

(Inter)racialisation: the regulation of domestic and urban space in housing North-African migrants in 1960s and 1970s France

Rébecca S. Franco

VU University Amsterdam, Faculty of Law

r.s.franco@vu.nl

Abstract

Literature on immigrant housing and assimilation has shown how housing policies perpetuate, create and contest racial boundaries. This paper argues for the necessity to look at the regulation of domestic space together with the regulation of the urban space. By reading “along” and “against” the archival grain, this paper looks at housing policies that targeted the North-African migrant population in the 1960s and 1970s in France as colonial continuities. French authorities ostensibly encouraged gendered assimilation through spatial politics and interventions in the domestic space. Literature on the French context has shown how this perpetuated racialisation in the housing process. Building upon feminist scholarship on gender, intimacy, and colonialism, this paper shows how these policies did not acknowledge interracialised households and prevented interracialised intimacies. This helps understand how housing policies can reinforce racialised exclusion by regulating racial boundaries in the urban space and the domestic space together.



Copyright R. S. Franco

Received 09-06-2021



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons

Accepted 31-03-2022

Check for updates

[Attribution 4.0 International License.](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Published 25-05-2022

Published by the SciPost Foundation.

doi:[10.21468/MigPol.1.1.003](https://doi.org/10.21468/MigPol.1.1.003)

Contents

1. [Introduction](#) 2
2. [Methods: tracing racialisation in the archives](#) 3
3. [Colonial continuities](#) 4

4. Hierarchies of assimilability	6
5. Racialised difference: segregation and cohabitation in urban space	8
6. Interracialisation in domestic space	9
7. Preventing interracialised intimacies	11
8. Conclusion	14
9. Cited archives	14
References	15

1. Introduction

Today, French public authorities see the banlieues spaces in the French urban peripheries through a prism of problems concerning the segregation and integration of their racialised inhabitants, who are mostly (descendants of) people originating from the (former) colonies on the African continent (Dikeç, 2011; B. S. Epstein, 2011). Researchers have shown that in contemporary urban politics authorities enforce spatial distribution based on social-mixture policies (Lefevre, Roseau, & Vitale, 2013). However, the ambiguous and uncertain goals of these policies lead to conflicting implementation that contributes to the persistence of inequalities (Boisseuil, 2019). Scholars in Western Europe more generally have explored whether and how discourse and practice on spatial politics and migrant integration have the effect of excluding those who are to be integrated (Bolt, Özüekren, & Phillips, 2010; R. Epstein & Kirszbaum, 2003; Musterd, 2003; Schinkel, 2013, 2017, 2018). The French case, in particular, is interesting because of the French universalist investment in colour-blind policies, which scholars have argued perpetuate racial formations and inequalities rooted in colonial histories (Beaman & Petts, 2020; Fassin & Fassin, 2013; Stovall & Van den Abbeele, 2003). Looking at the histories of the housing projects that created the banlieues in the 1960s and 1970s may help understand the construction of racial projects in France. In this regard, I have drawn on Omi and Winant's understanding of racial projects as governmental practices and policies that bring together ideological and material aspects of race to organise and distribute resources and capital along racial lines (Omi & Winant, 2014).

This paper looks at the housing policies that targeted migrants from the former colonies during and in the wake of political decolonisation. The French administration problematised and regulated migrants within the French metropolitan territory through housing policies, based on colonial modes of governance (Bernardot, 2008; Hajjat, 2018; House & Thompson, 2016; Lyons, 2006; MacMaster, 1997). Researchers have shown that the French authorities implemented housing policies that were based on logics of gendered assimilation and spatial distribution, but enforced exclusion of migrants from the French community (F. Belmessous, 2013; Bernardot, 2008; Hajjat, 2018; Hmed, 2006; Lyons, 2006, 2009, 2013). However, this scholarship does not examine how the household categories were constructed in the first place. To comprehend the intent and outcomes of these policies more fully, this paper looks at how these categories were crafted through the interventions in domestic space and how this, in turn, ordered the urban space.

This paper traces colonial continuities in the regulation of urban space and domestic space together to understand better the ways in which housing policies produce and possibly undo racial boundaries. I specifically focus on the regulation of the interracialisation of domestic space and interracialised intimacies. To do so, I build on insights from feminist research on gender, intimacy and colonialism. These scholars argue that the regulation of “sexual, conjugal and domestic life” and interracialised intimacies were essential to the colonial order of things and the protection of racial hierarchies (Camiscioli, 2009; McClintock, 2013; Povinelli, 2006; Stoler, 1989, 2010). I understand the domestic space to refer to the space that belongs to the household, crafted through state interventions. The concept alludes to the French term “*domestiquer*”: to domesticate or subjugate a population to colonial power. I use the concept of ‘interracialisation’ to refer to the process of assigning different racialised identities to the members of the household. Interracialised intimacies refer to the intimate relationships (sex, marriage, unmarried relationship/cohabitation) between people who are assigned different racialised identities. I base this on the concept of ‘interraciality’, used in critical (mixed) race studies to refer to the construction of interracial relationships and families/couples through law, politics, and discourse (Ifekwunigwe, 2004; Onwuachi-Willig, 2013; Onwuachi-Willig & Willig-Onwuachi, 2009). Building on Haritaworn’s work on ‘multiracialisation’, I underline the process involved in racialisation, and therefore, in interracialisation (Haritaworn, 2007).ⁱ

By focusing on interracialised households and interracialised intimacies, I contribute to the literature specific to French housing policies to show how authorities regulated interracialisation through housing. Interracialised intimacies can upset racial hierarchies, as categorisations are threatened, but thereby also solidified, on their boundaries. Examining interracialised households and intimacies in housing policies therefore helps understand the construction of racial boundaries. This paper also adds to the literature on migrant integration and spatial politics more generally by arguing for the necessity of looking at the production of domestic space together with the regulation of urban space.

In this paper, I first set out the methods on which this paper is based, after which I illustrate the context in which the housing policies developed. In doing so, I pay attention to the colonial continuities. I show how the housing policies consolidated and were based on racial and gender hierarchies of assimilability that connected the regulation of urban space with the regulation of domestic space. Looking at these connections reveals how housing policies regulated interracialised households and intimacies.

2. Methods: tracing racialisation in the archives

This paper is based on primary and original archival sources from the National Archives of France and departmental and municipal archives of the Paris region. I consulted these archives in the context of my doctoral research on the regulation of interracialised intimacies between the white French population and North-African immigrants in the period from 1956 to 1979. I selected archives based on keyword searches concerning African migration and based on the physical and PDF inventories compiled by archivists on certain state services, ministries or themes. After having set out the basic understanding of the various policy-fields that affected interracialised intimacies, I proceeded with more targeted searches on housing and social action for this particular paper. The archives used include those of the Ministry of Construction, the Ministry of Housing, the Ministry of Interior Affairs, the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Health and the Department of the Seine (the Paris region) and the Parisian Municipality. I also included the private archives of Monique Hervo, an activist for better housing conditions for North African migrants living in informal settlements known as the “bidonvilles”, where she lived between 1959 and 1971. I used freely available material and material which I had received special permission to consult (that is, a *dérogation*) under the 213-2 du *Code du Patrimoine*. I looked at governmental policies, correspondence, research, circulars and legislation.

Research on race and the racialisation of regulation in France comes with its own set of challenges, as the French tradition of colour-blind universalism does not acknowledge the existence of racialised processes and governance. However, at the same time, research on race and racism in France has argued that racial logics are embedded within the French Republic, but have never been made explicit (Célestine, 2011; Stoler, 2011; Stovall & Van den Abbeele, 2003; Thompson, 2016). Stoler calls on researchers of racial histories in France and elsewhere to “ask who and what are made into ‘problems’, how certain narratives are made ‘easy to think’, and what ‘common sense’ such formulations have fostered and continue to serve” (Stoler, 2011).

Gordon has argued that regulations do not (only) impose rules, but rather dispose of things within a certain order by presenting this as the “natural order of things” (Gordon, 1984). Categorisations are integral to this process because they form the discursive and regulatory basis on which certain groups become defined as a problem and create identities that can be regulated (Grommé & Scheel, 2020; Schrover & Schinkel, 2013). As different governmental rationales on assimilation and immigration led to different policies and policy outcomes (King, Le Galès, & Vitale, 2017), it is important to look at both the governmental policies and categories, and the omission of certain policies and categories to understand how the state “disposes an order of things”. Building on this understanding, I look at how regulation, categorisation, bureaucratic silences and omissions disposed a racialised order as the natural order of things.

For this paper, I approached the archive with the question whether and how French authorities were interested in the regulation of the intimate lives of the North-African population in the French metropole and, specifically, whether and how the authorities were interested in interracialised intimacies. I looked at the archive as an “object of knowledge” rather than a “source of knowledge” (Arondekar, 2005; Stoler, 2002). Scholars have argued for a reading “against the archival grain,” in which the researcher attempts to uncover that which is not being said, those knowledges that are disqualified (Burton, 2006; Whatley & Brown, 2009). Stoler has famously argued for a “reading along the archival grain”: a reading that treats the archive as a “force field,” to which the research should surrender (albeit not concede) to trace its logics, to show what and how governmental rationales order governance (Stoler, 2009). In this paper, I do both: by juxtaposing different types of archives and different sources, I trace and (re)interpret the silences, hypervisibilities, invisibilities, fragmentation, inconsistencies and assumptions with regard to categorisation and regulation of (North) African migrants. In doing so, I have been able to reveal the underlying ordering principles of the regulation of domestic and urban space.

3. Colonial continuities

This paper looks at the housing policies that targeted postcolonial immigrants from the former colonies in North Africa during and after the (political) decolonisation of the French Empire, specifically Algeria, between 1960 and 1975. From the second half of the 1950s until the end of the period under review, France waged a war against the nationalist movement of French Algeria. The war culminated in the eventual independence of Algeria in 1962, following a period of intense state violence against Algerians in both French Algeria and the metropole (Brun & Shepard, 2016). This period in France was also marked by rapid change and economic prosperity, yet with grave housing shortages (not unlike other European states at the time) (van Beckhoven, Bolt, & van Kempen, 2009).

Around this same period in the post-Second World War context, the French state needed cheap labour to rebuild and modernise the country through, amongst others, urban renewal (Ross, 1996). The French government moreover instated free movement between the metropole and the colonies on the African continent in an effort to retain its colonies. After independence, the French government and the newly independent nations negotiated free movement. However, ever since free movement was instated, the French administration sought to limit and control migrants from North Africa on French territory (Laurens, 2009; Spire, 2005). In the 1970s, anti-immigration

measures and legislation intensified, which were reinforced during the economic downturn following the Oil Crisis in 1972 (Laurens, 2008; Weil, 1995).

Paying attention to the colonial continuities in the regulation of North-African migrants helps to understand better the specialised housing policies for migrants. Scholars have shown that the French administration regulated migrants from Algeria separately through specialised institutions and categories that created intimate connections between colony and metropole, and between the colonial and postcolonial context (de Barros, 2003, 2005, 2006; House, 2004; House & Thompson, 2016; Lyons, 2006, 2009, 2013; Naylor, 2013). Officially, French Algeria was a French department of the metropole and therefore administered by the Ministry of Interior Affairs. Before Algeria became independent, the Muslim population of Algeria were French citizens—albeit regulated under the legal regime of “Muslim status,” which in fact created a differentiated set of rights in French Algeria (Blévis, 2004).

In the metropole, at least formally, the status of Algerians was not different to that of French citizens. Still, French metropolitan officials used the category of *Français Musulmans d'Algérie* (FMA) [French Muslims of Algeria—hereinafter “Algerians”], which allowed the administration to differentiate between them and the rest of the French citizenry (Lyons, 2013, p. 24). The use of distinctive categorisations of Algerians made possible the creation of specialised institutions and services that obfuscated the lines between colonial and metropolitan government. The department of Algerian Affairs of the Ministry of Interior opened up branches and instated specialised services in the metropole to regulate Algerians (de Barros, 2005). Through these institutions, colonial practices of governance, individuals and expertise travelled between French Algeria and metropolitan France. These interconnected housing and social welfare, surveillance and assimilation to monitor and regulate colonial (migrant) populations.

Housing shortages were an acute problem in France, but the state investment in migrant housing went beyond an interest solely in the improvement of living standards: housing was one of the sites through which the French administration codified classifications, problematised some groups of migrants and managed migrants in the French territory (Blanc-Chaléard, 2016; de Barros, 2005). The poor housing conditions of many workers from the African continent were seen as an aberration of the modern French state (Blanc-Chaléard, 2016). The administration developed housing policies that targeted the FMA category specifically and separately from the French population, as I will show throughout this article. Such efforts took effect during the Algerian War to suppress nationalist sentiment amongst the Algerian population and to promote a “civilising mission in the metropole” (Lyons, 2013). Throughout the 60s and 70s, French authorities continued to worry about the existence of *logements insalubres* [unsanitary housing] and *bidonvilles* [shantytowns]. This fuelled anxieties about the presence of migrants from the African continent on French territory in its entirety.

Metropolitan practices targeting North-African migrants should be seen as colonial continuities of technocratic governmental techniques for modernisation and rationality (Laurens, 2009; McDougall, 2018; Rabinow, 1995). In French cities in North Africa, such as Algiers and Casablanca, the colonial administration implemented housing policies that deconstructed social structures of the “Muslim city” to monitor and manage the Algerian population better as part of the colonial project of the civilising mission (Çelik, 1992, 1997; Rabinow, 1995; Wright, 1991). In the post-independence context, colonial institutions and officers who had been given a mandate to regulate the Muslim population in French Algeria and the French metropole were rebranded as managers of the foreign immigrant population. They brought with them spatial politics, urban planning and the crafting of domesticity as a colonial governance tool (Almi, 2002; de Barros, 2005; House, 2018; Wright, 1987).

In doing so, the policies intervened in both domestic space and urban space. Colonial officers and architects built differentiated housing units for the Muslim population that were supposed to contribute to their so-called evolution into modern French city life, by building European-style housing that catered to and crafted a nuclear family. The colonial administration allocated such housing units, based on the level of the so-called evolution of the family, by measuring the behaviour of the woman. They considered the “Muslim woman” to be the key actor through which

the “Muslim home” could be controllably assimilated into French domestic life (McKay, 1994). Being attuned to colonial continuities therefore points to the necessity of considering how the crafting of domesticity has been at the centre of imperial politics and the separation between coloniser and colonised (Conklin, 1998). This focus on gendered assimilation, as having both a spatial and domestic element, sheds light on the housing policies targeting postcolonial migrants in the 1960s and 1970s.

4. Hierarchies of assimilability

Before looking at housing policies, it is helpful to look at how the administration constructed hierarchies of assimilability of migrants, which were used as a justification for the housing policies. In the period of (relative and formal) free movement, the French administration favoured European migrants over North-African migrants, motivated by concerns about assimilability packaged in technocratic arguments (Laurens, 2009; Spire, 2005; Weil, 1995). The French administration asserted that European migrants and African migrants were inherently different because the former could assimilate into the white French community, but the latter could not. This is stated throughout reports on migration. For example, the 1968 report by the Institute of Applied Research on Housing commissioned by the Ministry of Housing stated that “the Spanish and the Italians assimilate easily: their arrival is desired,” but that it was mostly “Maghrebi, especially Algerians” whose adaptation caused problems. Whereas prior to Algerian independence concerns revolved mostly around Algerians, after independence the authorities and politicians used the category of “North African” or sometimes “Maghrebins” to refer to all migrants from North-African countries, such as Tunisia and Morocco. In the postcolonial metropolitan context, taxonomies of assimilability justified racialised differentiation, loosely and inconsistently referred to nationalities or geographical regions.ⁱⁱ

The notion of the inassimilability of North Africans is rooted in French colonial racial hierarchies. Research has shown that racism in France continues to target Muslim citizens and migrants (Hajjat, 2012; Mayer, 2012, 2018). The colonial government used the ideal of assimilation to promise colonial subjects the possibility of being granted full rights as French citizens—and therefore served to uphold Republican universalism (S. Belmessous, 2005). This, however, was racially circumscribed: assimilation was a goal that could (almost) never be fully attained by colonial subjects and therefore served to exclude racialised colonial subjects and uphold the colonial order (Coquery-Vidrovitch, 2001). Moreover, research on the metropolitan context of the interwar years shows that the French administration encouraged a racialised understanding of assimilation in the regulation of immigration due to eugenic demographic concerns that favoured European migrants over colonial migrants (Barton, 2020; Camiscioli, 2009). These racialised understandings of inassimilability travelled from colony to the metropole with the arrival of colonial migrants.

The problematisation of gender and marital status played an important role in the construction of North-African migration as inassimilable. Contrary to European migration, North-African migration was understood as temporary, consisting of single male low-skilled and low-class labour migrants. Authorities regulated immigrant workers from the African continent based on their capacity as male workers. Policy documents use the category “*isolés*” (isolated), which informed policy-making, to denote single men who came from the African continent to work in France. For example, in 1963 the Minister of the Interior sent a letter to the Prime Minister in which he stated numerous times that migration from the African continent was only temporary and argued that it was therefore in no-one’s interest to facilitate permanent residence.ⁱⁱⁱ As the Algerian sociologist Sayad has argued, African male migrants were seen as having an “in-between” family status. They were neither really married, even if they had families in their home countries, nor really without a family. This placed them outside the French conception of the nuclear family (Sayad, 1980, 1997)—thereby marking them as outside the French community.

Even though authorities and policymakers understood family migration as facilitating the assimilation of so-called “men without families,” the French administration worried about the

arrival of North-African families because it would incur the risk of their long-term settlement (Cohen, 2017). In contrast, French authorities encouraged family migration in the case of European migrants, such as Italians, because they were considered to be assimilable into the French community (Cohen, 2014; Spire, 2005). This informed the French administration's position on immigration from the African continent, as illustrated by a 1966 report by the social services responsible for social action on behalf of migrants.

Migrants from European countries: Italians, Spaniards and Portuguese with a behaviour that gives them the best chance of integration into the national community [...] Migrants from North Africa and Black Africa include a relatively high number of anti-social individuals, whose adaptation seems to be excluded *a priori*. [...] This population is mainly composed of single working men. In particular, the presence of families, a stabilising element, is lacking.^{iv}

The focus on single men's temporary status enabled the authorities to negate the possibility of settlement, justified the discouragement of family migration and generally provided a justification for the view that North-African migrants were inassimilable.

The construction of North-African migration as temporary and inassimilable did not acknowledge the reality of the presence of interracialised couples and households. It is difficult to find references to the presence of interracialised households in the governmental statistics. By explicitly looking for traces of their presence in the archives, however, I was able to discover that some of the households categorised as "North-African" or "Muslim" consisted of a woman who was white French or European. The trimestral reports by the *Conseillers Techniques pour les Affaires Musulmanes (CTAM)* [Technical Advisers for Muslim Affairs] provide statistics on the number of "European wives and concubines" in the "Muslim population" between 1959 and 1964: in 1963, the CTAM counted 10,700 "European wives and concubines" and 36,000 "Muslim wives".^v In later periods, various government services compiled statistics. The Directorate of Population and Migration of the Ministry of Social Affairs counted 57,000 Algerian families in France in 1968, of which 52,000 had an Algerian national as the "head of the household". Of the "Algerian heads of households," 17,000 were married to French women. About 5,000 Algerian families had an Algerian mother with a non-Algerian head of household.^{vi} In 1975, the General Population Census counted 92,000 Algerian men in a relationship, of which 24,000 lived with a French woman. These statistics were based on nationality, meaning that partners born Algerian, but who had been naturalised as French, were not counted in the statistics on mixed couples—thereby 'invisibilising' interracialised households where both partners had French nationality. These statistics therefore indicate that between 1959 and 1975 roughly one fifth to one third of the North-African families were interracialised.

However, these households were subsumed within the North-African population in housing and social-action policies. Most of the reports and policy documents on housing and social action do not mention the presence of French or European women. Instead, they crafted North-African migration as inassimilable and problematic. Similar to the colonial context, the social-action interventions almost exclusively women to assimilate their households into French domesticity. Educational courses taught women domestic skills: how to sew, how to clean their houses, how to rear their children and how to be proper French wives. The social-action reports even reported on the type of clothing Algerian women should wear: dressing "*à la française*" was a positive marker of adaptation.^{vii} Within this logic of gendered assimilation, the social-action services did not mention the prevalence of families that consisted of a North-African husband and a wife that was born and educated in France as a measure of assimilation.^{viii} In contrast, the authorities praised the prevalence of marriage between French women and European migrants as a sign of assimilation.^{ix} This is similar to the interwar years (Barton, 2020). As I will show, the invisibility of French wives and the prevention of interracialised intimacies more generally was justified and was a consequence of the institutional differentiation of North-African migrants in the housing policies and the separation of single men from families.

5. Racialised difference: segregation and cohabitation in urban space

The specialised housing service for migrants, the *Société nationale de construction de logements pour les travailleurs algériens (SONACOTRAL)* [national society for the construction of housing for Algerian workers] (renamed the SONACOTRA after Algerian independence to encompass all workers)^x, was responsible for building housing for the migrant population. When family migration increased in the 1960s, the SONACOTRAL established special services in the various cities and departments responsible for building housing for migrant families, such as LOGIREP in Paris and LOGIREM in Marseille. These authorities were financed separately from housing institutions for the French population, namely through a percentage of the family allocations of migrant workers. The regulation of housing through specified policies meant that the administration could more closely monitor the immigrant population and their presence in the French metropole.

The authorities developed housing policies that consolidated hierarchies of assimilability, determined by logics of race, gender, class and marital status. Legislation and policies differentiated between “housing for the isolated”—‘isolated’ being the term employed by the administration — and “housing for families.”^{xi} The authorities built segregated communal housing for single men, as I will show below. At the same time, the French authorities justified specialised housing for North-African families by arguing that this was necessary for assimilation.

The administration built two types of housing that housed North-African families: *cités de transit* [transit centres] and *habitation à loyer modéré (HLM)* [social housing]. Officially, migrants were eligible for regular HLM housing and had to be considered without any distinctions being made with the French population. However, HLM bureaucrats used unofficial requirements, such as having lived in a municipality for a minimum of ten years, to exclude migrants from HLM housing (David, 2016). Consequently, most North-African families were only eligible for HLM housing in the context of so-called “slum clearance,” which in practice meant that they often had to pass through the *cités de transit*.^{xii} Especially from 1969 onwards, the administration focused on building *cités* in their efforts for urban renewal.

These specialised housing structures were based on differentiating between North-African families and French or European families, and enforced urban segregation. Formally, the transit centres were built for any family, both French and migrant, which was considered *inadaptée* [unadapted] to modern French life. Regulations governing the transit centres also stipulated this, such as in the 1972 circular on the transit centres.^{xiii} However, in practice, the administration did not wish to house French families in *cités de transit*, even though French families were also living in unsanitary housing and needed to be rehoused. A 1971 report by the Prefect of the Paris region on the “reabsorption of the *bidonvilles* and the problem of migrants” asserted that putting French families in *cités de transit* for migrants “should be prohibited and no exceptions should even be tolerated.”^{xiv} The centres functioned as a segregated space for non-white migrants rather than a centre that aimed to improve the conditions for the poor working-class. Already in 1963, research showed that the families living in the *cités de transit* were slow to integrate because of segregation. However, the failure to integrate was read as a symptom of the poor adaptability of migrant families, thereby reinforcing the understanding that they were innassimilable and should be housed separately.^{xv}

In doing so, the authorities could spatially exclude and monitor North-African families and maintain their temporary status. The *gérants* [managers] of the transit centres had the authority to monitor the families and intervene in their domestic space when this was deemed necessary. Migrant organisations and activists criticised the repressive character of the *cités de transit*, as they argued that the *gérants* of the *cités* used their uncontrolled power to behave as “the king in the *cité*” and to rule with a “reign of terror.”^{xvi} In residents’ own words, “Here we are secluded. We wonder if we are human or if we are taken for savage animals, savage animals that must be isolated from civilisation. This is a concentration camp.”^{xvii} The temporary and repressive climate of these centres allowed the authorities to control the migrant population and expel from French territory those considered

undesirable.^{xviii} The left-wing newspaper *Libération* described the *cités* as “a deliberate and planned policy of deporting and locking up these sections of the population.”^{xix} Building transitory and temporary *cités* also served the interests of the authorities because they could quickly repurpose the land on which the centres were built if they deemed it desirable to do so (Ginesy-Galano, 1984). The argument of assimilation and the separate housing it justified thus served the interests of the French state.

Even though housing policies created segregated spaces by building *cités de transit*, authorities also raised concerns about the necessity to counter segregation of North-African families in HLM housing and encourage so-called “*cohabitation*” between North-African and French and European families. They problematised “the well-known tendency of Algerians to gather in a certain number of districts which they quickly transformed into a *medina*.”^{xx} The use of the term ‘*medina*’ reveals its colonial undertone. Similar to the urban planning in the colonial context in French Algeria that enforced cohabitation through special housing policies for Algerians, administrators in the metropole during the Algerian War argued that cohabitation was a way to insert Algerian families into the French community and calm nationalist sentiments (Blanc-Chaléard, 2016). Discussion of the necessity of spatial distribution revolved around concerns about “*cohabitation*” and “*brassage*” [mixture — lit: brewing], the terms used in the policy documents, and segregation, as well as the positive and negative impact this would have on the population groups that were to cohabit or not. This continued after Algerian independence, when the practice of “capping” the number of North-African families in a given housing estate or neighbourhood became common practice.

Politicians and bureaucrats alike believed that above a certain threshold assimilation was impossible and the (white) French community would not tolerate migrants’ presence. This understanding became popularised under the notion of the *seuil de tolérance* [tolerance threshold].^{xxi} This revolved mostly around housing, but also around schools and children’s camps, and around local shops and restaurants in a given neighbourhood.^{xxii} This had an underlying capitalist interest: officials warned that buildings “and even the entire neighbourhood” depreciated in value when too many North Africans moved in.^{xxiii} HLM housing authorities set in place a semi-formal system under which they would “exchange” migrant families for European (that is, white) between housing estates, financed either by the regular social-housing services or by the LOGI group. They did this to avoid segregation and stay under the so-called tolerance threshold. In reality, however, it also led to housing estates remaining empty because housing officials refused to house North-African families (Hajjat, 2018 p. 161).

The authorities asserted that the quotas and the tolerance thresholds should not be discriminatory, but at the same time implemented discriminatory quotas through discretionary measures. The cap was never a mandatory policy across France, but more a rule of thumb used by officials. Whereas the discussions between high-ranking officials set the maximum quota at fifteen per cent, in reality only about five per cent of apartments were allocated to migrants. However, the tolerance threshold did translate into local circulars that prohibited new migrant families from living in certain neighbourhoods, where local governments considered that the threshold had been reached.^{xxiv} This latter circular mentioned explicitly that it was prohibited to implement “discriminatory measures that apply the rule only to Algerian, Moroccan and Tunisian families.” Still, throughout the policy documents and discussions it targeted these families almost exclusively. The authorities were therefore aware of its discriminatory effects, but continued to implement caps that were concerned with limiting the presence of North-African families in urban spaces under the guise of assimilation and tolerance.

6. Interracialisation in domestic space

Looking at policies then at the level of urban space together with policies targeting domestic space shows that the segregation of families in *cités de transit* and cohabitation of families in HLM housing depended on constructing the “North-African household” as a monoracialised category that could

be segregated and/or spatially distributed—and controlled. Whereas research has shown that the policies that enforced cohabitation and segregation perpetuated racialisation in the housing structures (F. Belmessous, 2013; Hajjat, 2018), this research does not take into account the presence of interracialised households. Interracialised households were present in both the *cités de transit* and HLM housing for North-African families. However, interracialised households complicated the construction of racialised difference of North-African households. Looking at the household category shows that spatial distribution not only enforced racialisation in housing policies, but was dependent on the regulation of interracialisation.

The authorities did not respond favourably to interracialised families that made themselves visible outside their identification as a North-African family. Monique Hervo described in her journal the experience of Jeanette, who was married to an Algerian man and arrived in the “*bidonville de Nanterre*” in 1957.^{xxv} In 1968, after eleven years of living in a make-shift home, Jeanette went once again to the social-housing services (HLM) to ask about her application for an HLM apartment. At the Préfecture de la Seine, the official responsible for social-housing applications responded to her demand by proclaiming that he would not help her because the HLM is “not for ‘small goats’” [pejorative, racist term for Arabs].^{xxvi} He went on to exclaim that “Negros [*sic*], and all that, is not my area.”^{xxvii} The official saw Jeanette as a North-African labourer’s wife and she was therefore subsumed under the North-African household category. She was consequently placed outside the French community to uphold the differentiation between North Africans and French households. The housing policies made Jeanette’s situation, and thus interracialised households, unthinkable and incomprehensible within the system.

The ‘invisibilisation’ of interracialised households should be understood as an investment in upholding a racialised distinction between North-African and French families, which justified segregation and top-down spatial distribution. Research carried out by the *Études Sociales Nord-Africaines (ESNA)* [North African Social Studies] into the North-African population in the Parisian suburb of Gennevilliers from 1963 shows that out of the twenty-six families living in the centres, three were categorised as “mixed.”^{xxviii} Given that between one third and one fifth of the North-African families consisted of a French white female partner, it is likely that at least some interracialised couples were also living in the *cités de transit*—even though they are not reflected in statistics or discussed in policy documents. This can be explained by the fact that North-African families were excluded because they did not fit the ideal of French domesticity. The social-action services targeted women to teach them to lead a “proper” French domestic life before they could be assimilated into the French community. The existence of interracialised households did not “fit” the framing of the *cité de transit* as a segregated space for gendered assimilation.

The existence of the *cités* was motivated by an assimilationist goal that the administration knew did not function in practice. They were built, at least on paper, to function as temporary housing for families that were considered “not [to] have the necessary degree of evolution” to live in a modern apartment, coming, as they did, from the reabsorbed informal housing settlements.^{xxix} In the *cité de transit*, the administration believed strict discipline was necessary to “initiate families to modern life”^{xxx} and allow the transit to HLM housing. Maladaptation was not the only reason to house Algerian families in *cités de transit*: families from the informal housing settlement were frequently put into the centres because there was simply not enough HLM housing available (Cohen, 2013). Most of the *cités* were managed by the SONACOTRA(L) or *Centres de transit familiaux (CETRAFA)* [transit centers for families], organisations that stemmed from the colonial period. Because of the lack of other housing options and HLM availability, North-African families were housed in these centres for an average of eight years, even though they were supposed to be transitory and *éducatif* [educational] (Zehraoui, 1976). By putting families in *cités de transit*, sometimes for long periods of time, the French administration marked their racialised difference, precariousness and inassimilability, while at the same time arguing that these practices were necessary for assimilation. The presence of French wives thus upset this racialised difference that allowed the French administration to regulate North Africans through colonial modalities of governance.

The social workers and HLM bureaucrats determined who was considered sufficiently adapted to live in HLM housing, whereby they measured “adaptability” by looking at the behaviour of the wife.^{xxxi} There were no actual clear criteria on the basis of which these measurements were made.

Rather, the measurement of *adaptation* was considered to be self-explanatory, based upon colonial knowledge of the Muslim population. In the process of measuring so-called adaptability, authorities argued that interracialised households were more “adaptable” to the French lifestyle, compared to monoracialised North-African families. For example, the Préfet de la Seine-Maritime wrote in 1960 that the housing authorities regarded European wives more favourably with regard to their ability to adapt to “Western life” and manage a household than Muslim women.^{xxxii} Accordingly, of all 205 families categorised as “North African”, 30.7 per cent of “mixed families” in Le Havre lived in HLM, and only eighteen per cent of ‘Muslim’ families lived in HLM. Moreover, the ESNA shows in their research since 1963 that seventeen North-African families lived in HLM housing, of which seven were “mixed.”^{xxxiii} The sample of HLM housing provided in David’s research on the communist working-class city of Saint-Denis showed that four out of nine families categorised as “Algerian” were actually interracialised (David, 2016). This shows a consistent overrepresentation of “mixed” couples HLM housing for North African families, in comparison to *cités de transit*.

The authorities did not consider the presence of white women as an indication that the strict hierarchisation of assimilability was not tenable. The state officials do not recognise the irony of the fact that they were measuring European (frequently French) assimilation into “western life,” because these women were subsumed within the North-African population. By measuring “adaptability,” the authorities could include interracialised couples in the racialised hierarchy of assimilability without complicating the separation between white and non-white families.

The categories on which the housing policies for families were based classified the household as a pre-existing uniform patriarchal racialised category, consisting of a male head of household and a dependent wife and children. By subsuming interracialised families within the racialised migrant population and not acknowledging the presence of white women or the possibility of an interracialised household, the “family” remained a racialised monolithic category. In doing so, the authorities did not acknowledge interracialised families as salient to their understanding of assimilation, the tolerance thresholds, the cohabitation policies, or the segregationist measures. The negation of interracialised households allowed the administration to either segregate or enforce cohabitation policies for these racialised households categories that ostensibly promoted assimilation.

7. Preventing interracialised intimacies

Where family housing perpetuated racial boundaries in urban and domestic space by not acknowledging interracialised households, the housing for single men perpetuated racial boundaries in the intimate sphere by isolating North-African men so that they could not form relationships with the French population and specifically with white women. Hierarchies of gendered assimilability justified exclusion of North-African migrants from the French community. They continuously necessitated the reinforcement of racial boundaries within the intimate sphere. In doing so, the administration also prevented interracialised intimacies from forming in the first place.

The administration mandated the SONACOTRAL with building and managing hotel-type collective housing known as *foyers* for single North-African men. *Foyers* were an unspecified legal category and were meant to offer sanitary housing in a cost-efficient and regulated manner that would break down the “tribalism” that reigned, according to officials, in informal housing. The *foyer* was a collective housing structure, but at the same time it individualised and isolated its residents to a considerable degree because community ties between the residents were made difficult by surveillance and the lack of a feeling of ownership of the spaces (Sayad 1980). Residents had no tenants’ rights and hence were stuck in an transitory space: they had a bed, not a home, thereby producing temporariness and precarity (Hmed, 2006).

The administration did not wish to build other types of housing for African male migrants. *Foyer* housing was not exclusive for North-African migrants. Still, other groups that were housed in *foyers*,

such as students and young workers, did have other housing options, and only lived in a *foyer* for a specific period of their life (e.g. during their studies). African migrants only had the private-housing market as an alternative option—often either inaccessible to migrant workers or of poor quality.^{xxxiv} In contrast, in relation to European migrants the administration did not make an absolute distinction with regard to housing between families and single men. A letter from the Préfet de la Seine to the Minister of the Interior of 1963 sets out the “problem” of housing for workers from “African states.”^{xxxv} The Préfet argued that both West-African and North-African workers needed to be housed separately from families. He acknowledged that Spanish and Portuguese migrants also have housing problems. However, without explaining why, he argued that regular housing had to be constructed for these groups rather than *foyers*. By making the *foyer* the only type of housing available (besides informal dilapidated housing), single North-African migrants did not have access to domestic space. In doing so, the French administration could keep single men outside of the French community, both spatially and intimately.

The administration justified the necessity to house migrant men separately with reference to concerns for their inassimilability. Mixing housing for single Algerian men with housing for Algerian families was considered in the 1960s, thus before Algerian independence, but was never actually realised. When in 1960 the Prefect of the department in the Alps wished to mix Algerian families and single men in one housing facility, the Head of Social Affairs of the Algerian Affairs Department answered resolutely: “I am very opposed to this project,” without providing any further justification. In 1961, the social-action fund turned down a plan to build a residence with both single men and families.

After deliberation, we have not been able to approve this project because we do not consider it desirable from a social and familial point of view to group families and single men together in one building. Such a formula does not seem to benefit the evolution of the Muslim family.^{xxxvi}

The officials did not explain this undesirability further. Rather, it was considered self-evident that single men were corrupting influences on the promotion of the assimilation of families. Single (North) African men could never attain assimilation because they were deemed incapable of being integrated into French domestic life. The separation of North-African men from families also enabled the French authorities to regulate interracialisation.

The housing policies for North-African men were based on the construction of a threat posed by North-African men. Heyman argues that collective distrust of categories of people focuses the attention of the state: they become hypervisible as “risks” (Heyman, 2009). Racialisation plays a role in collective distrust by state institutions and officials, which in turn leads to further marginalisation and exclusion (Doyle, 2007; Heyman, 2009). For North-African men, institutional distrust was structured by sexualised fears of interracialised encounters. Consideration to the spatial regulation of the *foyers* in combination with the internal regulations shows that housing for single men discouraged any intermingling with the white French population, specifically with white French women.

The authorities used segregationist policies to keep North-African single men spatially distant from the white French population. Mayors refused to build *foyers* in their municipalities, invoking the danger that single North-African men (supposedly) posed a threat to (white) women and young girls. Massenet, the head of the Social-Action Fund and a member of the board of the SONACOTRA, proposed in a speech that spatial dispersion of North-African men was necessary because “women and young girls dare not leave the house because they fear they will be attacked and raped” (Shepard, 2018, p. 233). Moreover, residents of neighbourhoods protested against the building of *foyers* because they feared they would pose a threat to public order.^{xxxvii} However, the social-action service for migrants reported in 1971 that no instances of threats against women had occurred.^{xxxviii} This indicates that sexual anxieties were based on collective distrust rather than on actual instances of sexual violence.

Research has argued that the logic of surveillance explicitly underlined the building and working of *foyers* (Bernardot, 2008; Hmed, 2006). As these men were seen as uprooted and potentially

dangerous, strict internal rules applied in the *foyers*. The SONACOTRA(L) recruited *gérants* [managers/concierges], who were responsible for the inner workings of the *foyer*, mainly from amongst the colonial officers who previously served in Algeria.^{xxxix} Thus the officers who had enforced colonial rule now enforced the rules in the *foyers*. The organisation was directed by Jean Vaujour, who had been the architect behind the forced displacement of rural communities in Algeria. In describing the institution's mandate, Vaujour explicitly referred to the housing projects in colonial Algeria and vowed to make the *foyers* places for "moral and sanitary progress" (Bernardot, 2008, p. 48). In 1965, the *Préfet* of the Ain region justified building a new *foyer* by arguing that "it would also be suitable for achieving better police surveillance of the hostel itself and its surroundings, surveillance to which its current location does not lend itself well."^{xl} Sources that give the perspective of migrant men show that they were aware and attempted to defy such surveillance: for example, single men who were expelled from the informal shantytowns did not wish to be rehoused in *foyers* because of the widespread police surveillance.^{xli} The housing structures enabled police surveillance that was integral to the control of migrant workers.^{xlii}

Based on the desire to impose surveillance on the residents, the SONACOTRA(L) strictly controlled the possibilities for intimacy through communal living and internal rules that prohibited outside visitors. As illustrated by the right-leaning newspaper *Le Figaro*, the *foyers* ensured that the residents were controlled like children in a boarding school: "No visits in the *foyer*. Those are the rules! Even though they are past the age of boarding school."^{xliii} This affected the possibilities for residents to engage in intimate relationships. Moreover, research carried out in 1960 amongst Algerian workers shows that half of the respondents wanted a single room. One of the reasons given is the desire to have one or more romantic and/or sexual partners.^{xliv} This illustrates that through the structure and internal regulations, the administration could regulate the opportunities of the *foyer* residents to have a private life and ultimately a domestic life. Analysing the prohibition on visits together with the sexual anxieties that motivated segregation shows that this prohibition was partly aimed at the prevention of interracialised intimacies.

The right to visits was an issue central to the internal management of the *foyers*. The former "Director of Research and Programming" of the SONACOTRA stated in an interview that "this was the big issue at the time: visits, especially female visits" (Bernardot, 2008, p. 126). Female visits were considered a self-evident problem, as illustrated in the research on migrant housing carried out by the *Service de liaison et de promotion des migrants (SLPM)* [Service for the liaison and the promotion of migrants] from 1971.

There is another problem that is continuously relevant. It is demanded by the residents, and even more by those who wish to be their spokespeople, or even their defenders, in relations with the outside world, which is the problem of the right to visits and its limitations. [...] We understand that some, or even many, wish the right to receive visitors to be extended to women [lit. female sex] and to be exercised within the rooms. [...] But *evidently* the problem of meetings with women remains [emphasis by author].^{xlv}

The problematisation of female visits shows that the authorities worried about intimate heterosexual relations. However, they did not explain why it would be a problem to have "meetings with women," considering that the desire to prevent intimacies in the *foyers* was self-evident. The women these men were susceptible to meeting were mostly white women, given that North-African women living in the metropole at the time mostly arrived through family reunification (Cohen, 2020). The prohibition on female visitors thus affected, in particular, the opportunities for interracialised intimacies.

The desire of the authorities to ensure that single men would not have intimate relations with women revolved, amongst others things, around anxieties about sexual relations between men and (white) French women. These were based on the reactivation of old colonial stereotypes of Muslim men as unsociable sexually violent men (André, 2016; Brun & Shepard, 2016; Ruscio, 2016). In the colonies, interracialised intimacies had the potential to upset the colonial hierarchies (Stoler, 1989). Stereotypes of sexual threat, and deviant sexual and gender norms still today structure anti-Muslim stereotypes and have only slightly decreased in the last thirty years (Yuma, Mayer, Michelat, Tiberj, & Vitale, 2020). The authorities were not only concerned about intimate relationships, but also

about interracialised intimacies. These intimacies did not fit the paradigm of assimilation that excluded North-African men and problematised North-African families. The *foyer* housing enabled the authorities to prevent interracialised intimacies in order to reinforce and justify racial boundaries. Collective distrust justified surveillance and segregation, which reinforced the marginalisation of North-African families.

8. Conclusion

I have argued that the French administration employed colonial practices to regulate the presence of migrants from North Africa in Metropolitan France through housing policies that brought together the regulation of urban space and domestic space. By tracing fragmented information in the government archive and informed by feminist research on the regulation of intimacy and domesticity, I was able to retrieve the ‘invisibilised’ presence of interracialised households. Focusing on the presence of interracialised households and the regulation of interracialised intimacies in the analysis of housing policies, I have shown that the housing policies did not acknowledge interracialised households and prevented interracialised intimacies.

The housing policies reinforced hierarchies of assimilability that justified racialised difference. I have found that the administration did not acknowledge that interracialised households transgressed the categories on which cohabitation and segregation policies in the urban space were based. Moreover, I have argued that housing policies enabled the authorities to segregate single migrants and to intervene in their intimate lives. The separated housing of single men and the structure of *foyer* housing created a housing situation that made it difficult for North-African men to construct intimate relationships, which worked to prevent interracialised intimacies. This shows that authorities constructed monoracialised household categories, in which they did not allow for (opportunities for) interracialised households and, by doing so, reinforced racialised hierarchies of assimilability.

Official discussions about the housing policies revolved around assimilation, “evolution”, “adaptation” and tolerance. By examining how authorities regulated and intervened in the intimate sphere and the domestic space to order urban space through housing policies, I have contributed to a fuller understanding of the exclusionary outcomes of the housing policies that targeted North-African migrants. In the name of gendered assimilation, authorities problematised and racialised the intimate sphere. In doing so, they perpetuated racial boundaries that excluded African migrants.

The insights in this paper point to the necessity of analysing spatial regulation and the regulation of domestic space in combination with each other to understand more fully the production and perpetuation of racial boundaries in migrant housing policies. This shows that housing policies are racial projects at two levels: at the domestic level and at the urban level. This paper contributes to research on migration and housing by showing that racial boundaries are based on the racialisation of domestic space. This points to the necessity to examine the regulation of intimacy and domesticity in research on housing and spatial integration of migrants.

9. Cited archives

AN = Archives Nationales
 ASD = Archives Municipales Saint-Denis
 MH = Archives Monique Hervo

AN
 19760133 14 Secrétariat du directeur (direction de la population et des migrations) (1966-1980)

19770317	1	Chargé de mission (direction des personnels, des affaires politiques et de l'administration territoriale, ministère de l'Intérieur)
19770346	10	Secrétariat (sous-direction des affaires politiques et de la vie associative, ministère de l'Intérieur)
19770391	6	Direction de la population et des migrations (1966-1980)
19771141	17	France. Direction de la Construction (1944-1998)
19860269	11	Direction de la population et des migrations (1966-1980)
19950493	5	Direction de la population et des migrations (1966-1980)
19960134	3	Bureau des étrangers relevant des régimes spéciaux (direction des libertés publiques et des affaires juridiques, ministère de l'Intérieur)
ASD 37AC	17	Municipalité de Saint-Denis
MH ARC 3019	2	Monique Hervo, Demandes de logements, Attributions, Enquêtes, Notes de Monique Hervo
	4	Monique Hervo, « Carnet de bord », 1959-1971
	5	Monique Hervo, Nanterre. Dossiers des familles
	6	Monique Hervo, Nanterre. Dossiers des familles
	7	Monique Hervo, Nanterre. Dossiers des familles
	11	Monique Hervo, Cités de transit en France

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the European Research Council, as part of the project 'Regulating Mixed Intimacies in Europe (EUROMIX)' [grant number 725238]. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers and editor, whose valuable and constructive feedback have been of great help. I would like to thank the Senior Editorial Fellows: Dr. Saskia Bonjour, Dr. Evelyn Ersanilli, and, in particular, Dr Darshan Vigneswaran for their feedback and for organising the migration politics writing residency. I am thankful to the migration politics fellows and all commentators who provided such valuable feedback, in particular, Dr. Stephan Scheel, Dr. Anja Karlsson Franck, Prof. Loren Landau, and Dr Wouter van Gent. I am also grateful to Dr. Nora El Qadim for her attentive and helpful eye as Editor-in-charge.

References

- Almi, S. (2002), *Urbanisme et colonisation: présence française en Algérie*, Editions Mardaga, Bruxelles.
- André, M. (2016), *Le sexe comme champ de bataille. Algériennes et Algériens en métropole durant la guerre d'indépendance*, In C. Brun & T. Shepard (Eds.), *Guerre d'Algérie: le sexe outragé*, CNRS éditions, Paris.
- Arondekar, A. (2005), *Without a Trace: Sexuality and the Colonial Archive*, *Journal of the History of Sexuality* **14**, 10, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3704707>.
- Barton, N. (2020), *Reproductive Citizens*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Beaman, J., & Petts, A. (2020), *Towards a global theory of colorblindness: Comparing colorblind racial ideology in France and the United States*, *Sociology Compass* **14**, e12774, doi:[10.1111/soc4.12774](https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12774).

- Belmessous, F. (2013), *Du « seuil de tolérance » à la « mixité sociale » : répartition et mise à l'écart des immigrés dans l'agglomération lyonnaise (1970-2000)*, *Belgeo* 3, 2013 doi:[10.4000/belgeo.11540](https://doi.org/10.4000/belgeo.11540).
- Belmessous, S. (2005), *Assimilation and Racialism in Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century French Colonial Policy*, *The American Historical Review* 110, 322, doi:[10.1086/ahr/110.2.322](https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr/110.2.322).
- Bernardot, M. (2008), *Loger les immigrés: La Sonacotra 1956-2006*, Éditions du Croquant, Viraines-sur-Seine.
- Blanc-Chaléard, M.-C. (2016), *En finir avec les bidonvilles. Immigration et politique du logement dans la France des Trente Glorieuses*, Editions de la Sorbonne, Paris.
- Blévis, L. (2004), *Sociologie d'un droit colonial: citoyenneté et nationalité en Algérie (1865-1947): une exception républicaine?*, PhD thesis, Aix-Marseille 3.
- Boisseuil, C. (2019), *Governing ambiguity and implementing cross-sectoral programmes: urban regeneration for social mix in Paris*, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 34, 425, doi:[10.1007/s10901-019-09644-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-019-09644-4)
- Bolt, G., Özüekren, A. S. and Phillips, D. (2010), *Linking Integration and Residential Segregation*, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36, 169, doi:[10.1080/13691830903387238](https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830903387238).
- Brun, C., and Shepard, T. (2016), *Guerre d'Algérie: Le sexe outragé*, CNRS Editions, Paris.
- Burton, A. (2006), *Introduction: Archive fever, archive stories*, In *Archive Stories*, pp. 1-24, Duke University Press, Durham.
- Camiscioli, E. (2009), *Reproducing the French race: Immigration, intimacy, and embodiment in the early twentieth century*, Duke University Press, Durham.
- Célestine, A. (2011), *French Caribbean organizations and the 'Black question' in France*, *African and Black Diaspora: An International Journal* 4, 131, doi:[10.1080/17528631.2011.583451](https://doi.org/10.1080/17528631.2011.583451).
- Çelik, Z. (1992), *Le Corbusier, Orientalism, Colonialism*, *Assemblage* 17, 59, doi:[10.2307/3171225](https://doi.org/10.2307/3171225).
- Çelik, Z. (1997), *Urban forms and colonial confrontation: Algiers under French rule*, University of California Press, Oakland.
- Cohen, M. (2013), *Des familles invisibles: Politiques publiques et trajectoires résidentielles de l'immigration algérienne (1945-1985)*, PhD thesis, Université Paris 1 – Panthéon Sorbonne.
- Cohen, M. (2014), *Contradictions et exclusions dans la politique de regroupement familial en France (1945-1984)*, *Annales de démographie historique* 2, 187, doi:[10.3917/adh.128.0187](https://doi.org/10.3917/adh.128.0187).
- Cohen, M. (2017), *L'immigration algérienne post-indépendance : l'enracinement à l'épreuve de l'exclusion*, *Le Mouvement Social* 1, 29, doi:[10.3917/lms.258.0029](https://doi.org/10.3917/lms.258.0029).
- Cohen, M. (2020), *Des familles invisibles: les Algériens de France entre intégrations et discriminations (1945-1985)*, Éditions de la Sorbonne, Paris.
- Conklin, A. L. (1998), *Redefining "Frenchness": Citizenship, Race Regeneration, and Imperial Motherhood in France and West Africa, 1914-40*, In J. Clancy-Smith & F. Gouda (Eds.) *Domesticating the Empire: Race, Gender, and Family Life in French and Dutch Colonialism*, pp. 65-83, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

- Coquery-Vidrovitch, C. (2001), *Nationalité et citoyenneté en Afrique occidentale française: Originaires et citoyens dans le Sénégal colonial*, Journal of African history **42**, 285, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3647263>.
- David, C. d. (2016), *Logement social des immigrants et politique municipale en banlieue ouvrière (Saint-Denis, 1944-1995): histoire d'une improbable citoyenneté urbaine*, PhD thesis, Paris 10.
- de Barros, F. (2003), *Les municipalités face aux algériens : méconnaissances et usages des catégories coloniales en métropole avant et après la Seconde Guerre mondiale*, Geneses, **4**, 69, doi:[10.3917/gen.053.0069](https://doi.org/10.3917/gen.053.0069).
- de Barros, F. (2005), *Des « français musulmans d'algérie » aux « immigrés » L'importation de classifications coloniales dans les politiques du logement en France (1950 – 1970)*, Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales **4**, 26, doi:[10.3917/arss.159.0026](https://doi.org/10.3917/arss.159.0026).
- de Barros, F. (2006), *Contours d'un réseau administratif « algérien » et construction d'une compétence en « affaires musulmanes » Les conseillers techniques pour les affaires musulmanes en métropole (1952-1965)*, Politix **4**, 97, doi:[10.3917/pox.076.0097](https://doi.org/10.3917/pox.076.0097).
- Dikeç, M. (2011), *Badlands of the republic: Space, politics and urban policy*, Vol. 78, John Wiley & Sons.
- Doyle, A. (2007), *Trust, citizenship and exclusion in the risk society*, In Law Commission of Canada, Risk and Trust: Including or Excluding Citizens (Eds.) pp. 7-22, Fernwood, Black Point.
- Epstein, B. S. (2011), *Collective terms: race, culture, and community in a state-planned city in France*, Vol. 10, Berghahn Books, New York.
- Epstein, R., and Kirszbaum, T. (2003), *L'enjeu de la mixité sociale dans les politiques urbaines*, Regards sur l'actualité **292**, 63.
- Fassin, D., and Fassin, E. (2013), *De la question sociale à la question raciale?: représenter la société française*, La découverte, Paris.
- Ginesy-Galano, M. (1984), *Les immigrés hors la cité: le système d'encadrement dans les foyers (1973-1982)*, Vol. 1, Editions l'Harmattan, Paris.
- Gordon, R. (1984), *Critical Legal Histories*, Stanford Law Review **36**, 57, doi:[10.2307/1228681](https://doi.org/10.2307/1228681).
- Grommé, F., and Scheel, S. (2020), *Doing statistics, enacting the nation: The performative powers of categories*, Nations and nationalism **26**, 576, doi:[10.1111/nana.12596](https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12596).
- Hajjat, A. (2012), *Les frontières de l'" identité nationale": l'injonction à l'assimilation en France métropolitaine et coloniale*, La Découverte, Paris.
- Hajjat, A. (2018), *Colonial Legacies: Housing Policy and Riot Prevention Strategies in the Minguettes District of Vénissieux*, In E. Naylor (Eds.), France's Modernising Mission, pp. 225-250, Springer, London.
- Haritaworn, J. (2007), *Beautiful beasts. Ambivalence and distinction in the gender identity negotiations of multiracialized women of Thai descent*, Women's Studies International Forum **30**, 391, doi:[10.1016/j.wsif.2007.07.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2007.07.003).
- Heyman, J. M. (2009), *Trust, privilege, and discretion in the governance of the US borderlands with Mexico*, Canadian Journal of Law and Society, **24**, 367, doi:[10.1017/S0829320100010085](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0829320100010085).
- Hmed, C. (2006), *Tenir ses hommes*, Politix **76**, 11, doi:[10.3917/pox.076.0011](https://doi.org/10.3917/pox.076.0011).

- House, J. (2004), *Contrôle, encadrement, surveillance et répression des migrations coloniales: une décolonisation difficile (1956-1970)*, Bulletin de l'IHTP **80**, 144.
- House, J. (2018), *Shantytowns and Rehousing in Late Colonial Algiers and Casablanca*, in E. Naylor (Eds.) *France's Modernising Mission*, pp. 133-163, Springer, London.
- House, J., and Thompson, A. S. (2016), *Decolonization, space and power: Immigration, welfare and housing in Britain and France, 1945-1974*, in A. S. Thompson (Eds.) *Writing imperial histories*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Ifekwunigwe, J. O. (2004), *'Mixed race' studies: a reader*, Psychology Press.
- Jobard, F. (2020), *Policing the banlieues*, In *Policing in France*, pp. 187-201, Routledge, Oxfordshire.
- King, D., Le Galès, P., and Vitale, T. (2017), *Assimilation, security, and borders in the member States*, In D. King and P. de Gales (Eds.) *Reconfiguring European States in Crisis*, pp. 428-450, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Laurens, S. (2009), *Une politisation feutrée, les hauts fonctionnaires et l'immigration en France*, Belin, doi:[10.4000/lectures.906](https://doi.org/10.4000/lectures.906).
- Lefevre, C., Roseau, N., and Vitale, T. (2013), *Introduction. Les défis de la gouvernance métropolitaine*. In T. Vitale, C. Lefevre and N. Roseau, *De la Ville à la Métropole. Les défis de la gouvernance*, pp. 21-34, L'Œil d'or, ISBN:9782913661592.
- Lyons, A. H. (2006), *Des bidonvilles aux HLM: Le logement des familles algériennes en France avant l'indépendance de l'Algérie*, *Hommes & migrations* (1987) **1264**, 35.
- Lyons, A. H. (2009), *Social welfare, French Muslims and decolonization in France: The case of the Fonds d'action sociale*, *Patterns of Prejudice* **43**, 65, doi:[10.1080/00313220802636072](https://doi.org/10.1080/00313220802636072).
- Lyons, A. H. (2013), *The civilizing mission in the metropole: Algerian families and the French welfare state during decolonization*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- MacMaster, N. (1997), *Colonial migrants and racism: Algerians in France, 1900-62*, Springer.
- Mayer, N. (2012), *"Islamophobia" in France: old prejudice in new clothes?*, In *Methods, Theories, and Empirical Applications in the Social Sciences*, pp. 137-143, Springer, Wiesbaden.
- Mayer, N. (2018), *Les préjugés racistes en 2017: état des lieux*, *Hommes et libertés* **182**, 20.
- McClintock, A. (2013), *Imperial leather: Race, gender, and sexuality in the colonial contest*, Routledge.
- McDougall, J. (2018), *Rule of Experts? Governing Modernisation in Late Colonial French Africa*, In E. Naylor (Eds.) *France's Modernising Mission*, pp. 87-108, Springer, London.
- McKay, F. S. (1994), *Le Corbusier, negotiating modernity: representing Algiers, 1930-42*, PhD thesis, University of British Columbia.
- Musterd, S. (2003), *Segregation and integration: A contested relationship*, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* **29**, 623, doi:[10.1080/1369183032000123422](https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183032000123422).
- Naylor, E. (2013), *'Un âne dans l'ascenseur': late colonial welfare services and social housing in Marseille after decolonization*, *French History* **27**, 422, doi:[10.1093/fh/crt052](https://doi.org/10.1093/fh/crt052).
- Omi, M., and Winant, H. (2014), *Racial formation in the United States*, 3rd ed., Routledge, New York.

- Onwuachi-Willig, A. (2013), *According to our hearts: Rhinelander v. Rhinelander and the law of the multiracial family*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Onwuachi-Willig, A., and Willig-Onwuachi, J. (2009), *A house divided: The invisibility of the multiracial family*, Harvard Civil Rights- Civil Liberties Law Review 44, 231.
- Povinelli, E. A. (2006), *The empire of love: Toward a theory of intimacy, genealogy, and carnality*, Duke University Press, Durham.
- Rabinow, P. (1995), *French modern: Norms and forms of the social environment*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Rigouste, M. (2014), *L'ennemi intérieur: la généalogie coloniale et militaire de l'ordre sécuritaire dans la France contemporaine*, La découverte, Paris.
- Ross, K. (1996), *Fast cars, clean bodies: Decolonization and the reordering of French culture*: MIT press.
- Ruscio, A. (2016), *Mohamed ben Mohamed, "l'assassin probable" de Hayange: fait divers sordide et suspicion systématique*, In C. Brun & T. Shepard (Eds.), *Guerre d'Algérie: le sexe outragé*, CNRS éditions, Paris.
- Sayad, A. (1980), *Le foyer des sans-famille*, Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales 32, 89, doi:[10.3406/arss.1980.2082](https://doi.org/10.3406/arss.1980.2082).
- Sayad, A. (1997), *La double absence: des illusions de l'émigré aux souffrances de l'immigré*, Seuil, Paris.
- Schinkel, W. (2013), *The imagination of 'society' in measurements of immigrant integration*, Ethnic and Racial Studies 36, 1142, doi:[10.1080/01419870.2013.783709](https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.783709).
- Schinkel, W. (2017), *Imagined societies: A critique of immigrant integration in Western Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schinkel, W. (2018), *Against 'immigrant integration': for an end to neocolonial knowledge production*, Comparative Migration Studies 6, 31, doi:[10.1186/s40878-018-0095-1](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0095-1).
- Schrover, M., and Schinkel, W. (2013), *Introduction: the language of inclusion and exclusion in the context of immigration and integration*, Ethnic and Racial Studies 36, 1123, doi:[10.1080/01419870.2013.783711](https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.783711).
- Shepard, T. (2018), *Sex, France, and Arab Men, 1962-1979*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Spire, A. (2005), *Étrangers à la carte*, Grasset, Paris.
- Stoler, A. L. (1989), *Making empire respectable: the politics of race and sexual morality in 20th-century colonial cultures*, American ethnologist 16, 634, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/645114>.
- Stoler, A. L. (2002), *Colonial archives and the arts of governance: on the content in the form*, In C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Tayloer, M. Pickover, G. Reid and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, pp. 83-102, Springer, Dordrecht.
- Stoler, A. L. (2009), *Along the archival grain: epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Stoler, A. L. (2010), *Carnal knowledge and imperial power: Race and the intimate in colonial rule*, University of California Press, Oakland.

- Stoler, A. L. (2011), *Colonial Aphasia: Race and Disabled Histories in France*, *Public Culture* **23**, 121, doi:[10.1215/08992363-2010-018](https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2010-018).
- Stovall, T., and Van den Abbeele, G. (2003), *French civilization and its discontents: nationalism, colonialism, race*, Vol. 109, Lexington Books, Washington.
- Thompson, V. E. (2016), *Black Jacobins in contemporary France: On identities on politics, decolonial critique, and the other blackness*, *Sociological Focus* **49**, 44, doi:[10.1080/00380237.2015.1067853](https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2015.1067853).
- van Beckhoven, E., Bolt, G. and van Kempen, R. (2009), *Theories of Neighbourhood Change and Decline: Their Significance for Post-WWII Large Housing Estates in European Cities*, In R. Rowlands, S. Musterd, and R. van Kempen (Eds.), *Mass Housing in Europe: Multiple Faces of Development, Change and Response*, pp. 20-50, Palgrave Macmillan UK, London.
- Weil, P. (1995), *La France et ses étrangers: l'aventure d'une politique de l'immigration de 1938 à nos jours*, Vol. 44, Editions Gallimard, Paris.
- Whatley, P. and Brown, C. (2009), *Along and against the grain: the philosophy of the archive*, *Archival science* **9**, 127, doi:[10.1007/s10502-009-9108-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-009-9108-z).
- Wright, G. (1987), *Tradition in the service of modernity: architecture and urbanism in French colonial policy, 1900-1930*, *The Journal of Modern History* **59**, 291, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1879728>.
- Wright, G. (1991), *The politics of design in French colonial urbanism*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Yuma, A., Mayer, N., Michelat, G., Tiberj, V., and Vitale, T. (2020), *Mise en perspective de trente ans d'évolution par les chercheurs*, In I. H. Commission Nationale Consultative des Droits de (Ed.), *La lutte contre le racisme, l'antisémitisme et la xénophobie. Année 2020*, pp. 33-111, La Documentation française, Paris.
- Zehraoui, A. (1976), *Les travailleurs algériens en France: étude sociologique de quelques aspects de la vie familiale*, FeniXX, Paris.

Endnotes

i Whereas the archives I analyse use 'mixed households/families,' I use 'interracialised households' to underline the action required to make racialised identity salient, rather than it being a pre-existing reality that 'mixes'.

ii For a discussion on French colonial humanism and the ways in which cultural racism played an integral role in French colonialism, see Wilder, G. (2005). *The French Imperial Nation-State: Negritude and Colonial Humanism between the Two World Wars*. University of Chicago Press.

iii *Ministre de l'Intérieur à Monsieur le Premier Ministre, action sociale en faveurs des travailleurs africains établis en France,* 18 June 1963, in Archives Nationales 19770346/10.

iv *Synthèse de rapports des chargés de mission du service de liaison et de promotion des migrants, Ministère de l'Intérieur,* 1966, in Archives Nationales 19770346/10. All translations from French have been made by the author.

v *Synthèse des rapports trimestriels établis par les conseillers techniques pour les affaires musulmanes, Ministère de l'Intérieur. Service des affaires musulmanes et de l'action sociale,* 1959-1965, confidential, in Archives Nationales 19760133/14.

vi *Rapport sur l'immigration familiale, direction de population et de migration, Ministère de l'Intérieur, 1968, in Archives Nationales 19950493/5.*

vii *Rapports Trimestriels du Conseillers techniques pour les affaires musulmane, établis par les conseillers techniques pour les affaires musulmanes, Ministère de l'Intérieur, 1958-1963, confidential, in Archives Nationales 19760133/14.*

viii *Rapport Corréard de la CETRAFA SLPM, octobre 1965, Les cités de transit pour familles. Sent to the F.A.S. on 5 October 1965, in Archives Nationales 19770391/6. This report was compiled by the former CTAM officer Jean Corréard.*

ix For example, one of the reasons/examples given for of the assimilability of European migrants is the high prevalence of mixed marriages between Italians or Polish and French people. *Synthèse des rapports trimestriels établis par les conseillers techniques pour les affaires musulmanes, Ministère de l'Intérieur. Service des affaires musulmanes et de l'action sociale, July 1967, confidential, in Archives Nationales 19770346/10.*

x The SONACOTRAL before Algerian independence was mandated with the housing for Algerian migrants. It was renamed the SONACOTRA after 1962, because it became mandated with housing workers in general. The organisation primarily housed migrant workers.

xi For example, the circular of 5 October 1972 (on the “preparation for the resorption of unsanitary housing and for the housing of immigrants) differentiates between “the *foyers* for isolated workers” and “family housing”.

xii Referred to in French as the “*résorption des bidonvilles*”.

xiii Circular of 19 April 1972 “*relative aux cités de transit*” stipulates “obviously the *cités de transit* are likely to receive foreign families as well as families of French origin”.

xiv *Rapport à Monsieur le Préfet de la Region Parisienne sur la Résorption des bidonvilles et les problèmes des migrants, 1971, in Archives Nationales 19770317/1.*

xv *ESNA recherches les Africains du nord à Genevilliers 1963, in Archives Municipales Saint-Denis ASD-37AC17.*

xvi *Asti, info sur les cités de transit, 1974, Info sur les cités de transit, personal documents of Monique Hervo (undated), in private archives of Monique Hervo ARC-3019-11.*

xvii Personal documents “*la cité de transit solution pratique pour le relogement des travailleurs immigrés*” by Monique Hervo, (undated) likely 1974, in private archives of Monique Hervo ARC-3019-11.

xviii In Liscia, C., *l'enferment des cités de transit*, edited by the migrant organisation La Cimade, 1977, in the private archives of Monique Hervo, ARC3019/11. This booklet explains how the *gérants* of the centres kept a close eye on the residents and in cooperation with the police, deported undesired migrants to Algeria, including children who had never been to Algeria.

xix *Liberation*, 11 June 1974, *Claude Liscia et Gérard Melchior*. In Blanc-Chaléard 2016, p. 357.

xx *Lettre du Préfet de la region Rhône-Alpes, Préfet du Rhône à Monsieur le Premier Ministre, Le Ministre de l'Intérieur, le Ministre du Travail, de l'Emploi et de la Population, 5 January 1972, in Archives Nationales 19860269/11.*

xxi *Lettre du Préfet de la region Rhône-Alpes, Préfet du Rhône à Monsieur le Premier Ministre, Le Ministre de l'Intérieur, le Ministre du Travail, de l'Emploi et de la Population, 5 January 1972, in Archives Nationales 19860269/11.*

xxii *Ibid.*

xxiii *Synthèse de rapport des chargés de mission du service de liaison et de promotion des migrants, SPLM*, July 1967, in Archives Nationales 19770346/10.

xxiv Circular 15 June 1970, "*Limitation de l'admission des familles étrangères.*"

xxv Monique Hervo kept notes on all the families that passed through the bidonville. She has recorded 10 'mixed couples' in the *bidonville* of Nanterre, out of (about) 210 couples/families. In private archives of Monique Hervo, 1968, ARC/3019/4. I have changed the names to comply with privacy requirements of the archives.

xxvi *Ibid.*

xxvii *Ibid.*

xxviii *Etudes Sociales Nord Africaines, recherches des Africains du nord à Genevilliers* 1963, in Archives Municipale Saint-Denis 37AC17.

xxix *Rapport Corréard de la CETRAFA SLPM, octobre 1965, Les cités de transit pour familles.* Sent to the F.A.S. on 5 October 1965, in Archives Nationales 19770391/6. This report was compiled by the former CTAM officer Jean Corréard.

xxx In "*Etudes la cohabitation des familles françaises et étrangères,*" *Ministère de l'Equipement et du Logement*, August 1970, in Archives Nationales 19771141/17.

xxxi *Rapport Corréard de la CETRAFA SLPM, octobre 1965, Les cités de transit pour familles.* Sent to the F.A.S. on 5 October 1965, in Archives Nationales 19770391/6.

xxxii *Préfet de la Seine-Maritime au Ministre de l'Intérieur, services des affaires musulmanes. Objet : Logement des travailleurs musulmans et leurs familles,* 1960, in Archives Nationales 19770391/6.

xxxiii *Etudes Sociales Nord Africaines, recherches des Africains du nord à Genevilliers* 1963, in Archives Municipales Saint-Denis 37AC17.

xxxiv In 2021, retired African men still lived in *foyers*, unable to find affordable housing alternatives and with no possibility of returning to their countries of origin without losing their pensions.

xxxv *Préfet de la Seine au Ministre de l'Intérieur, conditions d'habitats de ressortissants d'Etats africains,* 20 March 1963, in Archives Nationales 19770346/10.

xxxvi *Lettre du fond d'action social à Monsieur le directeur de la SONACOTRAL,* 21 July 1961, in Archives Nationales 19770391/6.

xxxvii *Synthèse des rapports trimestriels établis par les conseillers techniques pour les affaires musulmanes, 1^e trimestre 1959, Ministère de l'Intérieur. Service des affaires musulmanes et de l'action sociale, confidentiel,* in Archives Nationales 19760133/14.

xxxviii *SLPM, Note sur l'immigration étrangère dans le Rhône, 1971,* in Archives Nationales 19860269/11.

xxxix For example, a newspaper report criticised the recruitment of colonial officers as *gérants* of *foyers* for Africans. Lecomte, Claude. 2 November 1970, *l'Humanité*, in Archives Nationales, 19960134/3.

xl *Préfet de l'Ain, à Monsieur le Premier Ministre, délégation de l'action sociale pour les travailleurs étrangers et pour information au Ministre de l'Intérieur, 7 May 1961, objet : hébergements des travailleurs d'Outre-Mer et notamment des travailleurs algériens.,* in Archives Nationales 19770391/6.

xli *Etudes de l'habitat, GEANAAP, 1957,* in private archives of Monique Hervo, ARC/3019/2.

^{xlii} Research on contemporary policing practices in the *banlieue* argue that today housing structures still play a role in policing practices. (Jobard, 2020; Rigouste, 2014).

^{xliii} *Le Figaro*, 19 janvier 1973, "la fin d'un foyer-taudis," retrieved from the archives of the Ministry of Interior that include newspaper clippings on the rent strikes, collected by the director of public liberty and legal affairs, in Archives Nationales 19960134/3.

^{xliv} *Sondage d'opinion publique sur les aspirations des travailleurs en matière de logement, Service des affaires musulmanes à fond d'action sociale*, June 1960, in Archives Nationales 19770391/6.

^{xlv} Report by the 'service de liaison et de promotion des migrants' by the *préfecture de la région parisienne*, for the *département of Paris* on the 'resorption of shantytowns and the problem of migrants', 1 March 1971, in Archives Nationales 19770317/1.