounts of the lives of great people, especially of royalty around the world or military heroes. They also covered adventure stories, stories about scouting, fantasy and fairy tales, and history, especially of the middle ages. Stamp-collecting and other hobbies were encouraged, and technical science was discussed. Small stories written by children themselves were published on a special page. One carried a story written by a little girl that was about a cat and a bird who joined forces to fight against a neighbor's dog; another was from a young boy who wrote about "Bob" and "Sam" who went around the world in an airplane in 4 days and 4 hours.[49] One feature carried handwriting profiles for readers from "Uncle Tom." The journal also carried movie reviews that mostly advertised good family fare and suggested that readers should go to a particular cinema, the "Cinema Familial Pleyel," for which it gave movie times. In this way, the journal reached into children's lives beyond merely the time spent reading its pages.[50]

One story that began in February of 1934 and ran through April was titled "Allo?...Paris ne répond plus!" The title recapped the beginning of the story, with a telephone call which no one answered. It was written by Henri Dorac, who had earlier contributed a humorous story about a glacier company that monopolized the world's

---

[49]Les Jeunes de France, Jan. 1, 1933.

[50]Les Jeunes de France, Jan. 1, 1933.

icebergs. "Paris ne répond plus" was a sort of spy story with a mad scientist/doctor who caused everyone in Paris to fall asleep, except for the three heroes of the tale: "Pierre Fontable, a young Parisian journalist; Jacky, an even younger movie actor; and Jim Horder, ex-seaman of the American marines." This little allied troop underwent numerous adventures as they attempted to solve the mystery of sleeping Paris, which, it turned out, was caused by Doctor Panowski, who was really the head of a ring of thieves intent upon looting the city's stores and businesses. Panowski (his name suggesting a Central European, though this was unspecified in the story) had stolen an invention of a good doctor, an "electro-narcotic" that could put people to sleep from a distance. The three heroes joined forces with the good doctor to uncover the truth, though they could do nothing to actually stop the looting. Afterwards, however, Fontable the journalist published the whole story in a series of articles for La Voix, for which he became editor two years later. Doctor Panowski remained insane but his accomplices were never found. The moral of the story was, "Let's hope that [Doctor Panowski] does not take up fantasy again, under the pretext of making a little experiment, and this time put all of France to sleep."[51]

This story began on February 1, just one week before the rioting of February, 1934, which the journal covered in its news feature on February 15:

> In the fifteen days since we left you, grave and sorrowful events have unfolded; you know about them, even though your parents, in order not to frighten or sadden you, have evaded discussing them in front of you. I also don't want to frighten nor to sadden you, except that it is necessary for you, the Youth of France, not to stay ignorant and indifferent to the misfortunes of your country, to the mourning that strikes other little French people. You should not live helplessly in the face of all this suffering. He who can do everything and who said: "Let the little children come unto me," is ceaselessly bending towards you, completely ready to

[51]Henri Dorac, "Paris ne répond plus!," Les Jeunes de France, Jan. 1, 1933.

> listen to you. Join hands, children of France, and pray for your country, pray for those who have died to save it.[52]

This ideological stance was reflected also in news articles about Hitler's rise to power and Germany's rearmament. The journal supported Mussolini with the idea that he was the only powerful ruler capable of protecting the rest of Europe from Germany's aggression.[53] In October, 1934, however, it also supported the inclusion of the Soviet Union in the League of Nations, and gave a similarly authoritarian reason: due to the size of the red army, it was one of the most important of the world. No mention was made of the Soviet army as a threat to capitalist countries, rather it was the size and strength of the army, now apparently on the right side, that was emphasized.[54]

Throughout the year, Les Jeunes de France also included numerous articles commemorating the battles and the heroes of World War I. Despite the adventurous quality of "Paris ne répond plus," therefore, its moral tone and ideological position were consistent with the authoritarian attitude of the editors: France must not sleep in the face of disruptive forces, both within the country and abroad.

In March of 1934, Passe-Partout announced that his boss (*M. le Directeur*) had told him that he could no longer personally respond to all the letters sent to the editor. Instead, they put in place a contest for the readers to see who could bring in the most new subscriptions, "between all the establishments and scholars' groups." Later the same month, the magazine added an additional four pages to the format, bringing the size of the journal up from 24 pages to 28. This addition included more information on sports. The journal also increased its advertising, though it consisted only of the back page. It included advertisements for cameras and for educational toys like "L'Edifice-Magazine," created just for "jeunes de France," consisting of houses to build out of cardboard. "A

---

[52] Les Jeunes de France, Feb. 15, 1934.

[53] Les Jeunes de France, April 1, 1935.

[54] Les Jeunes de France, Oct. 1, 1934.

toy, 'Edifice' is an admirable architectural school, capable of sparking in you a vocation directed towards a career that counts among the most beautiful, because as one eminent educator has said, 'The whole man is in the child. Games which nourish (*lait*) his childhood reveal what will later be his mind and his character. Also, the form that is given to his toys profoundly influences him in the direction of his future.'" Another advertised a bookbag, and yet another a "magic lantern," or simple cinematographic toy.[55] The advertisements varied, but remained limited to the back of the magazine, unlike adult illustrateds at this time, which had several pages of advertisements at the front and back. In January, 1935, the journal reminded its readers that they were the "elite" of France who could constantly improve the country by carrying on the building of it through architecture and industry.[56] In March they returned to this theme in their encouragement to subscribe, writing that Les Jeunes de France was "the only large-format illustrated review for *The French Catholic Elite*--it is the most gay, the most lively, and the most luxurious of the Children's Journals."[57]

Despite the assertion of increasing popularity, by late 1935, less than two years after it began, Les Jeunes de France appeared to be foundering. In November, Passe-Partout announced that the journal was joining with Les Enfants de France, "another review some of you may perhaps know." He told a little story about two cars driving down parallel roads. The two drivers decided to pool their money and buy one shared car that was better than either of their two previous vehicles. This parable was meant to explain the "perfecting" of both journals in their unity. As for Passe-Partout himself, he announced his retirement with the phrase "Passe-Partout is no more, long live Passe-Partout." Likening his passing to that of former kings passing their crowns to their sons,

---

[55] Les Jeunes de France, March 1, 1934.

[56] Les Jeunes de France, Jan. 1, 1935.

[57] Les Jeunes de France, May 1, 1935.

Passe-Partout explained that although he had no son, he would, mysteriously, remain alive to his readers after his "death." "If I die on one side, I am reborn on the other" he consoled his readers. As with the passing of the kingship to the heir-apparent, the readers should be reassured that "nothing had changed in the country."[58]

With the death of Passe-Partout, however, the aristocratic quality of the journal appeared for the most part to be subsumed to the ideological stance of Les Enfants de France. Unlike the earlier Les Enfants de France, however, the new combined journal did maintain a more strongly authoritarian and even militaristic position. The new magazine, now called Les Enfants et jeunes de France, had a new motto, "Pro Patria Laboremus: Croire, Vouloir, Servir" (To Labor for the Patrie: To Believe, To Strive, To Serve"). The May issue contained the first of several installments from the daily journalistic account of a World War I soldier, Charles Jacquemard, to show "to our readers what price the victory of the allied armies had to pay."[59] In October, 1936, it published a letter from Marshal Pétain supporting the new motto and the "insignia" depicting a young boy and girl carrying an enormous French flag.

> My Dear Friends,
> It pleases me to have the ability today to tell you of my affection for "Enfants et jeunes de France." Your device "Pro Patria Laboremus" is also mine. It has inspired all my acts. It holds my hopes, since you have chosen them. The mission that lies with your generation is to give equilibrium back to the Patrie and to return to it its grandeur. For her, you will cultivate your body and your mind, you will affirm your character. To respect for its past, you will join audacity, enthusiasm and faith in its future.
> My children, I give you all my confidence.[60]

---

[58] Les Jeunes de France, Nov. 15, 1935.

[59] Les Enfants et jeunes de France, Jan. 1, 1936.

[60] Les Enfants et jeunes de France, Nov. 1, 1936.

This inspirational patriotism was carried forward in the February, 1937 issue, with the publication of winning entries to an essay contest over which Marshal Pétain supposedly personally presided. Out of hundreds of entries, the winners had the opportunity to attend a ceremony at the journal's offices in Paris.[61]

The essays for the "Concours de la Patrie" were grouped into two age levels. The winners of the upper level ranged from 13 to 17, the lower level winners were all 10 years old. The themes were remarkably similar, using a similar form and similar rhetoric, listing numerous cultural attributes and symbols of France. The grand prize winner was a collaborative effort by two brothers aged 13 and 14, and contained as many elements of Frenchness as they could possibly include, in no particular order nor with any particular analysis.

> The *Patrie* is Saint Genevieve, Joan of Arc, Bayard and Du Guesclin, Richelieu and Colbert, Turenne, Hoche and Marceau, Foch and Pétain; it is RocheValmy, the Marne and Verdun, it is Saint Louis, Henry IV, Louis XIV, Corneille and Racine, Molière and La Fontaine, Ingres and Delacroix, Hugo, Pasteur, Guynemer and Lyautey. It is the Louvre, Notre-Dame, Reims, Strasbourg and Bayeux. It is the flags on the Route des Invalides, it is the salute to the dead by the eternal flame, it is the houses of the village gathered around the clock tower where Angleus chimed, it is the luminous sky on the field that shakes the yellow spikes, the sloping vineyard where the red vines are terraced, made golden by the setting sun, the sheds full of the harvest, the roadsides weighed down by fruit, the sweetness of the air one breathes on vacation; the old house where grandfather says: "It was here, before when I was little...". It is the tomb of our uncle in Sudan, it is the mutilated hand that Papa puts in front of us when he tells us: "Be good, my little ones." It is the voice of Maman, at her evening prayers, saying, "Saint Michael, pray for France" and then, it is still more all the other things that warm our hearts and bring tears to our eyes, when we say in a low voice, closing our eyes: "France, my France."[62]

---

[61] Les Enfants et jeunes de France, Feb. 1, 1937.

[62] Les Enfants et jeunes de France, Feb. 1, 1937.

Some of the other winning essays, containing many of the same heart-warming and tear-provoking elements, included other battles, other heroes, and sometimes ideals of Justice and Law, of Honor and Valor, of work and of knowledge. All included references to the suffering of the soldiers in the Great War, as well as glorification of French traditions and the love of families.

A few months later, Henry Bordeaux, a member of the Académie française, contributed a story about Guynemer, a World War I pilot, a "prince of French youth." Bordeaux's article reiterated the same theme as Pétain. Youth's "task is perhaps to be different from those [Guynemer] himself underwent, less dangerous and less glorious, but it is of the same order."

> Our France is menaced in peace as in war. She is preyed on by occult and evil forces. It is to youth that guarding her and giving her great civilizing and beneficent strength falls. [Youth] can do it by work, by bravery, by nobility of mind and heart, by this ensemble of qualities that formed the chivalry of the past, and that made of Guynemer a knight of the air...[63]

These references to chivalry and an aristocratic support for France seemed to look back to the type of elite nationalism supported by the original Jeunes de France, though they remained more militaristic than strictly political.

The combined forces of Les Jeunes de France and Les Enfants de France were insufficiently appealing, because by early 1938, the journal again changed not only its name but its format. Perhaps in competition with Benjamin, it switched to a newspaper format, with the shortened name JEF. It maintained its ongoing effort to keep up with modern youth's tastes, and took on a more strongly political cast. JEF was meant to be "easier to pronounce...easier to buy...the journal of today's French children...the journal of French youth's urge to live and to grow...rapid to read...luminous like a movie screen...[with] antennae on the life of the world like a radio tower...lifting its view always

[63] Les Enfants et jeunes de France, Sept. 15, 1937.

towards the ideal as an airplane seeks always to climb higher in the sky." But it would also remain faithful to its earlier editors, M. Andryane of the original Les Enfants de France and M. Passe-Partout of the original Les Jeunes de France. With the change in title, however, the "jeunes" was dropped in favor of "enfants": "JEF" stood for "Journal des Enfants de France."[64]

JEF introduced a pair of new editors. Like "Benjamin," they were supposedly a young brother and sister, obviously an imaginary pair, named "Jef" and "Jeffe." Unlike "Benjamin" reporting on readers' "little ideas," Jef and Jeffe would speak to their peers primarily about current political events, from the point of view of French youth.

> For today I would like to say only that our parents seem very preoccupied. Since I've reached the age of dining at the table, I have heard them speak about the falling franc, revolution and war. Today they are worried to see Germany annexing Austria on which France has not budged. I do not know what they will do during the months that come. But it is, from my point of view, one more reason for us to work harder in class and to unwind at the gym, in scouts, or in sports. Because I believe that in twenty years we may have to give someone a hard time (*un fil de retordre*). And that we will have to be both very stern and very strong.[65]

In the next issue, Jef complained that he was being disgusted by the movie offerings, so many of them about war, encouraging hatred. Jef asserted that among French youth, in school and in clubs, hatred based on social divisions were healed, and that France should take advantage of her ability to get along with those who were different. In April, 1938, he reiterated again that French youth were not only interested in sports, but in the "resurrection of France."[66] This comment seemed to look ahead to the Pétainist National Revolution after France's defeat in World War II.

---

[64]Les Enfants et jeunes de France, Feb. 15, 1938.

[65]JEF, March 15, 1938.

[66]JEF, April 1 and 15, 1938.

In May it was Jeffe's turn. She suggested that girls were just as interested in France's future as boys; she cited Joan of Arc as an example, and suggested that although girls would not become female soldiers, they could be nurses. Also, most importantly, they could become good housewives and mothers. "Because I've heard it said at the table that France needs many mothers and that will be the way for me to serve her and to later have many children."[67]

Through the rest of that year, Jef and Jeffe repeated their patriotic trope, with Jef asserting that to be a good scholar and a good scout, to prepare himself to be a soldier, was his task; Jeffe confirming again not only her maternal role but also her schoolwork, so she could take the place of men in offices in time of war. At the end of 1938, after ten years of efforts to maintain a specifically French and nationalistic, elitist type of journal for children, whether aristocratic or meritocratic, Jef was absorbed into its more successful competitor, Benjamin.

From the effort to create an intellectual elite through Les Enfants de France, through the more traditional patriotic and Catholic efforts of Les Jeunes de France and JEF, adult editors and authors sought more clearly to define French children's sense of national identity. From the late 1920s through to the eve of World War II, these magazines struggled against ultimately more popular competitors, both French and American. This illuminates the degree to which the cultural space of childhood and youth seemed open to ideological interpretation and guidance. It also shows that in the end, however, commercialization rather than ideology proved a more solid base for journalistic success.

These diverse contributions to shaping the identity of French children and youth in the interwar years formed an important part of the development of French youth culture. The creation of a literary community that brought together adult editors, authors,

---

[67]JEF, May 15, 1938.

and artists with readers, and also encouraged young people to communicate with one another, led to a newly imaginable picture of French youth as a distinct social collectivity, with its own cultural world. Whether supportive of institutions like the Republic, the Church, or a variety of youth groups, or subversively encouraging of counter-cultural values, youth periodicals like Benjamin, Les Enfants de France, Les Jeunes de France, and L'Épatant all shared in the process of shifting youth identity from a narrower family and class focus to a wider national level. Youth's heroic and strongly idealized social and cultural role continued to be supported and strengthened through young people's participation in the development of the youth press.

The extracurricular freedom offered through this new youth culture was echoed in an interwar reformulation of children's legal status. The rearticulation in youth groups and the youth press of French children's relationships to the rest of French society, while it supported children's cultural interests, did not go far in affecting children's social position. As the next two chapters will show, other authoritative sources moved from a different angle to modify children's status by defending their legal interests. As with the creation of a new youth culture, a new conception of the child as citizen worked to more narrowly define the child's social and cultural role in bringing about an idealized future. Although taking place in the legal rather than the cultural arena, the movement to construct youth culture was closely intertwined with the movement to recognize and represent children's civil rights.

# CHAPTER 7

## CHILDREN'S RIGHTS: PROTECTIONISM AND "NORMALCY"

The post-war atmosphere of the 1920s gave impetus to an international movement towards recognition of children's rights as citizens--of nations and of the world. Although French thinkers kept the interests of the nation at the forefront of their arguments about children's rights, as we shall see, their interests were partly but not entirely separate from those supported internationally. In 1924, the first international declaration of rights for children was drawn up, endorsed by the League of Nations, translated and distributed worldwide. Known as "The Declaration of Geneva," this bill of rights was the first of three international bills of rights for children, the others coming in 1959 and 1990 from initiatives within the United Nations.[1] The Declaration of Geneva laid out the most common twentieth-century approach that Westerners tended to take towards children's rights. Unlike adult rights, children's rights were conceived in terms of protection rather than in terms of natural liberty. This was true also for debates and reforms concerning French legislation of children's rights.

Within France, children's rights were debated relative both to parental and to state authority. The post-war perception of national crisis, which, as we have seen, was articulated with strong state control through the institution of the school and in a more open and diverse way through youth groups and the press, was also expressed through a redistribution of rights within the family. Legislators, lawyers, and intellectuals argued

---

[1]For information about the United Nations' efforts, see George Kent, Children in the International Political Economy (London: MacMillan Press, Ltd., 1995), chapters 9 and 10; A. Glenn Mower, Jr., The Convention on the Rights of the Child: International Law Support for Children (Westport and London: Greenwood Press, 1997); Children's Rights: A Comparative Perspective, ed. Michael Freeman, (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1996), esp. Freeman's introduction; for a more general discussion of issues and debates, see David Archard, Rights and Childhood (London and New York: Routledge, 1993); Gareth Matthews, The Philosophy of Childhood (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), pp. 68-80; on France, see Jacqueline Rubellin-Devichi, "The Best Interests Principle in French Law and Practice," in The Best Interests of the Child: Reconciling Culture and Human Rights, ed. Philip Alston (Oxford: For Unicef, Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 259-280.

that the French child should have a stronger right to state protection, in order to ensure the safety and normal development of future French citizens. The issue of rights was strongly connected to the ideal of "normalcy" that was legitimated within the schools through the efforts of a variety of child scientists and educators. Once again, the state moved in to control these reforms over the younger generation. Asserting children's rights relative to their parents served to give the once private space of the French family a more public, state-controlled, quality.

National or International Rights?

Although France was the allied country whose children had been most adversely affected by World War I, the Third Republic did not want the French child to seem, to other nations, in need of international protection. French authorities wholeheartedly endorsed the Declaration of Geneva as a statement of universal rights. By giving support to this international statement, the Third Republic aligned itself with the other Western nations. Together, these nations presented themselves as the international guarantor of children's rights, conceived in Western terms. In 1924 the French Minister of Education supported the League of Nation's goals by distributing the Declaration of Geneva to all the schools, commanding that it be hung in every classroom.[2] This suggests that the children themselves were supposed to become aware of their rights. No new legislation was put into effect in France, however, that guaranteed children representation on their own behalf. French youth were simply to rest assured that the Third Republic was seeing to their best interests in accordance with the new bill of rights. Within France, the child's best interests were defined primarily in accordance with particularly French values, and because of this, French interpretation of the international bill of rights veered away somewhat from the Declaration's stated purpose.

---

[2]"La charte internationale de l'enfant," L'Illustration, no. 4228, March 15, 1924, p. 247.

The writers of the Declaration put forth as its primary foundation the value of "normalcy" based on modern, secular, scientific knowledge of children and of childhood as a developmental stage of life. Traditional religious values, laws and customs were offered some respect, but came in a distant second to universalizing western scientific "truths" about childhood.[3] The devastation caused by the war led to international support for this idealistic statement of purpose. This was the same kind of drive towards normalcy that had fueled French social hygienists and the French state's educational and social service reforms [4] In practice, however, each participating nation interpreted this bill of rights relative to its existing laws and attitudes towards childhood.

In keeping with liberal discourse, children's rights seemed potentially liberationist, that is, they appeared to lead to greater autonomy and choice on children's part, especially in relation to their fathers.[5] By the late 1930s, French public school textbooks were declaring that fathers no longer had absolute rights over children.[6] The French state--with the support of the League of Nations and its higher truths--gave the appearance of stepping in to represent children against unfair family burdens and even abusive family practices. In practice, the state actually itself wielded a paternalistic sort of power and control through its institutions and legislation, taking on the role of substitute father towards all French children in the interest of "normalcy." Support for

---

[3]An International Year Book of Child Care and Protection: Being a Record of State and Voluntary Effort for the Welfare of the Child, including Information on Marriage, Divorce and Illegitimacy, Education, the Care of the Destitute Child, Treatment of Juvenile Delinquents, and Conditions of Juvenile Employment throughout the World, compiled by Edward Fuller (London: Longmans, Green and Co., and The World's Children Limited, 1925), preface.

[4]See Chapter 4.

[5]On "protectionist" vs. "liberationist" rights, see Joseph Hawes, The Children's Rights Movement: A History of Advocacy and Protection (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991), pp. 115-121; Harry Hendrick, Children, Childhood and English Society, 1880-1990 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 97-99.

[6]Linda Clark, Schooling the Daughters of Marianne: Textbooks and the Socialization of Girls in Modern French Primary Schools (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), pp. 88-89.

greater choice and youth authority, both in terms of self-development and autonomy, and in relation to a stronger public voice, was limited to a few intellectuals and social reformers like the New Humanists.[7] Even the most progressive of educators in France tended to formulate youthful "self-government" within a strongly patriarchal system rather than advocating an overthrow of age- and gender-based social relationships.[8] Throughout the interwar years, there also remained those who supported a return to a stronger, more privatized patriarchal order, and under Vichy, the emphasis on patriarchal family values returned to the fore.[9] Despite the intent of the Declaration of Geneva, putting children's rights into practice remained unclear, both in France and in relation to other nations, and interpreting and implementing new rights went in many different directions.

## The Declaration of Geneva: Form and Content

The five rights listed in the Declaration of Geneva vested authority in a representative, idealized, supranational organization supposed to be working in accordance with a higher authority. Children's universal rights were listed in the English version of the Declaration of Geneva as follows:

> By the present Declaration of the Rights of the Child, commonly known as the Declaration of Geneva, men and women of all nations, recognizing that mankind owes to the child the best that it has to give, declare and accept as their duty that, beyond and above all considerations of race, nationality or creed:
>
> I. The child must be given the means requisite for its normal development, both materially and spiritually.
>
> II. The child that is hungry must be fed; the child that is sick must be nursed; the child that is backward must be helped; the delinquent child

[7]See Chapter 3, especially.

[8]See Chapter 6, for example, on the Boy Scouts and "new education."

[9]See Kristen Stromberg, "Fathers, Families and the State in France, 1914-1945," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1998.

must be reclaimed; and the orphan and the waif must be sheltered and succored.

III. The child must be the first to receive relief in times of distress.

IV. The child must be put in a position to earn a livelihood and must be protected against every form of exploitation.

V. The child must be brought up in the consciousness that its talents must be devoted to the service of its fellowmen.[10]

In addition to "normal" protection in case of disease, hunger, and crisis, children's education and livelihood were also protected. This was not described as being in the best interests of individual children, but rather in service to the rest of society (in English, "fellowmen," in French, "*frères*" or "brothers"). Despite the aspirations of the League of Nations and international philanthropic relief organizations, this reflects the way thinkers in this period continued to position society and its needs ahead of individual needs. Whether "society" meant all of humankind, or was limited to the particular nationality to which a child belonged, remained ambiguous in this statement of child rights.

International Rights for the Child: Cooperation and Competition

Although "rights" for adults and children were generally considered in relation to citizenship in particular nations, after World War I the League of Nations attempted to come up with citizenship rights that transcended national boundaries, to either homogenize or integrate existing national laws. Because the Declaration of Geneva's definition of "normalcy" posited an overarching, scientifically determined, and universal standard for all countries, it might appear that national concerns were left behind. In supporting the League of Nation's efforts, the French had to move to understanding their own traditions and laws relative to those of other countries. On this level, "normalcy" was relevant to more than French traditions, and it was advances in "child science" that served as a replacement. As with French child scientists like Compayré, Binet, Claparède, and Piaget, scientific consistency seemed to open a path for dealing with

---

[10] An International Year Book, reprinted as frontispiece.

children in various different places and different walks of life.[11] A new scientific conception of the child, one that would apply to any and all children, was used as the basis for efforts to reform and regularize national laws to allow for greater international cooperation. In a way that ran parallel to the development of the national child in France, the League of Nations' Bill of Rights for the Child (the Declaration of Geneva) attempted to create a new, international or supranational child. "Normalcy" was the yardstick against which both French and international reconceptions of the child were measured. During the interwar period, the League of Nation's efforts in part worked with, in part struggled against, nationalist definitions of normal childhood. Such normalcy, scientifically determined, was supported in the League's subcommittees by various philanthropic organizations, both national and international in scope.

The Declaration of Geneva was originally drafted in French by the Save the Children Fund International Union in 1923. Founded in 1920, the Save the Children Fund International Union, a charitable organization raising relief funds for children in Europe and elsewhere, had member committees in 31 countries and was affiliated or associated with numerous other relief organizations, including the Universal Jewish Conference, various national Red Cross Societies, the Protestant Churches of France and Norway, the International Secretariat of Youth Movements for Child Relief, and various Jewish organizations. The original impetus for the creation of the International Union came from the London-based Save the Children Fund and the Swiss Committee for Child Relief, under the patronage of the International Committee of the Red Cross. Henri Rollet, a former lawyer and appeals court judge, head of the French Patronage de l'Enfance et de l'Adolescence,[12] joined Miss Eglantyne Jebb, a British representative of the Save the Children Fund International Union, as an "assessor" (non-voting) member of

---

[11]See Chapter 1 for more on child science.

[12]See Chapter 5 for more on Rollet.

the League of Nations committee.[13] The Declaration of Geneva acted as a statement of purpose, and its five rather general articles were to be endorsed by every nation as a first step towards worldwide unification of citizenship rights for the child.

The Treaty of Versailles had designated the League of Nations as the international body with authority over child care, and in 1924, the League expanded its interests from "traffic" in women and children to include "protection" for children. From concerns limited to questions of prostitution and economic exploitation, the League moved to a more encompassing interest in child welfare. This applied both to the kind of relief that the private International Union provided and to public state-run assistance programs, including the state-associated organization which Rollet headed, for children in all the member countries. The League also investigated and compiled information about family, education, and labor legislation from each country. "Assessor" members like Rollet played an important role in providing such information through the work of their organizations.[14]

In 1925 the Advisory Committee on Child Welfare voted to "take the normal child as the basis of its study and to emphasise the constructive side of child welfare at least as strongly as the question of protecting the child from adverse influences or shameful exploitation."[15] It was not until the 1990 United Nations version of the bill of rights that it directly articulated a universal definition of "the child"--an age-related definition of all those under age eighteen. The question of how to define those whom the declaration was intended to protect was one of the problems the League of Nations and The Save the Children Fund International Union set out to solve when they organized the First International Congress of the Child, held in Geneva in August, 1925.

---

[13] An International Year Book, and Series of League of Nations Documents, IV, Social (Geneva).

[14] Series of League of Nations Documents, IV, Social (Geneva).

[15] Minutes, League of Nations Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People, vol. V, no. 5, May 1925, p. 137.

There had been a series of similar conferences around the turn of the century, held in Florence, Budapest, and London, in which the French were heavily involved.[16] Early meetings had taken place in Paris in 1882, and little by little the congresses became better organized. In Florence in 1896, the Congress wrote a "Constitution," and in 1899 in Budapest participants wrote the official goals of the Congress. These were more complex than the Declaration of Geneva, and were geared more strongly towards bringing about reforms within rather than between nations, but were in some ways similar to the efforts of the 1925 Congress. Although they claimed neutrality relative to class and race, participants typed children according to class and cultural milieu as well as mental and physical condition: poor, criminal, mentally retarded ("feebleminded"), blind, deaf, epileptic, "tinker," and otherwise "abnormal" children were their primary concern. They saw themselves as "experts" lending advice to legislators rather than as public educators.[17]

These earlier congresses appear to have been forgotten or ignored by the League of Nations in the 1920s, whose interests and authority were directed at "normal" children, and thus were much more wide-ranging. These are in one sense merely opposite sides of the same coin--"abnormal" vs. "normal"--but the scientific and political aspects took on a different hue in the aftermath of the first World War. The earlier international congresses did not use discourse about the rights of the child as a means of developing their position; instead they pointed to the benefits of increased love for children and the future happiness of humanity as legitimation for interventionist protectionism. Most of the time, their solution to social problems regarding children was to create more and more institutions that would care for children or have stronger surveillance and control over family and

---

[16]Sylvia Schafer, Children in Moral Danger and the Problem of Government in Third Republic France (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 7.

[17]Report of the Proceedings of the Third International Congress for the Welfare and Protection of Children, Sir William Chance, Bart., editor (London: P.S. King and Son, 1902).

school activities.[18] By 1925, state legislation (including state institutions) dominated authority over children, both "normal" and "abnormal," and therefore the 1925 congress targeted legislative practices using a discourse of citizenship rights and state duties.

The weak image of the French child compared to those in other western nations was not necessarily what the Third Republic hoped to present. One example of American views, significant because the United States was to become an important philanthropic force in Europe in the interwar years, was expressed in 1920, shortly after the end of World War I. An International Conference of Women Physicians was held in the United States, a section of which addressed many of the issues raised in the earlier child congresses. Like the aims of the writers of the Declaration of Geneva, this conference was directed at providing a unified scientific front to serve as the basis for legislative reforms as well as improved health programs worldwide. Although doctors, social workers, and authors who contributed came from many countries, including France, most were American, and although most were female, some men also presented papers. There was a larger percentage of papers given by men in the section of the program titled "The Health of the Child" than in the other areas addressed by the conference. This reflected the extent to which childrearing was not yet perceived as an exclusively female concern. Contributors included education experts as well as medical doctors, social workers and government administrators.[19]

S. Josephine Baker, M.D., the Director of the Bureau of Child Hygiene, Department of Health of New York City, and author of two texts on preventative health care relating to infant mortality and "child hygiene," presented a paper extolling the benefits of child welfare systems that included some comparative details about social

---

[18]Report on the Proceedings of the Third International Congress; See also Schafer, Children in Moral Danger, pp. 6-7.

[19]The Health of the Child, vol. III of Proceedings of the International Conference of Women Physicians, (New York: The Womans Press, 1920).

work in the U.S. and various European countries.[20] She emphasized the impact on American public opinion that the destructive effects of the war had wrought on the French child, but did not glorify French efforts to redress the situation. She asserted that "we in America have not been cognizant of anything more important, from our point of view, than the welfare of the children of Europe." She argued that welfare programs had historically arisen from the effects of war, and in agreement with many of the French social hygienists and other social reformers, suggested that the first World War had precipitated unprecedented international concern for child health and welfare. She offered the same image of the child as the future, as the recipient of the war's aims, that was common in France.[21]

> After all, we fought this war for the children. It has not been our war at all, because even now we see the unrest and the disturbances and the various immediate reactions upon the adult population that always come from a war. We fought the war in the larger sense, as one of our great statesmen says, to make the world safe for humanity, but when we come down to the question, it simply means that the humanity we fought to make the world safe for is the rising generation, for they are the ones who will reap the rewards of the great trials and great sufferings that have taken place through the war.[22]

Dr. Baker then covered the history of social work in the West, and, to applause from the audience, asserted that "we have not a child welfare movement, so far as I know, that did not originate in France." Although she glowingly detailed France's early efforts at welfare, however, she described the movement as currently "languishing" in France, and suggested that international efforts to carry forward the impetus of social welfare were a means of paying France back for her earlier foresight. She argued that all the European

---

[20]The Health of the Child, pp. 25-38.

[21]See Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau, La Guerre des enfants 1914-1918: essai d'histoire culturelle (Paris: Armand Colin, 1993).

[22]The Health of the Child, p. 25.

countries were slow in moving from a punitive to a preventative style in social service efforts.

Dr. Baker emphasized the need to know vital statistics as an aspect of preventative hygiene. Although her interests were in preventing physical disease, she emphasized the relative educability of children as an important factor in prevention. She argued that school programs for children, both education and health inspections, and pre-natal education for expectant mothers were growing easier and more effective.[23]

Though her commentary was primarily directed at improving child hygiene in the U.S., her presentation at the international conference clearly supposed the interest of European, and especially French, attendees. None of the contributors to this part of the program were French, though some French doctors and social workers did present papers in other sections, primarily on women's health issues. Many of the other papers presented at the conference that made reference to children's health and welfare reflected eugenic ideas, similar to those at the turn-of-the-century Congress in London. France, however, was no longer perceived as a leader in international discourse about child protection.

The League of Nations' efforts at international cooperation on the subject of the child were thus following a trend established in the late nineteenth century but given stronger impetus by the first World War. The Save the Children Fund International Union's goals for the 1925 Congress, which the Declaration of Geneva represented, were to define "the child" in a way that would minimize competition between countries and universalize welfare and protection efforts worldwide. The Save the Children Fund of London published a yearbook in 1924 that contained information and statistics from all the world's countries. Unlike the earlier congresses, the International Union did see themselves as public educators, and by publishing the yearbook sought to present data in a way that would be understandable to a wide range of readers. The revised edition of

---

[23]The Health of the Child, pp. 29-30.

1925 included an introductory section explaining the purpose of the book: to provide comprehensive information intended to encourage "sincere determination" to make reforms, reliant "for executive power on a just appreciation of facts."

> Care for the young is a primitive instinct, but scientific co-ordination and study of corporate efforts to that end are a development of barely twenty years past...Generations yet unborn will profit or suffer by reason of the way in which we have used our knowledge and recorded our experience in efforts on behalf of the world's children, and it is therefore of the greatest importance that attention should be directed to the compiling and collating of information relating to this question...One need have but little experience of sociological problems to realise how important a clear and accurate record of vital statistics is as a basis of study and a guide to legislation...This is the first step towards discovering the weak spots in the world's care for its children, and setting on foot means of remedying such defects as may be found to exist. The importance of accuracy cannot too strongly be insisted upon...It is hoped that this book will be of service in helping the peoples of the world to understand at least something of 'how the other half lives' in those things which concern the life and care of its children, that, understanding, they may be in a better position to help with experience and advice, and, if need be, with tangible succour in time of grave distress.[24]

Clearly, not only was the child's right to normalcy a duty for each state, but between nations it was a sort of western imperialism The first step was an empirical compiling of data, but the goal was homogenization and reform of "weak spots."

In addition to emphasizing the importance of knowledge of children in the world, this commentary also bemoaned the lack of uniform terminology, complaining that comparisons were difficult when terms such as "infant," "child," and "young person" were differently defined from one country to the next. Uniformity did not even exist within one nation's legislation; the example was given of England--by implication one of the most advanced countries under discussion. English law defined "infants" as people up to age 21, but the United Kingdom's 1908 "Children Act" defined "infants" as those under age 7; yet again when statistics for "infant" mortality were given, only deaths in the

---

[24] An International Year Book pp. vii-xii.

first year of life were included. With similar disparities in other countries, the inaccuracies of comparison mounted.[25]

The Congress of 1925 did not settle these issues, nor did international law necessarily move in the direction of uniformly supporting what was best for "the child" without reference to nationality. In 1934, lawyers from several western countries gathered together under the banner of the Academie de Droit International, which was associated with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (*Dotation Carnegie pour la paix international*). German law professor Leo Raape addressed issues of inconsistency in international family law, using French family law as a special example for comparison with German law. Given the child's connection to its parents, one major concern was children whose parents were citizens of two different countries, with two different sets of laws relating to numerous citizenship rights for which the child or parent could apply. This was especially problematic in cases of divorce, abandonment, or dereliction of duty on the part of one or both of the child's parents. Different countries had different legislation and different means of applying for protection. Raape tended to support Germany's family code, and pressed for more uniform patriarchal values because "the head leads its members." He also firmly supported parents' rights over children's, arguing that "The interest of the parents is not inferior to that of the children." He did not discuss the problem of age because his concern was with the citizenship rights of "the child" in reference to his or her parents, a traditionalist view of the child as perpetually situated relative to the family, no matter at what age. He was more concerned about uniformity in legitimacy legislation, suggesting that legal filiation should always attach citizenship status to the father. Only with the death of the father, he argued, should such rights pass to the mother, even in the case of divorce or paternal negligence.[26]

---

[25] An International Year Book, pp. x-xi.

[26] There was a law passed in 1928 that allowed French mothers to pass their nationality, but not citizenship rights, to their children. Raape was concerned only with citizenship issues. Leo Raape, "Les Rapports juridiques entre parents et enfants comme point de départ d'une explication pratique d'anciens et de

This was the case with both the German and the French civil codes at that time, though in France, Raape pointed out, it was not always uniformly applied in the courts. France's tendency, Raape concluded, was to protect the family member who was French; if the child held foreign citizenship, the French father was protected; if the child were French and the father a foreigner, the French courts tended to protect the child. Raape cited one French legal commentator who argued in 1925 that this was in defense of French "*fille-mères*" (adolescent mothers) who were so often seduced by foreign workers. Raape's own view clearly attached children's rights to parents', and he made no references to a higher, uniform duty to children shared by all nations, as had the Declaration of Geneva ten years earlier. His concerns were practical, and his traditionalist legitimation was doing what most strongly supported "public order."[27]

French State-supported Child Rights vs. Family Rights: Two Views

Within France, the issue of children's rights was debated in relation to the French Civil Code, which dated to the Napoleonic era and had undergone only minor modifications to the time of the first World War.[28] Since the late nineteenth century, the question of rights within the family tended to center on the problems or abuses of paternal rights. Under the Third Republic, the state had increasingly legislated in favor of government intervention in family life, which meant emphasizing the dutiful aspects of parenthood over parental freedoms. Yet the French Civil Code still contained strongly patriarchal laws that awarded fathers a large measure of control over their children's lives.

---

nouveaux problèmes fondamentaux du droit international privé" in Recueil des Cours IV, vol. 50, Academie de Droit International établie avec le concours de la Dotation Carnegie pour la paix internationale (Paris: Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1934), pp. 401-544.

[27]Raape, Les Rapports juridiques, esp. pp. 419-422 and 469-470.

[28]See Women, the Family, and Freedom: The Debate in Documents, ed. Susan Groag Bell and Karen Offen (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1983); Stromberg, "Fathers, Families and the State in France 1914-1945"; Schafer, Children in Moral Danger.

In 1922, the year prior to the International Union's writing of the Declaration of Geneva, University of Lyon professor Charles Chabot published Les Droits de l'enfant, an eloquent argument against increasing scientifically-based state intervention.[29] Many years earlier, in his doctoral thesis at the Sorbonne in 1897, Chabot had argued that children had only one right: the right to parental love. Although in Les Droits de l'enfant he did not approve of using science to legitimate state intervention, he did support the use of scientific research and technique in pedagogy. Throughout his career he organized conferences and classes to exchange and spread knowledge of pedagogical advances. He founded an Institute of Pedagogy at the University of Lyon in 1906, and in 1913 began a yearly *semaine pédagogique* which was attended by both French and foreign, most notably Swiss, teachers and researchers. In 1923 he organized a Philosophy Society for an exchange of views on moral philosophy between professors, teachers, clergy, and medical doctors.[30] He preferred to keep scientific advances out of the hands of state legislators, however. He argued that statist intervention should be in defense of *la patrie*, which represented the people, and not in defense of the interests of the state itself, which was the way science was too often used. In Les Droits de l'enfant Chabot reiterated his view that morality was indistinguishable from obligation, and that truly moral parents would discharge their duty towards their children on the basis of parental love alone, without the need for state regulation. Despite his faith in science, he thus articulated a traditional conception of parent-child relationships.[31]

Chabot saw two camps operating together to support the state's displacement of the authority of the family: those who gleefully embraced "a normal evolution that would atrophy a social organ that had become useless"; and those who "resigned themselves to

---

[29]Charles Chabot, Les Droits de l'enfant (Paris: Perrin et Cie, 1922).

[30]"Un Educateur: Charles Chabot," L'Éducation, April 1925, pp. 404-409.

[31]Chabot, Les Droits de l'enfant, pp. 52-53, 84ff.

the inevitable." Taking issue with both stances, Chabot presented a third point of view, "a pedagogical theory" based on the central question of children's rights, "since it is in the name of these same rights that we envision the abdication or the replacement of the family." Presenting a history of children's rights, he argued that it was from Renaissance writers like skeptic Michel de Montaigne and rationalist René Descartes that the idea of egalitarian natural and rational rights derived. In the late eighteenth century the Jacobins, following Rousseau, strove to give rights to children, but Napoleon tossed these reforms aside again in 1804 with the writing of the Civil Code. Throughout the nineteenth century, the changing role of the child, particularly the working-class child, led to greater and greater abuses of children. Chabot was especially concerned about the neglect of working-class children by their working mothers, as well as the neglect of children in bourgeois families by both parents who preferred leisure activities to the tasks of childcare. He implied that labor by young children was the result of parental neglect or abdication of moral duty towards the child. All of these excesses did suggest a crisis in the family, a degeneration crying out for some sort of intervention on behalf of the child, Chabot acknowledged. It was left until the twentieth century to write a Declaration of the Rights of the Child, he asserted--though he made no reference to the International Union's upcoming efforts to do just that.[32]

Chabot's rhetorical style presented the interventionist camp's arguments fully. He acknowledged the purpose of interventionist reforms and the validity of their motivation, but portrayed the results of the reforms as unnatural and excessive. Well-meant statist efforts to save children both for their own sake and for the greater good of the community led ultimately to a sterile scientific environment, he argued, where children's true needs ceased to be met. He painted a picture of a world where all treatment of children was lovelessly scientific, in order not merely to protect the child, but moreso to protect the

---

[32]Chabot, Les Droits de l'enfant, pp. v, 9-27.

state itself. Although well-intentioned, statist treatment of children was not the right answer, according to Chabot. What was the state if not the collection of people who made it up? he asked. What were children's natural rights other than to be loved? Ultimately, he supported paternal right above state intervention, arguing that the former was the best way truly to protect children. Chabot thus concurred with the writers of the Declaration of Geneva that children's rights were only conceivable in protectionist terms, but disagreed with the use of statist scientific rationalism to overrule or replace paternal duties to children. Instead he argued in a modified traditionalist form that parental obligation was natural, and that state intervention should be limited to upholding parental rights.[33]

Support for children's rights was also expressed from the political Left. A newsletter published in Marseille in the mid-1930s by the Section Bouches-du-Rhône of the *Comité National de l'Enfance* and affiliated *Oeuvres* ran a series of articles that took a different view of children's rights relative to *la puissance paternelle*. La Voix de l'enfant reprinted the complete series twice--once in 1934 and again in 1935. Titled "Un Peu de droit," (both "A Little Right" and "A Little Law") the series briefly covered the history of *la puissance paternelle* in France, and supported successive reforms that had minimized paternal power over children. These articles, written by one of the editors, R. Jacquier, purported to match the purpose of the newsletter itself: to be concerned primarily about the physical but also the moral and material health of the child. Another contributor to the newsletter, Robert Claudel, published an article that clearly showed the socialist leanings of the paper (also evident in the newsletter's title). Claudel quoted some lines from an American journal that he attributed originally to early 19th-century French Socialist Charles Fourier, arguing that children should not be raised within the confines of the family. They needed to interact with other children, to choose their friends and

---

[33]Chabot, Les Droits de l'enfant, pp. 26, 82-83.

their tastes from their peers rather than solely their brothers, sisters, and parents. This anti-family stance was reflected to some extent also in the series on paternal rights.[34]

As Chabot had done, "Un Peu de droit" described industrial forces as abusive of children. Unlike the conservative educator, however, the socialist Jacquier called the child labor reforms of the nineteenth century "a great victory against the liberalism of the first half of the nineteenth century." He argued that even more, the move to protect children and women within the family offered benefits, through the progress of individualism, primarily to the mother and child. Jacquier suggested that "paternal power" should more properly be referred to as "parental power," as mothers wielded rights when the father died or was declared *déchu* by the courts. Jacquier declared that modern paternal power had been modified from its original Roman absolute quality, and had become an "authority of protection to permit parents to exercise their right of education." This protection of adults did not necessarily work as it was supposed to, however. The progress of industrialization, lowering moral standards especially among the proletarian masses, weakened the authority of parents and in many cases made them "more harmful than useful." This depiction of harmful parents thus upheld the state's rights to intervene in cases where the parents--fathers or mothers--were unable to use their authority to raise their children properly.[35]

Jacquier nevertheless supported the idea that children should respect their parents, not only until the age of majority, but for their whole lives, asking for advice and help when needed. Although written into the Civil Code, such respect was a moral rather than a legal rule, according to Jacquier. "Let's hope that the legislator will never have to intervene to establish sanctions that, up to today, have been useless." Clearly, Jacquier's ideal still cleaved to a traditional view of parental authority, and he had doubts about the

---

[34]R. Jacquier, "Un Peu de Droit," La Voix de l'enfant, January 1934, p. 1, and May 1935, p. 1; Robert Claudel, "L'enfant de demain," La Voix de l'enfant, January 1934, p. 1.

[35]"Un Peu de Droit," La Voix de l'enfant, January 1934.

state's ability to intervene effectively. This socialist view, like Chabot's more traditional one, did not advocate state intervention in "normal" or unproblematic family life. Jacquier agreed that the right of education, especially moral education, gave parents the right also to discipline and punish their children, including reading their letters or holding back those letters that might be damaging to the morality of the child, and chaperoning all visits with friends. He emphasized that this was only to the extent that it was in the child's best interests.[36]

How were parents to understand what was in the child's best interests? Another article supported the use of child psychology to better "govern" the child--though this was not easy because "although we have been children ourselves, we have great difficulty understanding what goes on in their souls." The answer was to try to "know" (*connaître*) the children as well as possible. For this newsletter, "knowing" children stemmed from scientific advances rather than from parental love, the latter seeming too often insufficient due to social problems.[37]

La Voix de l'enfant thus took a middle course on the issue of children's rights. Supportive of advances in child science, especially psychology, and supportive of individualism while at the same time bemoaning the negative effects of industrialization, the editors clearly considered that a child's rights were best served when parents properly fulfilled their traditional moral obligation. State intervention should not be necessary, though the condition of the modern, especially the working-class, family was such that intervention might be legitimate. Overall, the emphasis was on providing the child with a moral socialization that depended on understanding and respecting the child's position as child. In one sense that supported the child's individualism as distinct from the adult's,

---

[36]"Un Peu de Droit," La Voix de l'enfant, January 1934.

[37]"Psychologie spéciale des tout jeunes enfants," La Voix de l'enfant, August 1934, pp. 3-4.

yet at the same time it did not support children's autonomy. It fell back on the need for state-supported, if not mandated, protectionism, if only in special cases.

The newsletter's overall support for state intervention in the name of protectionist rights for the child specifically targeted abusive families, especially fathers. In keeping with this theme, the newsletter announced a conference to be held in 1935 at the *Office Centrale des Ouevres* on "the abuse of the rights of *la puissance paternelle* and the means of correcting them in the interest of children." The conference was to be led by the vice-president of the Civil Tribunal and president of the Tribunal for Children.[38] Again, parental rights were intended morally and legally to be in the best interest of the child, and state intervention was sometimes necessary to safeguard children against abuse. This socialist argument, although protectionist, did position the child's rights as an individual ahead of the family's rights.

Fathers' and Mothers' Rights and Duties Debated: Legislation and Legal Commentary

The question of mother's rights was not as clear-cut as La Voix de l'enfant suggested. Several law theses written in the interwar years addressed the finer points of parental authority as both a right and duty, including the thorny issue of comparative rights of mothers and fathers. Questions about children's rights wove throughout these experts' discussions, often ambiguously articulated. The format for such theses was, first to outline the history of the legislation to be discussed, then to offer an opinion about the direction reform should take. On the whole, these lawyers tended to support state intervention, sometimes arguing that it was in the child's best interest, sometimes that it was for the common good. When detailing the Third Republic's family legislation reforms, they tended to describe a constant amelioration, and in this way, they were not conservative. For the most part, however, the law schools for which these theses were

[38] La Voix de l'enfant, April 1935, pp. 1-2.

written were conservative institutions. Despite these future lawyers' reformist statements, the pace of family reform as well as its practice within the courts moved slowly throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. What these legal arguments provide that is significant for an analysis of the discursive construction of child rights is the subtlety of their discussion of the difficult triangulation of fathers', mothers', and state's rights and duties, and the relationship of children's rights to these authorities.

Father's rights, or *la puissance paternelle* as outlined in the Napoleonic Civil Code, changed little over the course of the nineteenth century, until the advent of the Third Republic. At this point, state control over parents increased, and interventionist strategies were more strongly legislated. Laws were passed that allowed the state to remove paternal rights from fathers (and, a little later, mothers) who were declared negligent in their duties, or in *décheance.*[39] These reforms considered parental negligence a criminal act.[40]

In 1922, Pierre Sabatier published La Dechéance de la puissance paternelle et la privation du droit de garde, in which he argued that both before and after the 1804 Napoleonic Code, *la puissance paternelle* was morally defensible due to the importance of the family as the primary social unit. He described the family as a sort of small society unto itself needing a leader who was best qualified for the role, namely, the father. Up to this point, Sabatier thus seemed to be in the same camp as the conservative Chabot. As the family gave way to modern society, Sabatier argued, however, the authority of the father (i.e., his rights) was replaced by the authority of society at large. Society's right was to demand that fathers fulfill their appropriate duties towards their children, especially the duty of education. This patriarchal inversion explained, in Sabatier's account, the development of interventionist laws under the Third Republic. He also took

[39]See Schafer, Children in Moral Danger; Stromberg, "Fathers, Families and the State in France."

[40]Sylvia Schafer, "Between Paternal Right and The Dangerous Mother: Reading Parental Reponsibility in Nineteenth-Century French Civil Justice," Journal of Family History 23 (April 1998): 173-189.

a stand against communitarian Socialist approaches to childrearing, in defense of the social need for fathers to maintain authority for the common good, especially through their duty of educating the next generation. In this, Sabatier was wholly supportive of the Third Republic's efforts. In Sabatier's view, there was nothing wrong with family organization, nor with paternal authority continuing to be enacted through the father.

> Since ordinary necessity pushed families to contract a more narrow union, they spontaneously obeyed the law of conformism, they were penetrated with a group spirit from which the fathers of families could not escape and the education of the child had to be more and more oriented towards the feeling of collective life of the constituted group. That is to say that *la puissance paternelle* developed parallel to social organization, following an infinitely winding curve; but that is not to say that in a perfectly organized society, it would find itself annulled, as certain socialist schools since Plato have requested, because the act of familial generation continuing, the State must always respect the educational ability of the parents, at the risk of being deprived of a source of strong and free energy and of going in that way against collective interests.[41]

Thus, in liberal societies, fathers represented the common good, and such representation constituted a new articulation of collective morality. Sabatier argued that this "official morality" transformed the nature of the child into that of a citizen. The idea of the citizen child--invested with rights derived from collective interests--legitimated intervention in cases of criminal (*vicieuse*) treatment. Official morality continued to exist, he insisted, as it always had, going back to the Ten Commandments, even though it seemed unconscious and sometimes a bit vague.

Sabatier's defense of the liberal position, especially in its claims to child citizenship, appeared to echo a discourse of natural rights; but his concern did not focus on the child as individual nor even on the child's difference from adults, but remained grounded instead in the collective, organic composition of society. Like the social hygienists and social Darwinists, Sabatier saw decay of the family reflecting a larger

---

[41]Pierre Sabatier, La Décheance de la puissance paternelle et la privation du droit de garde (Paris: Éditions de la Vie Universitaire, 1922), pp. 3-6.

systemic flaw. He asserted that the high incidence of criminality among adolescents was an indication of "a profound social imbalance, of an evident insuffisance of paternal authority, of a slackening of the moral connections provoked by the progress of individualism and of the need for strong reforms."[42] Sabatier portrayed the shift from a more old-fashioned and conservative view of the father's rights and duties to a more modern, liberal view, as merely a restructuring of an ageless morality. The Liberal State took on a paternal role itself, representing the collectivity of fathers whose duty it had always been to raise children, now geared towards questions of the common good rather than towards the good of individuals or families. Supportive of the liberal program, Sabatier did not support individual, liberationist children's rights. He saw individualism as counter to the legitimate force of state intervention.

The type of liberal stance Sabatier presented was typical of French understanding of parental authority, and it was around this kind of depiction that the issue of mothers' rights turned. For reasons of public order, reflected in family order, French lawmakers considered it best to vest parental authority in only one parent or individual at any given moment. "Les Droits de la mère sur ses enfants dans le Droit Français contemporain" (1913) by René Lefeuvre supported this aspect of the civil code as long as the father was appropriately fulfilling his duties, arguing that to allow more than one parent to have legal authority would be to "introduce anarchy into the family." In this law thesis for the University of Paris, Lefeuvre argued that mothers nevertheless did have equal parental authority. Mothers' authority was enacted through paternal decisions, he asserted--this supposed that fathers were representing mothers. As long as the mother and father were in agreement, they were united in their authority. Problems arose when they disagreed. By this, Lefeuvre appeared to mean when the mother disagreed with the father's will. This sometimes happened, he pointed out, even when there was not bodily separation as

---

[42]Sabatier, La Décheance, pp. 3-6.

in the case of legal separation, abandonment, or divorce. Lefeuvre argued that mothers' authority should be more firmly exercised even within marriage, when it served to protect the child, both from paternal abuse and from the child's own errors. In this way, Lefeuvre argued that mothers should act as a first-line defense against a criminal or abnormal situation in the family. By giving mothers rights, state intervention would be held at bay.[43]

Mother's rights were again the subject for a law thesis in 1925 at the University of Alger. In "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant," Maurice-Firmin-Felix Roure's discussion took on a slightly more, abeit still quite moderate, feminist stance than did Lefeuvre's. Roure argued that studying the role of the mother in the family provided the best understanding of the condition of any society. "Family organization has always been the first and the most exact mirror in which the civilization, customs or beliefs of an epoch or a race are reflected. And, in the family itself, the place given to the mother enlightens us better than any other sure point to the general tendencies and to the life itself of each society." Roure asserted that the current "crisis of the family" was most clearly apparent in the legislator's treatment of the mother. Family law had been "deformed from its origins by false principles and become increasingly too narrow." Roure provided historical coverage of French family law, emphasizing the successive reforms made to the 1804 code, and offered suggestions for further reforms supporting mothers' rights.[44]

Since 1889 mothers could wield most of the rights of *la puissance paternelle*, as long as the father was dead, absent, or declared *déchu*. Under other circumstances, however, the mother's rights were extremely limited. Even when they were given rights,

---

[43]René Lefeuvre, "Les Droits de la mère sur ses enfants dans le Droit Français contemporain," Doctoral thesis, University of Paris Law School (Paris: Librairie Nouvelle de Droit et de Jurisprudence, 1913), esp. pp. 127-129.

[44]Maurice-Firmin-Felix Roure, "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant," Doctoral Thesis, University of Algier, 1925, pp. 9-11.

mothers' authority did not extend as far as either the fathers' or the state's. In 1889, a modification was made that allowed mothers to wield paternal power (*la puissance paternelle*) almost to the same degree that fathers did, when those rights were legally withdrawn from the father. Usually this transfer of rights was enacted only in cases where the mother was living separately from the father. If she herself were still bound by law and custom to the father's dominance as the head of the family, courts would give legal guardianship to someone else (usually a family member or friend). Even after the 1889 reform, mothers awarded *la puissance paternelle* were not really provided with full executive powers, however, and continued to be expected, both by custom and law, to appeal to male members of the family for advice before wielding power over their children. There were two aspects of *la puissance paternelle* that were not extended outright to mothers: the right to choose their children's marriage partners, and the right to incarcerate their children at will.[45]

Lefeuvre's main goal was to support mother's rights as a means of preventing abuse, and thereby preventing state intervention. In keeping with this argument, one of Lefeuvre's suggestions was that the mother's veto powers should be augmented. As the law stood, when the father still held *la puissance paternelle*, the mother could veto the adoption of her children by someone else. She could not step in to keep her husband from approving of a marriage partner (the father's approval alone was legally "sufficient") nor to keep him from incarcerating a child. Lefeuvre argued that this was against the interests of her children, as her opinion stemmed as strongly from her natural authority--based on her love for her children and care for their interests--as the father's did, and therefore was equally important. The strengthening of veto powers was directed, not

[45]Roure, "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant"; See also Schafer, Children in Moral Danger.

towards supporting mother's autonomous parenting, but towards a greater ability to protect children from abusive fathers.[46]

While supporting increased rights for mothers, however, Lefeuvre was also supporting traditional paternal rights, and similarly to Chabot, arguing that the child's interests were best served by allowing parents freer authority over them, rather than by increasing state intervention. Although he did not go so far as to approve of splitting paternal authority equally, and thus contentiously, between the father and mother, he perceived the mother as the appropriate children's defender in the face of paternal abuse. This was true whether or not the parents were divorced, he argued. Lefeuvre decried the aspect of the 1889 law on *décheance* that did not allow the mother, unless she underwent a physical separation from the father, to have *la puissance paternelle* when the courts removed it from her husband. He held that women's fear that physical separation would lead to divorce kept mothers from speaking up against paternal abuse or in case of any dispute. Also, the mother should keep her rights over her children even when she remarried--instead of having *la puissance paternelle* legally pass to her new husband. Additionally, he urged, when mothers were awarded *la puissance paternelle*, they should have a stronger right to *correction*, or discipline of the child, including the right to demand that the courts incarcerate the child for a period of time, just as the fathers did. Such a legislative proposal was made just after the war, in 1920, even for mothers within marriage. The Commission of Civil and Criminal Legislation condemned such a move, claiming that mothers should take the kinder part of childrearing and fathers the more "energetic." Disagreement in the Senate caused the proposal to be set aside.[47]

Before World War I, debate about parents' rights emphasized the punitive aspect of the civil code, both in terms of removing rights from parents, and in terms of the

---

[46]Lefeuvre, "Les Droits de la mère sur ses enfants dans le Droit Français contemporain."

[47]Roure, "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant," p. 273, citing the Journal Officiel.

parents' need to punish or control their own children. The concept of a legal right to punish--on the part of the state or the parent--thus was largely understood as a duty. On the part of the parent, fathers would demand that the judge incarcerate his son or daughter, with no need to produce evidence or have a trial. The judges did not deliberate over the matter, but merely acted as justices of the peace in authorizing this paternal right. To the age of 16, incarceration was limited to one month. If the child was over 16 up to six months was allowed if the parent filed a requisition with the court; in these cases the judge would weigh the evidence and could shorten the sentence at his discretion. The child over 16 could also appeal to have the sentence shortened. Prior to 1889, fathers did not often use their right to correct their children by incarcerating them (1200 cases per year between 1875 and 1895).[48] The 1889 law emphasized parental duty but fell short of providing mothers with the most extreme civil means for controlling children that fathers had long held.[49] Mothers who wished to invoke this right had to get approval from the two closest paternal relatives (or failing that, friends of the father) and always had to offer an explanation for her request to the judge. The right to *correction* of children thus remained a masculine right and duty.[50]

The 1889 law did serve effectively to allow the state greater latitude to punish by removing paternal rights, from the father or the mother, when they were not properly fulfilling their duties. This included parents' personal duties to their children, but also strongly emphasized their parental duty to society at large, which focused on both education and effective control of children. Thus the state's right and duty was to oversee parental duties for the public good, not necessarily in the interests of individual children.

---

[48]Sabatier, La Décheance, p. 26

[49]This practice was a more democratic version of the Old Regime *lettres de cachet*.

[50]See Schafer, Children in Moral Danger, pp. 100-101. The law was often also used as a reason to investigate the father in case his request to incarcerate his child represented paternal negligence or abuse within the home.

Roure took a more aggressive stance than Lefeuvre in supporting mothers' right to hold parental power equivalent to that of fathers. The advent of the first World War had created a situation where many mothers could not conform to the expectations of the Civil Code that required her to receive permission from the father to make decisions legally covered under *la puissance paternelle*. Roure pointed out that a new law of 1915 allowing mothers to carry out paternal rights when the father was absent due to war merely replicated an earlier order from the Franco-Prussian war of 1870. Although mothers were accorded *la puissance paternelle* in a provisory way, including the right to emancipate their minor children, they were held ultimately to the permission of the court, and this was only awarded in "urgent cases." They were still not given the right to *correction* except with the combined approval of the two closest paternal relatives and the court. Roure asserted that this was insufficient. As a reform, the law of 1915 was, in Roure's assessment, insignificant.[51]

Much more significant was the law of November 15, 1921, which modified the way that paternal *dechéance* was determined. In the last months of the war, Etienne Flandin proposed to the Chamber that the law of 1889 be modified to allow the court to decide on all *or part* of *la puissance paternelle*, affecting all *or any one of* the children in the family. Previously, *dechéance* was an all-or-nothing determination: it affected the entire relationship between the negligent parent and all of his or her children, both presently living and to be born. This was perceived as providing considerably more leeway to the courts. Previously, judges had hesitated to declare a parent *déchu*, because of the irrevocable and total quality of the judicial determination, Flandin argued. While Roure saw this reform as an opportunity to expand mothers' rights, Sabatier considered it as an expansion of the state's powers, especially relative to the penal system. This diminution of paternal rights required that the negligent father continue his parental

---

[51]Roure, "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant," pp. 228-229.

duties, and thus do more for his children than the pre-war statutes had allowed. This was done by splitting up *la puissance paternelle* into many smaller parts, allowing charges to be brought against fathers (or mothers) about only one child or only one aspect of childcare. When this reform was passed into law in 1921, state interventionism could be applied both more subtly and more widely. Ironically, by charging the parent with less than total negligence, the state gained greater power.[52]

Roure pointed out that this benefited mothers still legally married to the offending father. She was no longer forced to deny her husband all of his legal rights to protect her children, thereby effectively sundering the family. He suggested, however, that the law had become more strongly interpretive, and this vagueness caused it to be still too narrowly applied in the courts. He cited a case from 1912 where a mother had petitioned the court to take control over her daughter's education away from the father. This was done because he had left his wife and was living with his mistress, and had placed his daughter in a boarding school not to his wife's liking. Because of the totalizing nature of the 1889 law, the mother, already separated from the father, was able to have the father declared *déchu* and take control herself. Under the 1921 reform, the mother would have to specifically argue that, by itself, the choice of school was proof of the father's negligence, without consideration of the morality of his living arrangements. Thus this case would have been decided against the mother, Roure suggested. Although sometimes the courts did decide on behalf of the mother's wishes, they could now go either way. This greater latitude on the court's part, which Sabatier saw as a simple and beneficial expansion of state intervention, Roure saw as an opportunity, albeit too ambiguous, for increasing women's parental rights. Such ambiguity and greater judicial leeway was also

[52]Roure, "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant," pp. 186-190.

not entirely in keeping with Lefeuvre's suggestions for mothers' rights, as it did not seem to function as a strategy to limit intervention.[53]

Roure's solution was to propose another reform that had already been implemented in Sweden: parents should exercise their rights conjointly and equally. He cited several arguments, rejecting those from socialists who claimed that children should be raised separately from their families after weaning. Roure also rejected arguments by feminists who claimed that women's rights were best exercised in the public sphere. He agreed only with the cause of one female lawyer who supported equal rights for parents by arguing that women's rights were limited to but most important in the domestic sphere. Roure approved of Catholic Modernist Pére Sertillanges' description of women's nature and their social role, pointing to Sertillanges' importance as a leader of youth intellectuals in that period. Sertillanges' brand of conservative feminism, as written in Féminisme et christianisme (1907) held that women's nature was especially suited to motherhood, and that her authority should be dominant in the home. Thus Roure's approach remained moderate, not even fully advocating a separate-but-equal gender policy, with mothers having equal but not dominant rights within the home and not at all in the public sphere.[54]

If parents were given equal authority, cases of disagreement would still cause complications, and to that end Roure wished to change France's system of moderating such disputes. He suggested a new system which allowed mediation from any person external to the couple themselves; preferably first from family members, friends, or clergy, but in the last resort to a single judge. Roure felt it would be best if the disagreements were kept as private as possible, and therefore did not like the idea of written requisitions nor evidence placed before an open court. He wanted to set up a more privatized mediation system, and he argued that, along with truly equal and

---

[53]Roure, "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant," p. 189.

[54]This female lawyer used the male pseudonym "Paul de Lauribar." Roure, "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant," pp. 270, 278.

conjointly enacted parental authority, mothers could thus better exercise their rights and duties towards their children. He suggested that this was the only recourse unless there was a radical social reform of the institution of the family itself: "...in the actual state of our laws and our mores [*moeurs*], it is absolutely necessary to give the mother rights equal to those of the father, and then to open to her the possibility of recourse, in case of irreducible disagreement." Short of reforming the family itself in such a way that disagreements would somehow cease to exist, it was necessary to legislate the introduction of strangers into parental decision-making, but Roure wished such mediations to remain private rather than state-adjudicated.[55]

Sabatier more strongly approved of the reform of 1921, because it allowed judges to apply the law more widely, yet he harbored one complaint. There were not enough good reform schools in which the courts could place children who had been removed from their families. Thus, though the law was in place, it was not yet fully effective. Sabatier argued for state intervention, but clearly remained in the school of thought that treated parental *dechéance* as a criminal action against the state. He considered the "child in moral danger" as a virtual criminal element more than as a citizen whose individual rights had been transgressed by his or her parents.[56]

The 1921 reform did not settle these issues, and it continued to be addressed by law students who offered suggestions for reforms. Thérèse Traizet's 1939 thesis suggested that while rights were better exercised by divorced or widowed mothers, they still were not sufficiently accorded to mothers within marriage.[57] Taking the opposite trajectory, two years later, Roger Saut's thesis written for the University of Dijon in 1941-

---

[55]Roure, "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant," p. 279.

[56]Sabatier, La Décheance, pp. 115-117.

[57]Thérèse Traizet, "Les Droits de la mère légitime sur la personne des enfants pendant le mariage (en l'absence de séparation de corps)," Doctoral thesis, University of Paris Law School, 1939 (Paris: Les Éditions Domat-Montchrestien, 1939).

-under the Vichy government--not only approved of limiting mothers' rights to support for fathers' leadership in the family, but also demanded greater authority be given to grandparents. In "Droits des grand-parents sur la personne de leurs petits-enfants," Saut argued that grandparents were also importantly interested in children, and were the family members parents themselves most often turned to in times of need. He went so far as to suggest that parents should be required to consult with the grandparents on important decisions such as the marriage or the emancipation of minor children or in case of dispute. He also argued that the court should have less control over the awarding of guardianship after the death of the parents. Further, he suggested that France follow Germany's lead in allowing for a testamentary transfer of guardianship directly from the parents to someone else, which, he claimed, would usually be the grandparents. All of this served to support parents' rights, and to extend those rights into the adult lives--in terms of parenting--of their children, thus giving grandparents greater authority over the next two generations of "children." This support for the Pétainist platform glorifying the family thus also spread family rights over a larger number of older family members, and did not suggest returning "parental" authority solely to the hands of the father. Significantly, however, it did suggest limiting mothers' rights.[58]

How do all these discussions of comparative rights of fathers, mothers, and even grandparents treat the question of children's rights? Clearly, none of these authors, with the partial exception of the socialist newsletter La Voix de l'enfant, supported "children's liberation." With the exception of Sabatier, they also kept the issue of the child's rights clearly located within the family, and especially as related to paternal rights, whether held by the father or guardian. Although state intervention was often referred to as being "in the child's best interests," the primary concern of these authors was society's best

---

[58]Roger Saut, "Droits des grand-parents dur la personne de leurs petits-enfants," Doctoral thesis, University of Dijon (Paris: Librairie Arthur Rousseau, 1941). On Vichy policies, see also Stromberg, "Fathers, Families and the State in France, 1914-1945."

interests, whether achieved through the action of the family or the state. Society's most important interest lay with the moral education of the next generation, and this was then articulated as the child's primary "right." The idea that children had other rights most often arose in relation to negligence or abuse within the family. Under normal circumstances, children would not require such rights, as their needs would be met in some "natural" way, whether through the love of their parents (Chabot), or the collective or common system of paternalism in French society, represented by the state (Sabatier). The question of mothers' rights, even in Roure's argument, was not founded on an individualist view of women as mothers, but was perceived merely as a mediating force between fathers and children. This included the mother's capacity to uphold the family's "normalcy" as a preventative for paternalistic state intervention (Lefeuvre).

On the whole, French interwar reforms increased state intervention, primarily through a process of division of rights--taking away the traditionally absolutist nature of fatherhood--and increased state surveillance. At the same time that the father's rights were divided under the 1921 law on *la puissance paternelle*, the state's right to particularize the definition of "normal" treatment of children was strengthened. At that point, each aspect of children's rights relative to their parents could be treated separately legislatively and judicially. Because more children were left with their parents, "normal" family life could be maintained, although the parents, once involved with the courts, were required to undergo greater surveillance over their behavior. In this way, as the courts gained greater latitude for fine-tuning judgments against parents, stronger state intervention was also implemented. Ironically, discursive support for parenthood, especially parental love, simultaneously supported increased state paternalist control. This difficulty remained unresolved under Vichy, despite the French state's apparent return to family values during World War II.[59]

---

[59]Stromberg, "Fathers, Families and the State in France, 1914-1945," esp. pp. 338-341.

Despite France's involvement in and approval of the Declaration of Geneva, French lawyers and legislators did not enter fully into the universalizing international discourse of "children's rights." They argued more often about the juxtaposition of parents' rights--including mothers' vs. fathers' rights--and state authority. As we have seen, these issues were argued within France in a post-war context that had to account for a wide-spread disruption, through death and disablement, of French families. It was primarily around questions concerning education that the discourse of children's rights came into play. As with the Pupilles de la Nation program, or the *école unique* reform, education services and reforms tended to portray the state as a surrogate father for French children. Educators tended to be more concerned with the child's education as citizen for the good of society, rather than for the good of the individual child.

Given the protectionist nature of the Declaration, France's internal family and education concerns were not in opposition to international goals. On the whole there was an increasing importance placed on protecting children from parental abuse, and thus preventing the abnormal conditions that signaled familial--and social--degeneration. Within France, such protection was still closely tied to the protection of the nation as a whole, whether through the mediation of the parents or the state. The degree to which discussion of children's rights seemed set against the biological father's authority, however, gave an illusion of liberationism, if not anti-patriarchalism, to the debate. Increasingly, those who stepped forward to claim for themselves the duty of protecting--and thereby controlling--children's upbringing did so on the basis of upholding children's rights.

One of these rights was the right to "normalcy." As the last chapter showed, the popular press tried to provide a new kind of "normalcy" by providing a sense of community among youth and fostering extra-familial ties to the rest of French society. Yet the youth press, especially, was a dangerous arena for the creation of French "normalcy," both because of its commercial nature and because of its openness to

different ideological influences. On the basis of the protectionist rights outlined in this chapter, a movement towards regulation of the youth press pushed hard against journalistic efforts to create an ideological market among the younger generation of the French. As the next chapter will show, the French child's "best interests" became conflated with the French child's "tastes," and in this way the legal and the cultural arenas meshed.

# CHAPTER 8

## CENSORSHIP AND REGULATION OF CHILDREN'S CULTURE

The postwar process of creating a national youth culture led, circuitously but surely, to the imposition of state control over every area of young people's lives. As we have seen, this control was most often articulated as a type of generational protectionism. Along with concerns about the child's well-being relative to family life and work, state protectionism extended to the development of youth culture, and especially to the press. In the domain of extracurricular youth culture, the French child's "best interests" were articulated as cultural "tastes." The developmental nature of childhood was reflected, French adults thought, in the development of young people's tastes for certain types of leisure activities, including reading. On the basis of its commercial competition as well as the potential for propagandist efforts, advocates of regulation considered the youth press dangerously free or open to diverse influences. It was therefore the area that, throughout this period, the French Republic sought most firmly to control.

Support for regulation meant censorship of children's culture, and that brought out a conflict between the construction of adult "natural" or civil rights and children's protectionist rights. Proponents saw censorship, which was more commonly opposed to adult liberationist rights, as supportive of young people's civil rights when it was applied to children's culture.[1] As a form of protectionism, censorship appeared to be one important child right in itself, which the state needed to regulate, and parents and other adults needed to carry out. That is, children had the right to be protected from whatever might be morally or psychologically damaging to them. They had the right to normalcy, and that extended to consuming only culture that was deemed appropriate--given their

---

[1]Pascal Ory points to the apparent contradiction between censorship and liberal democratic rights; he also outlines the market-supporting trajectory by which such a contradiction was able to stand. See Pascal Ory, "Présentation" and "Conclusions," in La Censure en France à l'ère démocratique (1849-...), ed. Pascal Ory (Brussels: Éditions Complexe, 1997), pp. 333-340.

status as children. Parents had the right to expect state support in carrying out this endeavor; and the state had the right to demand that parents fulfill their duties effectively.

Efforts at official censorship had to work around forces of commercialism, which were themselves in apparent tension with traditional parental authority in France. Overseeing children's reading material was a legal and customary paternal duty (part of *la puissance paternel*), which included both choosing good reading and denying children access to bad reading. Simone de Beauvoir--from a "bourgeois" family--described in her autobiography of childhood how her parents would let her read any book from their library that she asked for, but they would pin together the pages she was not to read before giving her the book. She also explained that she learned about sex through illicit reading of her parents' library and through books smuggled into school and passed around by her classmates.[2] With the proliferation of children's and youth periodicals, controlling children's reading became more and more difficult. Jean-Paul Sartre wrote that his mother bought him the periodicals that he most wanted to read, suggesting that she aided him in circumventing his maternal grandfather's household authority. His grandfather, with whom Sartre and his mother lived, encouraged young Jean-Paul to read only classics, including philosophy and history. His mother also took him to the cinema, where he saw movies not necessarily intended for young audiences. This kind of abetting of youthful tastes was probably unusual, however.[3] Both Beauvoir's and Sartre's comments depict the traditional lack of distinction made between literature, magazines, and films produced for adults, and those produced especially for children. The idea of allowing young people to read "good" adult literature, or of somehow abridging adult literature, remained in the interwar years. At the same time, new forms of direct-market

---

[2]Simone de Beauvoir, Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter, trans. James Kirkup (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1959), pp. 97, 115-118.

[3]Jean-Paul Sartre, The Words, trans. Bernard Frechtman (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), pp. 73-75, 119-125.

children's literature and magazines were becoming more numerous.[4] As those forms of children's and youth culture grew in France, "experts" offered their opinions in many different venues about just what kind of culture was appropriate for children, and what kind was not. Experts in child-rearing and education began more often to disregard parental opinion, even while, as we shall see, those experts disagreed with one another. Despite this, new expectations grew for up-to-date parental *surveillance* in accordance with expert opinion.

Not only were parents supposed to keep sharp watch over their children's access to books and magazines, but they also had to sort through increasingly complex, highly visible and tempting forms of reading. *Bandes dessinées*, French comic strips, were particularly problematic, but so were all sorts of fictional stories, especially the new genres of detective fiction and science fiction-like fantasies. Increasingly, the popular press's efforts to cater to young people's tastes--as "pure" distraction--created worry about youthful minds being engaged in less than wholesome activity. This included books, but especially targeted children's magazines, which were less expensive and more ephemeral. Books as a more elite literary form and texts used through the schools for educational purposes seemed less problematic, in part because parents and teachers appeared to have greater control over children's exposure to such things.

## The War and Censorship

The war played a role in strengthening support for censorship. In 1917, at the French National Congress on the Book, Edmond Haraucourt, the conservator of the *Musée de Cluny*, presented a report titled, La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image (Demoralization by the Book and by the Image). He served as the reporter for a committee appointed by the Congress and made up of members of the *Société des Gens*

[4]See Chapter 7.

*de lettres*. That organization, however, had requested of Haraucourt that he speak from his own position of personal authority, rather than attempting to summarize the efforts of the committee. Haraucourt delivered a tirade against demoralizing literature, art, and the "image that moves" (cinema). Although his concern was not limited to youth, he felt that the child and what he called the "man-child"--the adolescent--were at greatest risk. The effects of pornography on youth, he wrote, compromised the future.[5] He asserted that the child thinks through images, the "man-child" through imagination. This suggests that Haraucourt was basing his analysis of human instinct on a loose interpretation of scientific views of child development. Haraucourt argued that the instinctive drives of love and death were the most to blame for the tempting quality of immoral literature. It was the passionate masses who were in greatest need of protection through censorship of popular culture.[6]

Haraucourt's moral basis for censorship was not a universal, abstract quality, but rather a standard "adequate to the temperament of each race, of each people." He described three geographical areas differing in their passionate emphasis: the East, which focused on love, i.e., the sexual; the West, which focused on violence, death, and criminality; and the Latin, which incorporated both passions. He was unconcerned with private adult enjoyment of immoral literature and art, but decried the impact of public immoral material because it would affect "the millions of creatures who are the people of tomorrow, and all our hope." Instead of focusing on the elite few, who at most would cause damage to their own children, he advocated a reasoning and practical approach to

---

[5]Edmond Haraucourt, La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image (Congrés National du Livre, March 1917), p. 2.

[6]Haraucourt, La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image, pp. 3, 14-15. Haraucourt does not cite Freud; he argues his case from examples from literature, suggests that the historical origin is Genesis and "the first man," and refers to these dual "passions" as having a divine impetus, as long as the brake of reason is also employed as a control measure. Although he obviously sided with Catholic moral sentiment, Haraucourt did not directly support the Catholic Church as a moral arbiter in France, referring instead to French morality as humanist and charitable.

censorship for the masses. He cautioned against a complete denial of instinct or passion, which, he claimed, led to hypocrisy. In his view, market forces and consumerism rather than the failure of parental duty were the sources of the problems. It was the heightened receptivity of the masses that made them most at risk, and it was producers and marketers who desired profit who stood most to blame.[7]

Those most receptive to the "endemic illness" of immorality were, above all, the child and the "man-child"--those important social creatures that Haraucourt referred to as "two colossuses, so intimidating and so weak" whose impulsive character led them to give in to temptation. As representative of France's future, they were also most in need of social protection.

> These are the ones that must be protected by the laws, because they find within themselves but an insufficient defense against themselves, and a still more insufficient defense against those tempters who prowl freely in the town pushing their double cry of appeal: "Towards love! For death!"[8]

Advertisements for leisure entertainment and reading paralleled and seemed to displace a sort of battle cry, and in Haraucourt's view, such advertising was especially heinous during wartime. Haraucourt considered that the war had damaged those moral conventions and customs that had seemed forever fixed, and that the world was undergoing a revolution, for good or ill. He thus urged legislators to step in to guide the production and sale of literature and images.

Haraucourt argued that existing censorship laws were inadequate because they were ambiguous and unenforceable. He drew a parallel between France's wartime culture and that of Thucydides' Athens during the Peloponnesian War, when the plague had served as a sort of moral purgative, leaving people engaging in hedonistic and immoral activities. The Great War, he claimed, had created a situation where both love and death

---

[7]Haraucourt, La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image, pp. 11, 36.

[8]Haraucourt, La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image, p. 14.

were stronger than they had been; love, because of the need for repopulating, thus leading in excess to debauchery, and the desire for death and crime brought on by the heightened aggression of the war itself. Haraucourt cautioned specifically against crime fiction--a genre that, against his hopes, grew increasingly popular after the war.[9] Pornography and sexual images, especially female nakedness or partial nakedness, on public display in kiosks and on posters, as well as cinematographic "spectacles," were also especially disturbing to him. His view emphasized the street as the environment responsible for degeneration, rather than the home. No doubt in deference to his own status as an intellectual, he argued that it was not the expression of art but the desire for enrichment that drove such spectacles. Such "mercantilism" constituted exploitation of tastes, and was especially horrible during the sacrificial war that France was experiencing, an insult to the dignity and suffering of the country.[10]

Perhaps worst in Haraucourt's eyes was the production of texts in French by the Germans, imported across the border under the guise of friendship, he argued, but in reality to demoralize France. Haraucourt's deep animosity towards the expansion of German culture was similar to the many anti-German sentiments being expressed elsewhere in France at the time.[11] Although he cited no specific titles, he claimed that the Germans, in their Lutheran and hypocritical prudery, tended to refer to things sexual as "Parisian," including pornographic pictures and advertisements for abortion. They then exported these texts to France, thus, he complained, saving their own morale, damaging their enemy, and gaining monetary profit.[12] Such importation represented a contagion, "like the cholera," to which the French, due to their greater imagination and

---

[9]Haraucourt, La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image, p. 5.

[10]Haraucourt, La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image, pp. 10-11.

[11]See Martha Hanna, The Mobilization of Intellect: French Scholars and Writers during the Great War (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1996), esp. pp. 85-105.

[12]Haraucourt, La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image, p. 5.

impressionability, were perhaps more highly susceptible--but for which they should not be held liable. Rather they needed to be given "medication," i.e., regulation.[13] Haraucourt's demand for censorship of mass culture especially for the benefit of youth arose not only from wartime concerns, but also from a concern for France's future.

An organization called the "French Moral Defense Group" similarly advocated stronger regulation of mass culture. In 1919, they posted announcements around Paris declaring that to strengthen censorship of all forms of culture--because "France wants to be moral"--would save children from demoralizing German influence. The group addressed their call to action primarily to parents, and framed such action as continuing the war on German cultural influences. One poster read in part:

> So attack, demand the clean-up of the streets, the purification of the theater and the cinemas, the regeneration of truly French literature, demand the execution of nauseating and pornographic magazines, reproductions authorized by the German spirit, which you know is over, *the public powers*, fundamentally decent, will help you.[14]

For this group, as for Haraucourt, censorship or regulation was essentially nationalistic. Saving French children from demoralization would ultimately win the cultural war against Germany that France continued to fight even after the armistice.

International Censorship of Children's Culture: The Cinematograph

The idea that what constituted obscenity, pornography, or "a danger to good morals" was always an exotic sort of import indeed framed both the French national and the international approach to censorship throughout the decades after the First World War. Rather than directly attack producers of what might be deemed, albeit ambiguously,

---

[13]Haraucourt, La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image, p. 8.

[14]As reprinted in L'Enfant, no. 237, April 15 1919, pp. 92-93. The editors of this magazine, published by the Association for the Protection of Childhood and Adolescence, clearly supported the Group's efforts. This poster was signed by Charles Combes, who was a member of the administrative body for the *Pupilles de la Nation* program (see my Chapter 4).

"pornography" in their own countries, legislators tended to focus on stopping the importation of pornographic texts from other countries, especially when considering how best to protect the younger, up-and-coming, generation.

This attitude held true for the League of Nations' efforts to regulate "obscene" material. This initiative followed up on efforts put into play by the French government before the war. Representatives at an international diplomatic conference in 1908 wrote a draft of a resolution, in which each participating government agreed to appoint a central authority to "combat the traffic and to communicate information to one another." By 1922, however, this resolution remained in draft form. The League then undertook to complete the process. The French again took the lead in summoning a new conference in Geneva in September, 1923, which was attended by 35 countries. The reason given for picking up again where the earlier conference had left off was that "there were signs of an increase in the traffic" of obscene materials after the war.[15] Two League of Nations committees oversaw these efforts: the Committee on Traffic in Women and Children, and the Committee for Child Welfare.[16] The former had begun the movement for regulation, since trafficking in pornography was considered both part of, and often an incitement to, other forms of trafficking. Along with concerns about labor and family welfare, these committees jointly attempted over many years to draft a workable resolution to internationally regulate the production and sale of "obscene" material.

---

[15]League of Nations, Ten Years of World Co-operation, foreword by Sir Eric Drummond (Secretariat of the League of Nations, 1930), pp. 26-27.

[16]The Committee for Child Welfare came into being in 1925, and was presented as taking over the efforts of the recently formed Brussels International Association for the Protection of Children. Under the League of Nations' original covenant, the committee designated to oversee the problem of traffic in women and children also had an Advisory Committee on Traffic in Women and the Protection of Children. The new committee formed in 1925 separated the question of child protection and welfare from that of traffic in women and children. Although the United States was not a member nation, the American Social Hygiene Bureau contributed much of the funding for the work of the Child Welfare Committee. The question of censorship of the cinema was on the program from the Committee's first meeting in 1925. Illustrated Album of the League of Nations (Geneva: Atar, n.d.- probably 1925-26), pp. 74-76; League of Nations, Ten Years of World Co-operation, pp. 297-299.

Although their original concern about pornographic texts and images leading to increased sex trade--especially procuration of minors--continued for both committees, their primary concern became protecting minors from demoralizing exposure to such material.

The first step for the committees was to send a questionnaire to the governments of member countries, asking them to list all such activity, laws, and the success of such laws when applied through the courts. From this compilation of data, the committees hoped to clarify some means of creating a new, supranational law concerning "obscene" material, especially relative to its sale or exposure to minors. Most of the countries that responded claimed that little or no "obscene' material was being produced there, and that they had very few prosecutions for such offenses.[17]

Important and problematic was the definition of "child" or "minor." Seven years after the French organized the conference in Geneva, the issue still had not been resolved. In relation to trafficking, in 1930 the committee decided to eliminate the age requirement for protection, which had been set at 21, on the basis that it was easy either to lie about a girl's age or to claim that the girl herself had lied, and thus escape conviction. The committee recognized that although it was more immoral to engage minors in sexual activity, especially prostitution but also "entertainment" of various sorts, this was seemingly balanced out by the idea that even "girls over 21" needed protection.[18] The problem was compounded by the fact that different countries had different laws concerning age of sexual consent and minimum age for marriage, so the committee carried out a study to determine a comparative framework. Because of these differences,

---

[17]This also held true for reports concerning "trafficking" and procuring of women and children for sexual purposes. League of Nations Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People, Minutes of the Ninth Session, April 1930, Geneva: official no. C.246.M.12.1930.IV. A Mr. Cohen of the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women noted this desire to shift blame to other unspecified countries; his comment received little response.

[18]League of Nations Publications IV, Social, 1930, Child Welfare Committee, Report on the Work of the Sixth Session, Geneva: official no. C 223.M.110; League of Nations, Ten Years of World Co-operation, pp. 295-296.

any supranational efforts at protection would seem to conflict with various aspects of national law, especially in cases where citizens of foreign states were living in or traveling in other countries at the time of the offense. Thus what was considered "obscene" activity concerning minors varied from one country to the next and left any supranational efforts ambiguous and largely unenforceable. The same problem held true to some extent for the production and sale of "obscene" publications.

When considering this latter problem, the committee immediately and persistently had faced two other major difficulties that obstructed their efforts. The first was widespread disagreement over the meaning of the word "obscene," which was never adequately resolved. In 1923, the Committee resolved to arrive at an international agreement on whether birth control "propaganda" should count under the rubric of "obscene" publications. Some countries, for example England, took "obscene" to mean specifically "that which incites sexual passion." Some, like Belgium, wanted to include any sort of material deemed damaging to public morality, which for the Belgian representatives included advertisement of abortion and birth control. Others argued that although some such publications might indeed be considered obscene, birth control was not "in itself obscene." Committee members also disagreed about whether other kinds of morally damaging material, including crime fiction and fantasy, might be considered "obscene," especially for an audience of minors.[19]

The second problem was whether the definition of "text" should be limited to written material, or should include other cultural forms, such as objects or films. The "cinematograph" became the subject for a campaign by the committee. Of special concern was the question of how to regulate films for consumption by minors, who, the committee had discovered, made up as much as two-thirds of most cinema audiences,

[19]League of Nations, Ten Years of World Co-operation, p. 297. League of Nations Publications, IV Social 1931, League of Nations Traffic in Women and Children Committee, Minutes of the Tenth Session, Geneva: official no. C.401.M.163, pp. 16-19.

whether accompanied by an adult or not.[20] In 1927, the Italian government (at that time, fascist) set up a League-sponsored Educational Cinematographic Institute.[21] The League of Nations commissioned the Rome Institute to carry out a study of children's viewing habits, with the intention of determining both what was damaging and what was beneficial, either educational or constituting worthwhile leisure activity, or healthy distraction. When it presented its findings in 1930, the Institute announced that most people would be surprised to discover that children tended to dislike films created especially for them and preferred adult films. This evidence of children's tastes was an important step forward, the committee argued, because it recognized that films needed both to be healthy and to be able to produce a profit.

Summarizing the responses to the study, the Institute complained that specially-produced children's films were "generally based on a purely hypothetical and erroneous idea of [children's] intellectual capacity and mentality." Young people especially liked adventure films, but they also wanted "realistic" portrayals of life, which expressed some kind of difficulty, danger, or adverse situation that the protagonists needed to overcome. The Rome Institute concluded that this taste was not necessarily morally nor psychologically dangerous for children. Along with historical and documentary types of films, adventure films could be produced that would both appeal to children and be healthy viewing. Not just anybody could produce such films, however. According to the Institute, a team consisting of a psychologist, an artist, and a producer was necessary for successful production of safe films for children. The psychologists' role was to determine children's true tastes, thus replacing the theoretically constructed or imagined tastes that

---

[20]See League of Nations Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People, Minutes for the Sixth Session, April, 1927, Geneva: official no. C.338.M.113.1927.IV, and the Seventh Session, March 1928, Geneva: official no. C.184.M.59.1928.IV.

[21]The work of the Rome Institute was considered to be of interest both to those involved with the Child Welfare Committee and the League's Committee for Intellectual Cooperation. The League of Nations from Year to Year (October 1926 - October 1927) (Geneva: Information Section, League of Nations), pp. 103-104.

had hitherto driven such efforts.[22] At the same time, the Committee for Child Welfare asserted that children's tastes varied from one nation to the next, and supranational legislation would need to take this into account. Despite this tension, the committee took the Institute's findings as the cornerstone for international efforts to censor or to regulate the film industry.

### Regulating French Children's Cultural Consumption: Judgments on the Cinema and the Press

Within France, the effects of the cinematograph on children appeared to be a much smaller concern than that of the influence of the children's press. French law had in 1919 declared that all films be approved by a censorship board overseen by the Ministry of Education and Fine Arts. Although censorship during the war had been quite active, in the interwar years far fewer films were banned outright. Local governments also had the ability to regulate film showings, by banning some films or by cutting objectionable portions of films. Such local censorship had to deal, however, both with local public pressure and with the power of the state, which on occasion intervened in local decisions.[23]

The national board did not actually designate which films were inappropriate for minors. What they did do was provide public "honorable mention" of films they thought were especially well-suited to children. Although the French representatives on the two relevant committees of the League of Nations supported the idea of supranational regulation, the French government did not contribute much in response to the committees' questionnaires. Concern within France was geared more towards the production of educational films, both for children and for adults, and less interest was paid to the idea of

---

[22]League of Nations Publications, Social IV, 1930, Minutes of the Sixth Session, Rome Institute Findings, Geneva: official no. C.337.M.137, p. 76.

[23]Jean-Pierre Jeancolas, "Cinéma, censure, contrôle, classement," in La Censure en France, pp. 217-219. See also L. Gabriel-Robinet, La Censure (Paris: Hachette, 1965), p. 132.

censoring films for minors.[24] A proposal had been made in 1919 to create two different visas permitting films to be shown in France. One would be for adults, the others for minors under the age of 18. This idea was rejected by those who argued that there were not two different degrees of morality. Furthermore, older youth, between the ages of 18 and 21, were even more likely than younger children to be led into dangerous waters by many demoralizing films, so the age limit was deemed counterproductive. By the late 1920s, it was common to find recommendations of "family" films in children's magazines, but no particular warnings against those films that might be damaging to children's morals or tastes.[25]

This may have been due to the general sense the French had, supported by the Napoleonic Code, that parents were required to oversee their children's cultural consumption, which presumably stretched from reading material to the cinema, and that parents would naturally not allow their children to see films that they thought were inappropriate or morally damaging. This was the view of the Catholic Committee on the Cinematograph in 1930, when one member argued that it was up to "fathers of families" to decide which movies their children could watch.[26] The League of Nations expressed concern that parents were unaware of the dangers of the cinema, that they often preferred, for example, to take their children with them to the movies rather than leave them at home. This implied that parental control needed regulation.[27] Short of imposing such

---

[24]The first French law passed regulating minors' access to films was in the Family Code, in July 1939. See Paul Leglise, Histoire de la Politique du cinéma française, (Paris: Librairie Générale de Droit et de Jurisprudence, 1970), p. 250. A similar law was passed after World War II. Constantin Matthéos, La Protection de la jeunesse par la censure cinématographique en France et à l'Étranger (Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence, 1966), pp. 53-55. For a general discussion of censorship of films, see Jeancolas, "Cinéma, censure, contrôle, classement," pp. 213-221.

[25]This was the case, for example, with Les Jeunes de France, which included a page that was a virtual advertisement for one particular cinema that offered a number of "recommended" family films.

[26]As quoted in Leglise, Histoire de la Politique du cinéma française, pp. 249-250

[27]Minutes of the Sixth Session, Rome Institute Findings, p. 76.

regulation, within France it seemed more important to help parents benefit from guidance as to which films were especially good for children.[28]

Above all, the French state sought to use cinema as a means of educating both children and to some extent, adults, rather than considering it in light of censorship of children's public entertainment. Just after the war, the Third Republic began subsidizing the use of films through the national education system. State officials sent a projector to each school, and declared that the schoolteacher had the primary authority for its use. The purpose was not merely for children's education, however, but also for adult education, especially through the showing of documentaries such as agricultural films, and such use was not restricted to the classroom. This educational aspect, overseen by teachers serving as representatives of the state, took precedence over concerns about cinema's potentially negative effect on youth.[29]

This was not the case with the children's press, however. In the years following the war, numerous voices aided the call for censorship of children's publications, especially children's magazines. Just after the turn of the century, a Catholic leader, the abbé Bethléem, had published Romans à lire et romans à prescrire, which provided a detailed outline of which books published since 1800 were morally good and which bad. In 1910, the abbé's efforts dealt specifically with the children's press in the magazine Roman-Revue, which in 1919 became Revue des lectures. Other Catholics followed the abbé Bethléem's lead.[30] The privately Catholic but publicly laic Henry Marty, a leader of

---

[28]On the cinema in France more generally, see Richard Abel, The Ciné Goes to Town: French Cinema, 1896-1914 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994) and French Cinema: The First Wave, 1915-1929 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); Paul Monaco, Cinema and Society: France and Germany during the Twenties (New York: Elsevier, 1976); and Charles Rearick, The French in Love and War: Popular Culture in the Era of the World Wars (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997).

[29]L'Éducateur Protestant, Jan, 1925. See also Leglise, Histoire de la politique du cinéma français, pp. 228-229.

[30]See Ory, La Censure en France.

the secular division of the French Boy Scouts and co-director of the École des Roches, France's model "new education" school, published a list of good magazines for children in the journal he edited, L'Éducation.[31] Marty separated non-confessional and Catholic magazines, for the most part approving of religious content but also including as morally sound a number of non-religious magazines. Under the heading "respectable publications," Marty listed two he thought were borderline, Le Petit Monde and Science et Voyages, because the former was too worldly, artificial, and vain, and the latter scientifically suspect, *fantaisiste*, and for which the advertisements were too adult.[32]

Catholic morality was not the only basis for such negative judgments. In L'Éducateur Protestant, the newsletter of the Association fraternel des membres protestants de l'enseignement primaire, Pastor Jean Laroche commented on Marie-Thérèse Latzarus' recently published thesis on children's literature. Latzarus claimed that children's leisure interests had turned away from reading books and towards periodicals, and that children's literature was in decline, in plain crisis after the war.[33] Latzarus reiterated her thesis in an article for L'Éducation in 1923. "The illustrated magazines are a little bit closer to death today, killed by encyclopedic publications; imitating foreign magazines. Those that are left present nothing more to their readers than grotesque caricatures, or texts lacking value printed in tiny characters."[34] Pastor Laroche echoed this concern, and more pointedly argued that many children's magazines contained "ridiculous adventures, grotesque characters, as if children have tastes inculcated by savages!" Also, he complained, the quality of the paper and the artwork for children's

---

[31]See Chapter Seven for more on Marty.

[32]L'Éducation, March 1921. Marty condemned, among others, two magazines published by Offenstadt: L'Épatant and Le Cri-cri.

[33]Marie Thérèse Latzarus, La Littérature enfantine en France dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle: étude précedée d'un rapide aperçu des lectures des enfants en France avant 1860 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1923).

[34]Marie Thérèse Latzarus, "La Littérature enfantine en France," L'Éducation, December 1923, p. 135.

magazines had dropped since the war. Laroche concluded by adding to Latzarus' thesis that the crisis was at least as much one of the authors as it was of the readers. To be a children's author, he proclaimed, should be more of a mission than a career.[35]

Literary and art critic Jean Calvet also published advice concerning children's reading, but directed his arguments in L'Enfant dans la littérature française towards parental choice rather than production or official regulation. He gave his judgment on literature--primarily books, not magazines--intended originally for adults, rather than addressing books written specifically for children. It would seem, he suggested, that children most enjoyed reading books with children as characters. This did not mean, however, that any book with a child character made good reading. It was important to pick through the many possibilities and present to children those depictions most in keeping with their own experiences and level of understanding. To this end, he presented his own judgments on a historical parade of books depicting children, including autobiographies. In his final chapter he did turn to the burgeoning children's literature, and like Pastor Laroche, cited Latzarus' study, but backed down somewhat from her negative view.[36]

Literature professor Paul Hazard agreed with the idea that authorship needed to be more than merely a profitable exploitation of children as a market. In 1932, in Books, Children, and Men, he argued, however, that children would read only what they liked, and that efforts to override children's tastes in favor of didactic, religious, or high-class qualities would meet with failure. Hazard, one of the founders of the academic discipline of comparative literature in France, did not consider works written for children to be beneath his notice. A professor at the Sorbonne since 1925, Hazard also taught for one term every year at Columbia University, in New York City. He pointed to the immense

---

[35]L'Éducateur Protestant, March 19, 1925, p. 91.

[36]Jean Calvet, L'Enfant dans la littérature française (Paris: F. Lanore, 1931).

difference between children and adults, suggesting that children seemed to be another species, and that their lack of reasoning led them to greater happiness through a greater freedom for play and imagination. Historically, he complained, authors had lacked full understanding of this difference.

> Except for a few privileged persons, a few madmen, a few poets who, by some gift from Heaven, have understood the language of children as the fairies understand that of birds, adults failed for a long time to grant their prayers.[37]

Providing good literature for children was not easy, he acknowledged, but, "to misshape young souls, to profit by a certain facility that one may posses to add to the number of indigestible and sham books, to give oneself too easily the airs of a moralist and scholar, to cheat in quality--that is what I call oppressing children."[38] This oppression was not passively received by children, however: in Hazard's view, such efforts led to warfare regarding children's reading. "The adults insist, the children pretend to yield and do not yield. We overpower them; they rise up again. Thus does the struggle continue, in which the weaker will triumph."[39] Thus Hazard positioned himself as a champion of children's right to read what pleased them, according to their taste.

He wrote that children tended to choose certain adult books as their own: their desire to read what was not written just for them denoted their desire to be treated as equals. Books such as Robinson Crusoe, Gulliver's Travels, and Don Quixote, he pointed out, had long been claimed by children as their own favorite reading. It is worth noting that none of these titles were written by French authors. Unlike the majority of those concerned with regulating children's literature in France, Hazard, perhaps influenced by his time spent in the United States, did not define good literature on the basis of

---

[37]Paul Hazard, Books, Children and Men, trans. Marguerite Mitchell (Boston: The Horn Book, Inc., 1944), pp. 2-3.

[38]Hazard, Books, Children and Men, p 45.

[39]Hazard, Books, Children and Men, p. 49.

nationality. He did describe various nations as having approached the issue of children's literature differently from one another, however. He was especially glowing about England and the United States.

> You will see that England claims, even for her children, quite justly, that respect for the individual which is one of the dogmas of her moral life. She does not wait for them to become adults before granting them that right to liberty which she has passionately defended all through her history.[40]

He was even more glowing when discussing the United States, declaring that even though it was true that North America was overly materialistic, homogenizing, and moving towards an increasingly mechanistic lifestyle "with only sports and the cinema for relaxation," there was another side to American culture exhibited by Americans' care for their children's reading material. He claimed that this stemmed especially from the concern they felt for children. "The elite of the country, that long-suffering elite which rebels against any diminution of the spirit, surrounds the coming generation with a solicitude probably unequaled anywhere as a treasury of hope."[41] Hazard did not more specifically define this "elite," but, taking into consideration his more negative comments, it is fair to assume he was referring to the educated elite.

Hazard described the creation of children's libraries in the U.S., as well as the first such library in Paris, L'Heure Joyeuse, as a place where children had complete freedom to read whatever they liked.[42] At the same time, however, in keeping with his comments about authorship, he supported efforts to train librarians, and to encourage children to emulate the classic works they read, in order to raise a new generation of children's book

---

[40]Hazard, Books, Children and Men, p. 80.

[41]Hazard, Books, Children and Men, p. 87.

[42]L'Heure Joyeuse opened in 1926 with help from the Friends of the New York Public Library. Viviane Ezratty, "Mobilisation en faveur de la littérature enfantine," in Livre, mon ami: lectures efantines, 1914-1954, ed. Annie Renonciat, catalog published in conjunction with the Exposition des bibliothèques de la Ville de Paris (Paris: Mairie de Paris, 1991), pp. 33-37.

authors. He lauded the American Newbery Award, given for the best children's book each year. Toward the end of the 1930s, Hazard became president of the jury for the French *Prix de Jeunesse*.[43] Overall, he described children reading good books because of the work done by innumerable adults to ensure that it be so.

In Hazard's view, such reading activities would not only provide pleasure for children in their leisure hours, but would also ultimately lead to a better world. He wrote that children had a mission "to bring to the world a renewal of faith and hope," and argued that the world would not progress if it were not "refreshed by this confident young strength." This youthful mission would come about through the creation of a "World Republic of Childhood." "Yes, children's books keep alive a sense of nationality; but they also keep alive a sense of humanity," he wrote. This tolerant sense of humanity, which he claimed lay in children's nonchalant acceptance of books written by foreign authors, would lead to a more tolerant and peaceful world, he asserted.[44]

Using terms like "freshness," and "simplicity" to describe the child's view of the world, Hazard suggested that adults could learn much from society's youngest members. Adult concerns, like the "savoring of gloom," and "perversity" would be offset. "Childhood does not understand the pleasure there is in being sad, or holding on to grief so as to relish it slowly," Hazard declared.[45] This description seemed opposed to contemporary adulthood, both in terms of advocating tolerance and peace, and in terms of offsetting grief and the pleasure of suffering, and in Hazard's view, put children on the frontlines of French regeneration in the years following the Great War.

Despite his discussion of children's liberty (albeit directed), and equality and respect for children, Hazard remained fairly traditional when describing children's tastes.

---

[43]L'Éducateur prolétarien, March 15, 1937, p. 290.

[44]Hazard, Books, Children and Men, pp. 105 and 146. Hazard, a scholar of the Enlightenment, may have been thinking of the 18th-century "Republic of Letters."

[45]Hazard, Books, Children and Men, pp. 166-167.

He was not so heavily moralizing as to assert that fantasy or adventure were dangerous to children's development, as some of his compatriots did, but his view of what children liked cleaved fairly closely to accepted descriptions. He wrote that girls liked maternalistic, sympathetic, charitable heroines, and boys liked brave, valorous, and just heroes. Like so many others at the time, he argued that the police must win out over bandits, "unless we are able to invent a particularly delightful and virtuous bandit"--a paradoxical creation. Children also, he asserted, enjoy hearing about modern inventions. Authors who could meet these needs were the real heroes of Hazard's book. "Let us think gratefully of those who, through children and for children, perform the miracle of springtime...a breath of pure air to inspire each new generation." He included in this list the authors of by-then classic fairy tales, like Perrault and Andersen, as well as more contemporary authors like Verne and Barrie.[46]

For all that Hazard's views seemed liberal, and his efforts seemed anti-censorial, it is important to recognize that he was at the same time drawing out the need for diligent oversight of children's reading. He targeted the producers of such literature, along with the new institution of the children's library full of trained experts, to carry out his vision of happy and progressive childhood. In the future, this oversight would lead to an improved world, as children soaked up the particular set of values that Hazard outlined. It was those values that he argued constituted children's tastes, including a tolerance for national differences, a sense of cooperation, and a desire to uphold peace and justice. Compared to Haraucourt's weak and intimidating child, Hazard's child was primarily innocent and good. Yet in a broad sense, his articulation of children's right to read what they pleased was not so different from the right to "normal" or "moral" reading material espoused by other advocates of children's cultural regulation. To respect children's difference from adults--their unreasoning simplicity and their joy of play and

---

[46]Hazard, Books, Children and Men, pp. 9, 42-45, 92-105.

imagination--ultimately was inextricable from instilling those very values in the next generation for the good of society.

The Printing Press in the Classroom: Children as Authors

Even those on the political left contributed to efforts to regulate children's literature and the press. Communist schoolteachers Célestin and Élise Freinet went even further in the direction of producing books at children's own direction. Not content merely to discover children's "tastes," Célestin Freinet sought to give young students the freedom to produce their own literature in the classroom. He called children's productions the "true children's book."[47] In 1924, he developed what became known as "The Freinet Method," which centered on the use of the printing press in the classroom (*l'imprimerie à l'école*). With his wife Élise including children's drawings, the Freinets sought to provide children with a free-form sort of creative education, avoiding merely copying the classics. Freinet's primary concern was the education of working class children; despite this, the Communist party in France (PCF) considered him too "bourgeois," and rejected his teaching method because it was not enough in line with Bolshevik pedagogical methods such as those used in the Soviet Union. French Liberals similarly rejected his method until the mid-30s, even causing him to lose his schoolteaching position in the national education system by 1935; their concern was that he was indeed too close to the Left, and that his child-centered pedagogy strayed too far from Republican methods.[48]

Freinet complained that children were too often asked merely to imitate adults, to memorize bits of literature and poetry by rote and to write by copying. He also opposed

---

[47] Livre, mon ami, p 62.

[48] See Madeleine Freinet, Élise et Célestin Freinet: Souvenirs de notre vie, vol. 1, 1896-1940 (Paris: Stock, 1997); Victor Acker, Célestin Freinet (Westport CT and London: Greenwood Press, 2000). Both these books provide details of the innumerable debates Freinet engaged in and the persecution he faced throughout his career.

adult propagandizing in children's books and magazines, especially religious propagandizing. Using a printing press in the classroom permitted children free reign with their own imaginations, and allowed schoolteachers to much more closely follow their students' lead in preparing materials for classroom use. Importantly, it also encouraged intercommunication between students, both within the classroom and with students in other areas. To this end, Freinet published a children's magazine which was exchanged between numerous classrooms in France: La Gerbe. He and like-minded schoolteachers in France, and later Algiers as well, also communicated with one another through various publications Freinet edited, including L'Éducateur prolétarien in the 1930s.

In the late 1930s, after Freinet had parted ways with the national education system, he started a school of his own in Vence, based on the principles he began to call "*L'École Moderne*." The "Modern School" was not identical in its methods or purposes to the "New Education" methods such as those practiced at the École des Roches.[49] Freinet felt that New Education was too bourgeois, and he distinguished his Modern School through its emphasis on working class children. At his school, however, he also wanted to enroll some middle-class children, apparently feeling that his method was the right kind of pedagogy for all children. He discovered that middle-class parents were not happy because they "remained hypnotized by future careers" and did not want to stray too far from traditional elitist educational methods.[50] Freinet's emphasis on "active" education was in his view not only the best pedagogy for the proletariat, but also the best counter to traditional elitism. Freinet, perhaps thinking along the lines of Lenin's enlightened elite, sought to create a new kind of elite drawn from both the lower and the middle classes. Because of his emphasis on inter-communication, especially focused on

---

[49]See Chapter 4.

[50]As quoted in Acker, Célestin Freinet, p. 71.

the print media but also including efforts with the cinema, Freinet's elite would be one prepared to function within the unions and possibly within a future revolutionary movement.

Freinet saw some similarities between his system and those of proponents of New Education, and he continued to work with groups committed to such educational reforms.[51] This collaboration became even stronger after the second world war. Ultimately, the Freinet Method's communist beginnings were forgotten, and Freinet became a part of the panoply of modern educators such as Décroly and Montessori according to whose methods so many schools in western countries eventually underwent reform.[52]

Indeed, after World War II, Freinet came even more forcefully under attack from the French Communist party. There is no question that in the interwar years, Freinet developed his method on the grounds of his communist sympathies, and maintained his efforts even in the face of party rejection.[53] In the end, however, Freinet was more strongly committed to his vision of education than he was to any particular political party. By the late 1920s, as his inability to engage either the French communists or the Soviets with his mission became clear to him, he directly articulated his commitment. "We are against brainwashing, whether it is from the Right or the Left, from the government or the opposition. Brainwashing is not education, it is precisely the opposite."[54] In an article

---

[51]Freinet was quite heartily inimical to the Boy Scout movement, however, claiming that the traditionalist and elitist pedagogical methods that stemmed from the British Baden-Powell's leadership were an important obstacle to acceptance of the proletarian Freinet method. This is significant, because some of the French leaders of the Boy Scouts laid claim to New Education pedagogy. See Chapter 6.

[52]In the late 1930s, Freinet and his followers were concerned that if the state began subsidizing the "printing press in the classroom," the spirit of the movement would be lost. Too many teachers would just go along, without actually paying attention to Freinet's method or purpose. L'Éducateur prolétarien, March 15, 1937, pp. 255-256.

[53]See Acker, Célestin Freinet, pp. 111-13, for a brief synopsis of Freinet's relationship with the PCF; see also pp. 89-110 for a more in-depth description of Freinet's struggle with the party.

[54]As quoted in Acker, Célestin Freinet, p. 93.

published in L'Éducateur prolétarien in the late 1930s, Freinet's colleague, Pierre Rossi, argued that children's tastes were not necessarily "beautiful and good," that children were not "simple" as people would like to argue. Rossi suggested that teachers needed to be the ones who would train the little "human animal" not to give in to the egoistic "beast that is in him," and that this meant not giving children merely what pleased them.[55] The idea that children had "natural" tastes suggests that children's "free" play of imagination in the classroom did require oversight by teachers, although keeping children away from the negative influences of adults seemed paramount for Freinet and his followers.

In the 1950s the communist party accused Freinet of creating the school as a separate child's world, of supporting the child's imagination and keeping him within the confines of the school in a way that did not allow for the teaching of present realities of class struggle.[56] It does seem that the "orientation" to society that the party wanted to impart, despite its Leftist quality, constituted one sort of the "brainwashing" Freinet had long sought to avoid.

Freinet was thus caught up in a larger web of interests concerning the regulation of children's culture: his efforts to avoid "brainwashing" led to a kind of censorship that appeared to deny adults the ability to teach at all, whether Left or Right, moral or not, and he was attacked from all sides. Eventually his method was endorsed by the French government, but only when the post-WWII Leftist leadership sought, albeit moderately, to implement a wide array of less political reformist pedagogical methods. At that point Freinet's method was recognized to fit in well with other "modern" teaching techniques.[57]

---

[55]Pierre Rossi, "La Presse Enfantine," L'Éducateur prolétarien, February 1, 1937, p. 188.

[56]Acker, Célestin Freinet, p. 94.

[57]W. D. Halls, Society, Schools, and Progress in France (Oxford: Permagon Press, 1965). p. 28. Antoine Prost dates acceptance of modern methods, including Freinet's, even later, in the 1960s, when schoolteachers' civic power waned and they had a great deal more personal teaching freedom. Antoine Prost, L'Enseignement en France, 1800-1967 (Paris: Armand Colin, 1968), p 450.

When the communist nature of his method was debated, Freinet was more often vilified, from the Left for being too moderate, from the Right and Center for being too radical.

While Freinet's efforts to create a kind of child-driven humanism in the schools became increasingly controversial in the 1930s, commercial efforts to produce more literature and magazines for children also burgeoned. At the same time, concern grew about children's access to adult forms of consumption. In 1927, one lawyer approached this aspect of the debate by suggesting that parents' traditional ability to oversee their children's moral upbringing was being obstructed by producers of pornography. Yet in Reforme de la législation rélative a l'outrage aux bonnes moeurs, Pierre Arnaud of the Paris Court of Appeals did not suggest attacking producers of pornography. Arnaud limited the object for censorship to that which interfered with the father's ability to take charge of the sexual education of his minor children. He asserted that it was not practical nor efficacious to attack producers, and that it was too difficult to argue what constituted a "danger to good morals" for adults. Pornography existed, he argued, as a consequence rather than as a cause of social degeneracy. The law supported adults' individual right to partake in pornography, and should intervene to protect that right, not take it away.[58]

This was not the case for children, however. "The child on the contrary is without defense. By a precocious invitation he risks becoming profoundly and forever perverted. The law must take him under its protection." The role of the state, Arnaud argued, was to help fathers protect their children by removing the obstacles to their performance of this duty. He therefore suggested targeting the marketing and circulation practices of the industry. For example, since so many obscene publications were circulated through the mail, there should be a law requiring them to be hidden until the adult recipient opened it. By packaging the material in nondescript covering, the children in the household would

---

[58]Pierre Arnaud, Reforme de la législation relative a l'outrage aux bonnes moeurs: L'Outrage aux bonnes moeurs considéré comme portant atteinte au droit du père de famille d'assurer l'éducation sexuelle de ses enfants mineurs (Paris: Librairie Arthur Rousseau and Cie., 1927).

not be exposed to the material. Advertisements and the placement of such magazines in stores and kiosks could also be regulated, not to keep adults from buying them but to keep minors from being aware of them. This kind of argument sought to correct future morality without impinging on individual choice in the present. His underlying point was that market demand drove the production of pornography. If a new generation grew up without developing a taste for such publications, then pornography would cease to exist.[59] Arnaud, then, fell into the camp of those who sought to regulate children's tastes, yet without appearing to be engaging in an act of direct censorship. Like Hazard, Freinet, and Haraucourt, he assumed that children would not seek out degenerate or morally damaging material for themselves. Unlike those who argued that society (represented by the state) or producers had the duty to directly determine what was morally damaging, Arnaud left that choice in the hands of the "fathers of families." By attacking marketing practices, however, Arnaud did formulate a role for state regulation, which would still require a determination of what would be considered universally morally damaging.

The Censorship Law of 1949

When France did pass a censorship law in 1949 concerning "literature destined for youth," it targeted producers, including both authors and publishers, and marketers. Teachers and parents were assumed to have healthier goals than those individuals driven by the desire for market success. State censorship was thus seen as providing aid to those whose task was defending youth against degenerative market forces. Many of the same concerns expressed throughout the interwar years were raised again during debates about the law of 1949, and indeed, this piece of legislation did not put to rest all the existing varieties of worries about the negative effects of the press on children's upbringing. What the law did do was twofold: first, it provided a condensed summary of all the possibly

[59]Arnaud, Réforme de la législation relative a l'outrage aux bonnes moeurs.

degenerative qualities and conditions of "literature destined for youth" that had been expressed earlier; and second, it cemented the idea that commercial profit-seeking was the primary cause of the proliferation of demoralizing publications.[60]

The main commercial enemies vilified throughout these debates were foreign publications. These included foreign periodicals and syndicated serials imported by European publishers, as well as European imitations of the same. By and large, the law of 1949 was motivated by efforts to defend French youth culture against what was perceived as a barbaric invasion.[61] This invasion went beyond merely economic displacement, however, which is clearly shown by the articulation of equal dislike of French producers' imitation of successful foreign publications.[62] It was not enough to limit or regulate through taxation the importation of foreign publications; the law set out to define what kind of cultural content was allowable and what was not, whether foreign-produced or French-produced. At the same time, as had been the case during the interwar years, what was degenerative continued to be seen as primarily an imported poison. Thus, state intervention as an act of protection for youth was simultaneously a defense of French culture.

Many pointed to 1934 as the turning point for French youth culture, the moment of "invasion" started by a children's magazine featuring Disney characters, Le Journal de Mickey. Published by Opera Mundi, a French company owned by Hungarian-born Henri

---

[60]The French law was similar in many ways to an industry code--the "Comics Code,"--originally drafted in 1948 and modified (in the second version even more like the French law) in 1954, 1971, and 1989. One major difference was that the American code was more prescriptive than proscriptive, and did not include regulation about national culture or the need for educational content. See Amy Kiste Nyberg, Seal of Approval: The History of the Comics Code (University Press of Mississippi, 1998).

[61]Denise Escarpit uses this term for describing the popularity of the American comics in France. Denise Escarpit, La Littérature d'enfance et de jeunesse en Europe: Panorama historique, Que sais-je? (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1981), p. 114.

[62]Under Vichy, the state supported imitation of American-style comic strips and implemented strict censorship laws that affected many French periodicals. Maurice Horn, "Comics," in Handbook of French Popular Culture, ed. Pierre L. Horn (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), p. 16.

Winkler, Le Journal de Mickey rapidly succeeded in drawing the attention of the youth market in France. Opera Mundi followed up quickly with a spate of similar magazines, and other French publishers began competing by buying primarily American syndicated comic strips to run in their own magazines. With the advent of these magazines, those who complained about degenerative productions for children turned their attention especially to the "American-style" comic, which used brief speech balloons within the picture frame instead of the *bande dessinée*'s lengthier and more literate narrative paragraph beneath the frame. The content of these comics was also objectionable, both on the grounds that it was too *fantaisiste* and that it was overly violent, even criminal. Children's tastes were being turned away from language-based content and towards more sensationalist pictorial content, detractors complained.[63] Youth's apparent rejection of the French language and content along with the traditional French *bande dessinée* appeared to be feeding, instead of properly forming, immature tastes.[64] As one commentator put it, before the advent of Mickey, "at least this children's press was entirely written, drawn, edited in total by French people." The foreign invasion was thus seen as an "offensive against the French press," while at the same time it represented a battle over traditional French child-rearing practices. The "imported" values represented in the "comics," especially violent and criminal images and storylines, did indeed prepare children for some kind of life--but was it the right kind of life?[65] Clearly, the consensus was that it was a kind of life inappropriate for the French child.

These issues had, at least on the surface, moved away from the more straightforward conservative attack on immorality that had been articulated especially in relation to the censorship of popular culture. Such concerns were still embedded in

---

[63]A. Brauner, "Poison sans paroles," Les Journaux pour enfants, special edition of Enfance: psychologie, pédagogie-neuro-psychiatrie-sociologie (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954), pp. 407-411.

[64]Georges Sadoul, Les origines de la presse pour enfants," Les Journaux pour enfants, p. 375.

[65]H. Gratiot-Alphandéry, "La Presse pour enfants et ses conséquences," Les Journaux pour enfants, p. 406.

debates about children's culture, but they were not limited to the Right, and were overlaid by worries about foreign culture and commercialism. In the 1930s, Georges Sadoul, the editor of the communist children's magazine Mon Camarade, tried especially to fight the tide of foreign "poison," both American and fascist, by providing only French-produced content that stuck to traditionally French types of children's cultural offerings. The very right-wing Catholic magazine Coeurs Vaillants also battled foreign invasion, even engineering a magazine-burning event of which subscribers could buy photographs.[66] That these two magazines could face the common enemy of foreign, especially American, publications and syndicated serials, shows the extent to which censorship appealed across the political spectrum.

In 1947, the Patriotic Union of Youth Organizations held an inter-movement conference at which a proposal of a censorship law for children's publications was first drafted. The proposal was submitted to the minister of Youth, Arts and Letters, after which the communists presented it to the National Assembly.[67] For two years, politicians of all stripes debated the law and its exact wording in committees and in the Assembly itself.

The communists pushed for the inclusion in the law of a clause limiting to 25% the amount of foreign material allowed in youth periodicals published in France. The law was first read to the Assembly on July 1, 1949 with this clause intact, but within days, members of the press and representatives of publishing companies, including both the World War II era editor of the children's newspaper Benjamin, and, most importantly, Henri Winkler of Opera Mundi, successfully presented their case and caused that particular clause to be amended in their favor. The communists tried again to have the

---

[66]Michel Pierre, "Le Journal de Mickey," in Entre Deux Guerres: la création française entre 1919 et 1939, Olivier Barrot and Pascal Ory, eds. (Paris: Éditions François Bourin, 1990), p. 124.

[67]"'Haro sur le gangster': Les catholiques et la censure de la presse enfantine (1934-1949)," in La Censure en France, p. 274.

law returned to its original wording, but when the law was voted on July 16th, it still lacked that clause. The communists then refused to vote. From the communists' point of view, foreign-driven capitalism had won out over a necessary defense of French authors and artists. One communist participant was Madame P. Charbonnel, who later wrote an article for Enfance in which she emphasized the early role of her party. Charbonnel complained: "Under this form the law was nothing but an illusion destined to give appeasement to a large, profoundly alarmed, public opinion. But it had become impossible to attack the real roots of evil..." She praised a group formed after the law was voted, called the Committee for the Defense of the Press and Literature for Youth, for its continuing efforts to fight against demoralizing publications and to search for "the means susceptible to help youth to discover and to love the beautiful texts of the rich literary patrimony of France and the great works of foreign literature."[68] For this communist, as for the editor of Mon Camarade ten years earlier, defending French workers also protected the type of morality French children needed to be taught.

When the law was actually voted, it defined the object for censorship as "all publications, periodical or not which, by their character, their presentation, or their object, appear as principally destined for children and adolescents"--except for "official scholarly publications under the regulation of the minister of national education." The law regulated the importation of foreign publications, but not with any percentage included. Their content had to conform to the same requirements as those for publications produced or edited in France. The main article which described the requirements for content read as follows:

> Publications addressed by article 1 must not carry any illustration, any story, any chronicle, any rubric, any insertion favorably presenting banditry, lying, robbery, laziness, cowardice, hatred, debauchery or all acts

---

[68]P. Charbonnel, "Comment a été votée la loi du 16 juillet 1949," in Les Journaux pour enfants, pp. 436-437.

that qualify as crimes or offenses or of a nature to demoralize childhood or youth.[69]

The law also banned advertisement for immoral publications, as well as the sale, gift, or proposal to any minor under age 18 of any such publications that represented "a danger for youth."

Charbonnel's despair at the efficacy of the law proved correct. Very few producers or marketers were actually condemned for violating it.[70] The aspect of the law that seems to have been most workable was the clause that clearly defined the publications whose sale to minors was banned; by 1953, the list included 143 titles, some of which were also banned from sale at all in train stations.[71] The regulatory commission assembled in 1949 included a complicated mix of political representatives and representatives of the press; it also included one father and one mother to be appointed by the National Union of Family Associations. There were several requirements for members of the commission, including French citizenship, lack of a criminal record--with the exception of acts of Resistance during the war that had been declared crimes under Vichy--and never to have been declared in *décheance* of paternal rights.

The commission published a list of recommendations for editors of children's magazines to aid them in forestalling children's acquisition of the habit of reading "sinister publications," which would take away their optimistic view of life. "It is necessary that the inspiration of these [publications] respond to the primordial needs of the childish soul, which desires and hopes."[72] Editors were given the duty to take up an educative role in relation to their clients, and to recognize that "children cannot be the

---

[69]Annexe 1, Les Journaux pour enfants, p. 485.

[70]See Michel Pierre, La Bande dessinée (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1976). Pierre's thesis is that these efforts at repression led to the creation of the underground "comix," in fact raising the appeal, to adults as well as to youth, of this type of publication.

[71]Annexe 5, Les Journaux pour enfants, pp. 511-512.

[72]Annexe 2, Les Journaux pour enfants, p. 490.

sole judges of what is good or bad for them, no more in the moral domain than in the domain of nutrition, for example." Thus the law denied that children's tastes were necessarily inherently good--despite children's "primordial optimism."

The commission carefully explained to editors how to construct a healthy publication. First, they should carefully contrive the content of stories. All fantasy and adventure should avoid being overly unrealistic, "at least in the presentations that risk confounding the real and the imaginary and disorienting the mind of the reader." They should remain logical, they should not mislead children as to elementary scientific principles, especially those of natural history. In other words, they should avoid presenting unrealistic animals or other creatures--though it is unlikely this advice applied to classic fairy tales. Good consequences should not be won without an effort; intelligence rather than force should be used. The plot should not be limited to warfare between the good guys and the bad guys, rather, "a place must be made for labor, in the pursuit of an ideal, in the war against the elements, for work." Instead of hatred, "disinterested feelings of sympathy (goodwill, generosity, pity)" should motivate actions. Scenes of horror, of blood, of "hideous people, monstrous or deformed," scenes of trouble between men and women, women with provocative or equivocal clothing or attitudes, should all be avoided. The Commission's advice included a lengthy rendering of the personality of heroes and the need to avoid any criminality or dishonesty.[73]

Additionally, national interests needed to be upheld. Whenever possible, the editors should include "descriptions, voyages, research, discoveries." When they could, they should "evoke...the *milieux* of life imprinted on the national reality." Also, stories set in the colonies should not upset [*froisser*] overseas readers, and should inspire in Parisian readers "a feeling of solidarity and sympathy." Complaints about the way children's periodicals, and especially American-style comics, did not uphold a good

[73]Annexe 2, Les Journaux pour enfants, pp. 498-501.

understanding of the French language were also addressed. Good spelling, grammar, and syntax were demanded, and the works should be well-written and well-composed. Also, "Precede or follow the 'balloon', as often as possible, with a descriptive or explanatory text, in order to give the child the taste for reading." On the whole, publications should make an effort to inspire "a minimum of optimism and *joie de vivre*," rather than a cynical and pessimistic world view.[74]

The commission ended its recommendations by asserting that they were not attempting, themselves, to direct the editing and publication of children's literature and press. Their advice was to serve only as a guideline, and each publication would be judged by its own merits and with respect for the producer. Their advice, they suggested, merely described an ideal children's publication, which was not to say that such an ideal should be uniformly applied.[75] Indeed, their complicated and complete list of recommendations was more proscriptive than it was prescriptive, and in actuality, few producers of "literature destined for youth" had their work condemned by this regulatory board.

The advice of the regulatory commission incorporated many of the suggestions concerning appropriate as well as inappropriate reading for children that had been made throughout the interwar years. It ignored only the leftist view that children's tastes should be allowed more headway and the communist effort at protecting French production. Interwar scientific theories especially influenecd supporters of the censorship law, who commonly incorporated such ostensibly non-political knowledge, especially of children's difference from adults, into legitimation for a variety of opinions.

What is most significant is not that children's cultural consumption was seen to be in need of regulation. What is significant is that such discourse increased during the

---

[74]Annexe 2, Les Journaux pour enfants, pp. 498-501.

[75]Annexe 2, Les Journaux pour enfants, p. 501.

period following the First World War, and involved people with a variety of different political, religious, and social visions for the future. The specific values they espoused and the particular methods by which they sought regulation offer a reflection of larger French and international cultural concerns. As with regulation of the cinema, but in a more complex and detailed way, the efforts to censor children's reading "habits" or "tastes" were simultaneously efforts to create a separate children's culture. This childish cultural world was largely protected from adult concerns and interests and was defined at least superficially by a new understanding of the child's nature presented by "child scientists"--especially psychologists. Ultimately, such a separate culture for the younger members of society contributed to the creation of a new, collective social identity for French youth--but one for which their cultural consumption was at least rhetorically "protected" by adults. The potential youth seemed to have for collective power, whether heroically defending or reforming France, thus was never quite realized. Allowing for the concrete expression of such power would have been in effect to relinquish control over the nation's future. The pressures of post-World War I destruction and anxiety, though they led to the glorification of the younger generation as future citizens and leaders of France, never truly created an environment for French children that evaded the authority of French adults. Youth's potential agency continued, however, well beyond the time of the Great War, to reflect both the threat and the promise of generational rebellion.

# CONCLUSION

In 1960, Philippe Ariès published L'Enfant et la vie familale sous l'ancien régime, a book considered seminal for the history of childhood. In this account of family life prior to the French Revolution, Ariès argued that until the 17th century or so, people were unable to consider the child as anything other than an "adult on a smaller scale."[1] The title of the 1962 English translation, Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life, suggested that the book was not merely about Old Regime France, but about the period of modernity that spanned four centuries and led right up to the present.[2] Although his English-speaking readers did not realize it, Ariès was responding to worries about the relationship between the child and society that had been primarily a phenomenon of the early twentieth century in his own country, during his own interwar youth.[3] English-speaking readers focused on that part of Ariès' book devoted to the "discovery" of the child in the early modern period, and especially on its impact on family life.[4] If childhood did not exist prior to the early modern period, then a "child" must be a historically-determined cultural "invention," not a biologically-determined

---

[1]Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1962). Originally published as L'Enfant et la vie familale sous l'ancien régime (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1960).

[2]Richard T. Vann, "The Youth of Centuries of Childhood," History and Theory 21, no. 2, (1982): 278-297. Vann supports the idea that Ariès' book is "not just about the *ancien règime*." p. 279, cf. 1. Ariès himself suggested that the English title was "beautiful but false." Philippe Ariès, Un Historien du dimanche, with Michael Winock (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1980), p. 137-138.

[3]Ariès, Un Historien du dimanche, pp. 134-139.

[4]Two of the earliest English arguments against Ariès were an article by Natalie Zemon Davis, "The Lords of Misrule: Youth Groups and Charivaris in Sixteenth Century France," Past and Present 50 (1971): 41-75, and a book by David Hunt, Parents and Children in History: The Psychology of Family Life in Early Modern France (New York and London: Basic Books, Inc., 1970). For further coverage, see Vann, "The Youth of Centuries of Childhood," and Adrian Wilson, "The Infancy of the History of Childhood: An Appraisal of Philippe Ariès," History and Theory 19, no. 2 (1980): 132-153. The other section of L'Enfant et la vie familale is devoted to the bourgeois schools; this has received much less attention from English-speaking scholars.

being. It was this argument against prevailing twentieth-century scientific definitions of the child that other scholars subsequently and repeatedly cited.[5] This reading of Ariès' thesis, however, does not take into account the book's polemical quality.

Ariès' opinions can be understood much more readily when we place Centuries of Childhood in the context of post-World War I French views of childhood. As this dissertation has shown, it was in the early twentieth century that children of all classes became, through institutions and laws, socially and culturally fully segregated from adults. In France, it was during the interwar years that a new youth culture, designed especially with children's psychologically distinct make-up in mind, began to be consciously constructed. Ariès was engaging in a late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century argument about the balance between familial influence in children's lives and the influence of new social and cultural institutions, often state-administered. It was the origins of this modern trend, as defined by Ariès himself, that he sought to discover in the early modern period.

For French readers, Ariès' views undoubtedly seemed more old-fashioned than striking.[6] L'Enfant et la vie familale countered conservative complaints that "the family" was being ruined by the advance of liberal individualism, claiming instead that it was not individualism, but rather the family itself, in a modern guise, that had triumphed. What set Ariès apart from other conservatives was that he was not a supporter of the family as a modern institution--at least not what the French called the "Malthusian family," the small,

[5]Linda Pollock argued specifically against this thesis and in support of a universal, natural or biological quality for parent-child relations. Linda Pollock, Forgotten Children: Parent-child relations from 1500 to 1900 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[6]The publication of this book, which became seminal for the history of childhood, made barely a ripple among French academics. This suggests that the originality of Ariès' thesis was less marked for his French audience than it subsequently was for English readers. His renown in France seems to have come about through his popularity among English readers, especially through interpretations of his work by American sociologists and psychologists: one French magazine even erroneously referred to Ariès as an American sociologist. See Ariès' 1973 "Préface à la nouvelle édition," L'Enfant et la vie familiale. David Hunt also pointed out the consistency between Ariès' 1960 thesis and an article on demographics he wrote much earlier, in 1948. Hunt, Parents and Children in Society, p. 42.

parent-child private enclave that he found preponderant in twentieth-century France. His thesis, however, offered up an alternative conservative complaint. The nuclear family was stronger than ever, Ariès argued, but unfortunately privileged the child in a way that did damage to the strength of the broader social and moral order.

What he seemed to find most distressing was the increasing influence of an inverted age-related social status in the modern period, where youth was held up as an important and powerful age. Although Ariès argued that he had found the roots of this movement in the seventeenth century, his was clearly a twentieth century lament.

> Nowadays our society depends, and knows that it depends, on the success of its educational system. It has a system of education, a concept of education, an awareness of its importance. New sciences such as psycho-analysis, pediatrics and psychology devote themselves to the problems of childhood, and their findings are transmitted to parents by way of a mass of popular literature. Our world is obsessed by the physical, moral and sexual problems of childhood.[7]

This "obsession," Ariès argued, developed out of new parental duties towards children, including sentimental love for them and the need to provide egalitarian training for life. This was combined with an increasing understanding that "the child was not ready for life, and that he had to be subjected to a special treatment, a sort of quarantine, before he was allowed to join the adults." Families, especially middle-class families, initiated school systems in order to provide both the training and the "quarantine" this new ethic demanded. "Family and school together removed the child from adult society." Ariès thus placed the blame for the modern breakdown of community on atomized familial self-centeredness. He saw public institutions as an outgrowth of that brand of liberal individualism. Yet he argued that they served to control and homogenize children's upbringing, gearing each child towards a new and universal ideal.[8] The way in which the

---

[7]Ariès, Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life, p. 411.

[8]Ariès, Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life, pp. 403-407.

modern child fit into the larger fabric of society, he asserted, no longer supported a communitarian ideal. The modern "obsession" with knowing and controlling the child's separate world ultimately worked against communal ends.

The connection Ariès made between the modern, "nuclear" family and the growth of public institutions, however, did not take into account the shift of authority over children's lives that occurred over time, especially under the Third Republic. While modern public institutions, including the modern school system, may have been rooted in the growth of the private, bourgeois family, I have argued that over time, the authority originally vested by parents was ultimately removed from them and placed in the hands of the institutions themselves. This occurred especially through the twentieth-century reliance on new child sciences, which, as Ariès did comment, began to tell parents how to raise their children.

If we set aside Ariès condemnation of the bourgeois nuclear family, we can see instead the way that, after the Great War, authority over children and youth, representative of authority over the nation's future, shifted from parents to the state and other public institutions. Part of youth culture was constructed by adults as an effort to find new, non-familial ways of transmitting traditional values to the younger generation. Part of it was constructed by adults as a spur to new youth creativity and autonomy designed to lead towards some brand of reform or even revolution. New "knowledge" of childhood, put forth primarily but not exclusively by child scientists, especially psychologists like Jean Piaget, gave adults confidence that they could control youth's new social and cultural power. Both the early child-rights movement and the movement in France and elsewhere towards greater censorship of children's culture were ways of legally cementing official adult control over youth as a social collectivity. This control was couched as the adult duty to protect children's and youth's "normalcy," and was often rhetorically tied to support for parental caregiving. It was actually a restructuring of traditional parental authority in such a way that children's relationship to the rest of

society became more direct, and no longer needed to be mediated through individual familial authority figures. Instead a whole range of new substitute family figures, especially father figures, representing many different social, cultural, and political positions, battled for authority through new youth cultural media.

Sometime between the 1921 publication of Father Fernand Jamin's reputedly "reasonable" traditionalist advice book and Ariès' work in the 1950s, faith in adolescent obedience to tradition faded. Efforts at patriotic collectivization of young people during the war also led youth to appear to have a new kind of social power. The interwar creation of a new youth culture, through education, youth groups, and magazines and other leisure activities, along with support for greater protectionist rights for children, all served to support collective youth consciousness. This allowed young people to take on a new social identity with the apparent potential for reform, rebellion, or even revolutionary activity. The encouragement to rebellion offered by the New Humanists, for example, grew out of an emphasis on youth soldiers' heroism in the First World War. Support for children's rights, relative both to their parents and to the state, also provided youth with potential agency. Yet in the face of youth's greater agency, adults simultaneously sought stronger and more public control over young people's lives.

Have youth in the twentieth century ever realized the power seemingly vested in them through their patriotic collectivization after World War I? Can that power really exist in an autonomous and self-created way? Certainly we can point to numerous efforts by youth themselves to solidify such power, and we can also see the repeated frustration of their goals, from efforts in the 1930s through the international youth movements of the 1960s. At the same time, adults have placed greater emphasis on youth's agency, on their visibility and their voice, in national, and increasingly, global forums. Perhaps the most successful realization of youth's power as a collective group in global society has come through repeated efforts by adults to grasp and to mold such power to a variety of adult ends. In the interwar years in France, this was certainly true for Fascist efforts to co-opt

youth's power, for example. In the same way, the Resistance laid claim to youth's allegiance. By the end of World War II, when the censorship law began to be officially debated, it seemed that French youth had been subjected to propaganda more than they had truly participated. Yes despite ambiguous or abortive efforts throughout the century to realize or to stifle youth's social and cultural power, we in the West continue to see as important raising the younger generation as a way of creating or maintaining our own future.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Periodicals

Benjamin: Le premier grand hebdomadaire français pour la jeunesse (Paris) 1929 -1940.

Benjamine, supplement to Benjamin (Paris) 1934-1938.

L'Éducateur prolétarien: L'imprimerie à l'école, le cinéma, la radio, les techniques nouvelles d'éducation populaire (Saint-Paul-de-Vence, Vence) 1925 - 1939.

L'Éducateur Protestant (Paris) 1922-1934.

L'Éducation: revue d'éducation familiale et scolaire, then L'Éducation: revue pour des parents et des maîtres (Paris) 1909-1938.

Enfance: psychologie, pédagogie-neuro-psychiatrie-sociologie (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France) 1948-1952.

L'Enfant: revue mensuelle illustrée consacrée à la protection de l'enfance (Paris) 1907-1928.

Les Enfants de France (Paris: Édition du Figaro, Revue de la jeunesse) 1928-1935.

Les Enfants et jeunes de France (Paris) 1935-1938.

JEF: Journal des enfants de France (Paris) 1938-1939.

Les Jeunes de France (Paris) 1934-1935.

La Voix de l'Enfant: Organe de liaison de la Section des Bouches-du-Rhône du Comité national de l'enfance (Marseille) 1933-1937.

## Primary Works

Archambault, Paul, Étienne Borne, Jean Lacroix, Marc Sherer, Georges Hourdin, and Louis Terrenoire. Options sur demain: tâches nouvelles, nouvelles équipes. Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1939.

Arnaud, Pierre. Réforme de la législation relative a l'outrage aux bonnes moeurs: L'Outrage aux bonnes moeurs considéré comme portant atteinte au droit du père de famille d'assurer l'éducation sexuelle de ses enfants mineurs. Paris: Librairie Arthur Rousseau and Cie, 1927.

Auvergne, Dominique. Regards catholiques sur le monde. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1938.

Beauvoir, Simone de. Memoires of a Dutiful Daughter. Translated by James Kirkup. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1959.

Bergson, Henri. The Two Sources of Morality and Religion. Translated by Ashley Audra and Cloudesley Brereton, with W. Horsfall Carter. New York: Holt and Co., 1935.

———. Creative Evolution. Translated by Arthur Mitchell. New York: The Modern Library, 1944.

Binet, Alfred and Th. Simon, The Development of Intelligence in Children. The Binet-Simon Scale. Translated by Elizabeth S. Kite. Vineland, NJ: Publications of the Training School at Vineland New Jersey, 1916.

Bondam, Richard. Le Mal social et ses remèdes. Paris: Société Mutuelle d'Édition, 1920.

Boring, Edward G., and Herbert S. Langfeld, Heinz Werner, and Robert M. Yerkes, eds. A History of Psychology in Autobiography. Vol. IV. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press, 1952.

Boucher, J. Psychologie appliquée à l'éducation d'après les programmes officiels du 18 août 1920, 15th edition. Paris: Librairie Delagrave, 1934.

Bringuier, Jean-Claude. Conversations libres avec Jean Piaget. Paris: Robert Laffont, 1977.

Calvet, Jean. L'Enfant dans la littérature française. Paris: F. Lanore, 1931.

Cassin, René. Le Contentieux des victimes de la guerre: étude de la jurisprudence concernant les pensions de guerre et l'adoption des pupilles. 1924-1925. Paris: Éditions de l'Union Féderale, c. 1925.

Chabot, Charles. Les Droits de l'enfant. Paris: Perrin et Cie, 1922.

Chance, Sir William, ed. Report of the Proceedings of the Third International Congress for the Welfare and Protection of Children. London: P.S. King and Son, 1902.

Claparède, Edouard. Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child. Translated by Mary Louch and Henry Holman. New York: Longmans, Green and Co.; London: Edward Arnold, 1911.

Compayré, Gabriel. The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child. Translated by Mary E. Wilson. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1906.

———. Jean Jacques Rousseau and Education from Nature. Translated by R. P. Jago. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1907.

D'Arc, Paul. L'Éducation Française. Vol. 1 of Pour l'Aprés-Guerre: notes, impressions, souvenirs pendant la guerre. Paris: B. Grasset, 1917.

Durkheim, Émile. La Vie Universitaire à Paris. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1918.

Enfance et Jeunesse. Vol. 1 of La Guerre et la vie de demain: Conference de l'Alliance d'hygiène sociale, 1914-1916. With papers by MM. Émile Boutroux, le Professeur Chauffard, Mme. Jules Siegfried, M. le Professor Pinard, Mlle. Berthe Milliard, MM. le Dr. Mosny, Montjotin, J. Lefebvre, Cohendy, Gustave Bèlot, Louis Liard, under the presidence of MM. Lèon Bourgeois, le Dr. Emile Roux, Mme. la Marquise de Ganay, MM. le Professseur Chauveau, Ferdinand-Dreyfus, le Dr. Mathieu, Ferdinand Buisson, Paul Painlevé, and Ernest Lavisse. Paris: Félix Alcan, 1916.

Finley, John H. Report of a Visit to Schools of France in War Time. New York: The University of the State of New York, 1917.

Finot, Jean. "Les Instituteurs de demain et la pédagogie optimiste." Revue des Deux Mondes 137 (1919): 216-231.

Forton, Louis. Les Pieds Nickelés en Amerique. Paris: Henri Veyrier, 1969.

———. Les Pieds Nickelés s'en vont en guerre. Paris: Henri Veyrier, 1979.

Fuller, Edward, compiler. An International Year Book of Child Care and Protection: Being a Record of State and Voluntary Effort for the Welfare of the Child, including Information on Marriage, Divorce and Illegitimacy, Education, the Care of the Destitute Child, Treatment of Juvenile Delinquents, and Conditions of Juvenile Employment throughout the World. London: Longmans, Green and Co., and The World's Children Limited, 1925.

Garric, Robert. Belleville: Scènes de la vie populaire. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1928.

———. Albert de Mun. Paris: E. Flammarion, 1934.

———. Le Message de Lyautey. Paris: Éditions Spes, 1935.

Garric, R., P. Tézenas de Montcel, P. Deffontaines, and R. Lambry. Les Équipes sociales: Esprit et methodes. Paris: Éditions de la Revue des Jeunes, Desclée et Cie, 1924.

Halphen-Istel, Claire. "Le Scoutisme et la Morale." In 1er Congrés pour l'étude des questions relatives à l'organisation de l'Enseignement du second degré, 31 mai au 4 juin 1936 au Havre. Section IV, no. 37.

———. "Adaptation du projet d'un Club-Bibliothèque à L'Enseignement secondaire." In 1er Congrés pour l'étude des questions relatives à l'organisation de l'Ensiegnement du second degré, 31 mai au4 juin 1936 au Havre.

Haraucourt, Edmond. La Démoralisation par le livre et par l'image. Congrés National du Livre, Mars 1917.

Hayes, Carleton J. H. France, A Nation of Patriots. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930.

Hazard, Paul. Books, Children and Men. Translated by Marguerite Mitchell. Boston: The Horn Book, Inc., 1944.

The Health of the Child. Vol. III of Proceedings of the International Conference of Women Physicians. New York: The Womans Press, 1920.

Hersent, Georges. La Reforme de l'Éducation Nationale. Paris: Hachette et Cie, 1917.

Hollebecque, Mme [Marie]. La Jeunesse scolaire de France et la guerre. Paris: Didier, 1916.

———. Lahy-Hollebecque, M. L'Enfant: une cause d'avenir. Paris: Éditions du Sagittaire, 1932.

Illustrated Album of the League of Nations. Geneva: Atar, n.d.- probably 1925-26.

Jamin, Fernand. Conseils aux jeunes gens de France après la victoire. Paris: Perrin et Cie, Librairies-Éditeurs, 1921.

Lacroix, Jean. Le Personnalisme: sources-fondements-actualité. Lyon: Chronique Sociale, 1981.

Laporte, M. and M. Bot, Mlle de Gollville and M. Taillade. Office des Pupilles de la Nation: Lois du 27 juillet et du 26 octobre 1922. Paris: Librarie du Recueil Sirey, 1934.

Latzarus, Marie Thérèse. La Littérature enfantine en France dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle: étude précedée d'un rapide aperçu des lectures des enfants en France avant 1860. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1923.

The League of Nations from Year to Year. October 1926 - October 1927. Geneva: Information Section, League of Nations.

League of Nations Publications, Ten Years of World Co-operation. Foreward by Sir Eric Drummond. Geneva: Secretariat of the League of Nations, 1930.

League of Nations Publications, Social IV. Traffic in Women and Children Committee Minutes. Geneva.

League of Nations Publications, Social IV. Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People Minutes. Geneva.

Lefeuvre, René. "Les Droits de la mère sur ses enfants dans le Droit Français contemporain." Ph.D. diss., University of Paris Law School. Paris: Librairie Nouvelle de Droit et de Jurisprudence, 1913.

Manoll, Michel. Entretiens avec Robert Garric. Paris: Les Éditions de l'Épargne, 1970.

Mauny, Mlle Sabine. "Les Pupilles de la Nation: Comment on devient Pupille de la Nation, Avantages que confère ce titre." Ph.D. diss., University of Poitiers. Poitiers: Imprimerie "L'Union," 1923.

Minutes, League of Nations Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People. Vol. V, no. 5, May 1925.

Murchison, Carl, ed. A History of Psychology in Autobiography. Vol. I. New York: Russel & Russel, 1930.

Nisot, Joseph. Les Pupilles de la Nation en France. Brussels: Imprimerie P. Dykmans, n.d.

Piaget, Jean. The Language and Thought of the Child. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959 , originally published in 1923.

———. The Child's Conception of Physical Causality. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1930.

Raape, Leo. "Les Rapports Juridiques entre parents et enfants comme point de départ d'une explication pratique d'anciens et de nouveaux problèmes fondamentaux du droit international privé." In Recueil des Cours IV, Vol. 50, Academie de Droit International établie avec le concours de la Dotation Carnegie pour la paix internationale. Paris: Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1934.

Rougemont, Denis de. Politique de la Personne, Problèmes, doctrines et tactique de la Révolution Personnaliste. Paris: Éditions "Je Sers," 1934.

Roure, Maurice-Firmin-Felix. "Les Droits de la mère sur la personne et sur les biens de son enfant." Ph.D. diss., University of Algier, 1925.

Sabatier, Pierre. La Décheance de la puissance paternelle et la privation du droit de garde. Paris: Éditions de la Vie Universitaire, 1922.

Sarraut, Albert. L'Instruction publique et la guerre. Paris: Henri Didier, 1916.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. The Words. Translated by Bernard Frechtman. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.

Saut, Roger. "Droits des grand-parents sur la personne de leurs petits-enfants." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Dijon, 1941. Paris: Librairie Arthur Rousseau, 1941.

Schinz, Albert. État présent des travaux sur J.-J. Rousseau. Paris: Société d'Édition les Belles Lettres; New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1941.

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre. Lettres à Léontine Zanta. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1965.

———. The Making of a Mind: Letters from a Soldier-Priest 1914-1919. Translated by René Hague. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

Thamin, R. L'Université et la guerre. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1916.

Traizet, Thérèse. "Les Droits de la mére légitime sur la personne des enfants pendant le mariage (en l'absence de séparation de corps)." Ph.D. diss., University of Paris Law School, 1939. Paris: Les Éditions Domat-Montchrestien, 1939.

Le Travail par èquipes à l'école. Geneva: Bureau International d'Éducation, 1935.

Vidler, Alec R. M.A. The Modernist Movement in the Roman Catholic Church: Its Origins and Outcomes. London: Cambridge University Press, 1934.

Zanta, Léontine. La Science et l'amour: Journal d'une étudiante. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1921.

———. Psychologie du féminisme. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1922.

———. La Renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1914.

## Secondary Works

Abel, Richard. The Ciné Goes to Town: French Cinema, 1896-1914. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

———. French Cinema: The First Wave, 1915-1929. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Acker, Victor. Célestin Freinet. Westport CT and London: Greenwood Press, 2000.

Anderson, Benedict. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. New York: Verso, 1991.

Archard, David. Rights and Childhood. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Ariès, Philippe. Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life. New York: Vintage Books, 1962 . Originally published as L'Enfant et la vie familale sous l'ancien régime. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1960.

———. Un Historien du dimanche. With Michael Winock. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1980.

Arnal, Oscar L. Ambivalent Alliance: The Catholic Church and the Action Française 1899-1939. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985.

Audoin-Rouzeau, Stéphane. La Guerre des enfants 1914-1918: essai d'histoire culturelle. Paris: Armand-Colin, 1993.

Bard, Christine. Les Filles de Marianne: histoire des féminismes 1914-1940. Paris: Fayard, 1995.

Becker, Jean Jacques. The Great War and the French People. Translated by Arnold Pomerans. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.

Bell, Susan Groag and Karen Offen, eds. Women, the Family, and Freedom: The Debate in Documents. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1983.

Bosworth, William. Catholicism and Crisis in Modern France: French Catholic Groups at the Threshold of the Fifth Republic. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Charle, Christophe. La République des Universitaires, 1870-1940. Paris: Édition du Seuil, 1994.

Chevallier, P. and B. Grosperrin. Documents. Vol. II of L'Enseignement français de la Révolution à nos jours. Paris, Le Haye: Mouton et Cie, 1971.

Chateau, Jean, ed. La Psychologie de l'enfant en langue française. Toulouse: Privat, 1979.

Chevallier, Pierre, ed. La Scolarisation en France depuis un siècle: Colloque tenu à Grenoble en mai 1968. Paris: Mouton, 1974.

Cholvy, Gerard. Histoire des organisations et mouvements chrétiens de jeunesse en France XIXe-XXe siècle. Paris: Les Éditions de Cerf, 1999.

Clark, Linda. Schooling the Daughters of Marianne: Textbooks and the Socialization of Girls in Modern French Primary Schools. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984.

Cohen, David. Faut-il Brûler Piaget? Paris: Éditions Retz, 1981 .

Couperie, Pierre. A History of the Comic Strip. New York: Crown Publishers, 1968.

Crubellier, Maurice. L'Enfance et la jeunesse dans la société Française 1800-1950. Paris: Armand Colin, 1979.

Dansette, Adrien. Histoire religieuse de la France contemporain: L'Église catholique dans la mêlée politique et sociale. Paris: Flammarion, 1965.

Donzelot, Jacques. The Policing of Families. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books, 1979.

Ecksteins, Modris. Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age. New York: Doubleday, 1989.

Elder, Glen H. Jr., John Modell, Ross D. Parkes, eds. Children in Time and Place: Developmental and Historical Insights. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Escarpit, Denise. La Littérature d'enfance et de jeunesse en Europe. Que sais je? Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1981.

Eude, Jean-Dominique. Les Fondateurs du scoutisme catholique en France. Chambray-les-Tours: C.L.D., 1992.

Filippini, Henri, Jacques Glenat, Numa Sadoul and Yves Varende. Histoire de la bande dessinée en France et en Belgique: des origines à nos jours. Paris: Jacques Glenat, 1979.

Fourment, Alain. Histoire de la Presse des jeunes et des journaux d'enfants 1768-1988. Paris: Editions Eole, 1987.

Friedlander, Judith, Blanche Wiesen Cook, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, eds. Women in Culture and Politics: A Century of Change. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Freeman, Michael, ed. Children's Rights: A Comparative Perspective. Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1996.

Freinet, Madeleine. Élise et Célestin Freinet: Souvenirs de notre vie. Vol. I, 1896-1940. Paris: Stock, 1997.

Gabriel-Robinet, L. La Censure. Paris: Hachette, 1965.

Galbraith, Gretchen R. Reading Lives: Reconstructing Childhood, Books, and Schools in Britain, 1870-1920. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Garcia, Jean-François. L'École Unique en France. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994.

Halls, W. D. Society, Schools, and Progress in France. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1965.

———. The Youth of Vichy France. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Hanna, Martha. The Mobilization of Intellect: French Scholars and Writers during the Great War. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Hause, Steven and Anne Kenney. Women's Suffrage and Social Politics in the French Third Republic. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Hawes, Joseph. The Children's Rights Movement: A History of Advocacy and Protection. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991.

Hellman, John. Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left 1930-1950. Toronto and Buffalo, University of Toronto Press, 1981.

———. The Knight-Monks of Vichy France: Uriage, 1940-1945 . Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Hendrick, Harry. Children, Childhood and English Society, 1880-1990. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Higonnet, Margaret. "War Games." The Lion and the Unicorn 22:1 (1998): 1-17.

Hommage à Robert Garric. Special edition of Revue de la Haute-Auvergne, Jan.-June 1968.

Horn, Maurice. "Comics." In Handbook of French Popular Culture. Edited by Pierre L. Horn. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Hunt, David. Parents and Children in History: The Psychology of Family Life in Early Modern France. New York and London: Basic Books, Inc., 1970.

James, Allison, Chris Jenks, and Alan Prout. Theorizing Childhood. New York: Columbia Teachers College, 1998.

Jordanova, Ludmilla. "Children in History: Concepts of Nature and Society." In Children, Parents and Politics. Edited by Geoffrey Scarre. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Kennedy, David. "The Roots of Child Study: Philosophy, History and Religion." Teachers College Record 102, (June 2000): 514-538.

Kent, George. Children in the International Political Economy. London: MacMillan Press, Ltd., 1995.

Kergomard, Pierre and Pierre Français. Histoire des Éclaireurs de France de 1911 à 1951. France: Éclaireuses et Éclaireurs de France, 1983.

Laneyrie, Philippe. Les Scouts de France: l'évolution du mouvement des origines aux années 80. Paris: Cerf, 1985.

Lebovics, Herman. True France: The Wars over Cultural Identity, 1900-1945. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Leglise, Paul. Histoire de la Politique du cinéma française. Paris: Librairie Générale de Droit et de Jurisprudence, 1970.

Levi, Giovanni and Jean-Claude Schmitt, eds. A History of Young People in the West. Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press, 1997.

Livre, mon ami: lectures enfantines, 1914-1954. Edited by Annie Renonciat, with Vivianne Ezratty and Françoise Lévêque. Paris: Agence Culturelle de Paris et Annie Renonciat, 1991.

Maleprade, Henri. Léontine Zanta. 1872-1942 : Vertueuse aventurière du féminisme. avec une lettre inédite du Père Teilhard de Chardin . Paris: Éditions Rive Droite, 1997.

Marten, James, ed. Lessons of War: The Civil War in Children's Magazines. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1999.

Matthews, Gareth. The Philosophy of Childhood. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Messerly, John J. Piaget's Conception of Evolution: Beyond Darwin and Lamarck. Lanham, Boulder, New York and London: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1996.

Metthéos, Constantin. La Protection de la jeunesse par la censure cinématographique en France et à l'Étranger. Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence, 1966.

Monaco, Paul. Cinema and Society: France and Germany during the Twenties. New York: Elsevier, 1976.

Mosse, George. Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Mower, Glenn Jr. The Convention on the Rights of the Child: International Law Support for Children. Westport and London: Greenwood Press, 1997.

Neubauer, John. The Fin-de-Siècle Culture of Adolescence. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.

Nyberg, Amy Kiste. Seal of Approval: The History of the Comics Code. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1998.

Nye, Robert. Crime, Madness and Politics in Modern France: The Medical Concept of National Decline. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

O'Connell, Marvin R. Critics on Trial: An Introduction to the Catholic Modernist Crisis. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994.

Ory, Pascal, ed. La Censure en France à l'ère démocratique. 1849-... . Brussels: Éditions Complexe, 1997.

Pagnol, Marcel. Marcel Pagnol's Memories of Childhood. Translated by Rita Barisse. San Francisco: North Point Press, 1986.

Panichas, George A., ed. Promise of Greatness: The War of 1914-1918. New York: John Day Co., 1968.

Parias, Louis-Henri, ed. Histoire générale de l'enseignement et de l'éducation en France. Vols. 3 and 4. Paris: Nouvelle Librairie de France, 1981.

Paul, Harry W. The Second Ralliement : The Rapprochement Between Church and State in France in the Twentieth Century. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1967.

Pedersen, Susan. Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State: Britain and France, 1914-1945. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Pierre, Michel. La Bande dessinée. Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1976.

———. "Le Journal de Mickey." In Entre deux guerres: la création française entre 1919 et 1939. Edited by Olivier Barrot and Pascal Ory. Paris: Éditions François Bourin, 1990.

Pollock, Linda. Forgotten Children: Parent-child relations from 1500 to 1900. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Ponteil, Félix. Histoire de l'enseignement en France: les grandes étapes, 1789-1964. Paris: Sirey, 1966.

"Population and the State in the Third Republic." Forum. French Historical Studies 19, No. 3 (Spring 1996): 633-754.

"Priests and Instituteurs in the *Union Sacrée*: Reconciliation and Its Limits." French Historical Studies. 22, No. 2 (Spring 1999): 263-289.

Prost, Antoine. L'Enseignement en France, 1800-1967. Paris: Armand Colin, 1968.

———. "Jeunesse et Société dans la France de l'Entre-Deux-Guerres." Vingtième Siècle 13 (Jan-March 1987): 41-42.

Queffélec, Henri. Mémoires d'enfance: La Douceur et la guerre. Paris: Seguier, 1988.

Rearick, Charles. The French in Love and War: Popular Culture in the Era of the World Wars. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997.

Robert Garric et son milieu intellectual entre les deux guerres. Special Edition of Vie Sociale 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1997).

Roberts, Mary Louise. Civilization without Sexes: Reconstructing Gender in Postwar France, 1917-1927. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Rollet-Echalier, Catherine. La Politique à l'égard de la petite enfance sous la IIIe République. Paris: Institut National d'études démographiques: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990.

Rubellin-Devichi, Jacqueline. "The Best Interests Principle in French Law and Practice," in The Best Interests of the Child: Reconciling Culture and Human Rights. Edited by Philip Alston. Oxford: For Unicef, Clarendon Press, 1994.

Schafer, Sylvia. Children in Moral Danger and the Problem of Government in Third Republic France. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

———. "When the Child is the Father of the Man: Work, Sexual Difference and the Guardian-State in Third Republic France." In History and Theory, Beiheft 31, History and Feminist Theory. Edited by Ann-Louise Shapiro. Wesleyan University, 1992 , p. 98-115.

———. "Between Paternal Right and The Dangerous Mother: Reading Parental Reponsibility in Nineteenth-Century French Civil Justice." Journal of Family History 23, No. 2 (April 1998): 173-189.

Scott, Joan Wallach. Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and The Rights of Man. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Stromberg, Kristen. "Fathers, Families and the State in France, 1914-1945." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1998.

Talbott, John E. The Politics of Educational Reform in France, 1918-1940. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Trigon, Jean de. Histoire de la littérature enfantine: de Ma Mère l'Oye au Roi Babar. Paris: Hachette, 1950.

Vidal, Fernando. Piaget before Piaget. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Weber, Eugen. The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1994.

Winter, Jay. Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Wohl, Robert. The Generation of 1914. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Wolf, Theta H. Alfred Binet. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Wyness, Michael G. Contesting Childhood. London and New York: Falmer Press, 2000.