

2002

The Tardieu moment: Andre Tardieus failure as Prime Minister of France, 1929-1930

Tim K. Fuchs

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, tfuchs1@lsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fuchs, Tim K., "The Tardieu moment: Andre Tardieus failure as Prime Minister of France, 1929-1930" (2002). *LSU Master's Theses*. 634.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/634

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

THE TARDIEU MOMENT:
ANDRE TARDIEU'S FAILURE
AS PRIME MINISTER OF FRANCE, 1929-1930

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

The Department of History

by
Tim K. Fuchs
B.A., Georgia Southern University, 1998
May 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 ECONOMIC BACKGROUND	5
3 TARDIEU'S CAREER	44
4 TARDIEU AND THE CHAMBER	74
5 CONCLUSION	123
BIBLIOGRAPHY	127
VITA	130

ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with André Tardieu, a French politician who had an outstanding career as a journalist and a politician. After the retirement of Prime Minister Raymond Poincaré in 1929, it seemed like Tardieu would be the natural choice as his successor. He was the only leader on the Right. Tardieu formed his first cabinet in November 1929 and proposed an ambitious program for public works projects to improve the country's infrastructure. Despite solid funding, Tardieu's proposal never passed the Chamber of Deputies and his ministry fell in December 1930.

The purpose of this thesis is to find the reasons for Tardieu's failure as head of government. It has usually been argued that Tardieu was either a reactionary who could never get the support of the Left or that he became a victim of the institutions of the Third Republic. These viewpoints are not satisfactory. The third and fourth chapter of this work demonstrate that Tardieu did have a majority in the Chamber and that his fall can be attributed to his personality and his behavior during the earlier years of his political career, during which he made many enemies.

In order to prove this point, the voting patterns of the deputies are closely examined in a table, which includes votes of confidence after ministerial declarations as well as votes relating to Tardieu's ambitious economic program. The necessity of such a program was universally accepted and is illustrated through the assessment of the economic situation after the First World War in chapter 2.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

André Tardieu was one of the most talented politicians in France during the period between the two world wars. He has not, however, received the recognition from historians that he deserves. In major works about France, Tardieu receives only marginal attention. The American historian Eugen Weber describes him as the only leader who stands out among the Conservatives. He calls Tardieu “the best leader the French Conservatives never had.”¹ In the *Twilight of France*, journalist Alexander Werth focuses mainly on the later part of Tardieu’s career, he is portrayed as a reactionary who worked against the institutions of the Republic. The coverage of Tardieu’s first and second cabinet, with which this thesis is concerned, is only marginal. Werth even fails to distinguish between the two and calls Tardieu’s fall from power in December 1930 “the overthrow by the Senate of the first Tardieu cabinet,”² when it was, in fact, the second. British historian Denis Brogan only addresses Tardieu with a few sentences in his work entitled *The Development of Modern France, 1870-1939*.³ This author acknowledges that Tardieu best presented the spirit of Raymond Poincaré by 1929, but he does not explore the reasons for Tardieu’s failure in 1930. Historian Gordon Wright does not go into any details about Tardieu’s first and second premierships in his study *France in Modern Times*.⁴ Like Werth, Wright gives most attention to Tardieu’s role in the government of Gaston Doumergue in 1934 painting him as an anti-republican. This author does mention Tardieu’s economic program, which he proposed in 1929, in passing, but not what it entailed or what its effects might have been, although he acknowledges that French

¹ Eugen Weber, *The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1994), 117.

² Alexander Werth, *The Twilight of France, 1933-1940* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1966), 9.

³ Denis W. Brogan, *The Development of Modern France, 1870-1939* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966).

⁴ Gordon Wright, *France in Modern Times: 1760 to the present* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1960).

governments “did almost nothing until 1932, and not very much more until 1935, to work out a consistent crisis program”⁵ to deal with the depression. It seems that there is a connection, but Wright does not make it, instead he vaguely links Tardieu to big business interests without supplying any strong evidence. Wright writes, “the key figure of the period was André Tardieu, who headed three cabinets between 1929 and 1932. A brilliant man of somewhat overbearing and cynical temper, Tardieu for years seemed to be on the verge of becoming one of the republic’s really first-rank statesmen, yet he never quite lived up to his promise.”⁶ It looks like the author is on to something, but he never goes further into explaining why this was the case. In *The French Republic, 1879-1992*⁷ by French historian Maurice Augulhon, Tardieu is mentioned twice. Augulhon wrongly gives the impression that Tardieu’s economic program was actually passed, “André Tardieu was still able to rely on the soundness of public finances to launch an innovative program relating to the economy (massive public works – Tardieu was conscious of France’s relative backwardness).”⁸

The few works that focus solely on Tardieu’s career are by partisan Frenchmen. The collection of essays entitled *André Tardieu*,⁹ published in 1954, includes pieces by Louis Aubert, who also edited the book, Ivan Martin, Michel Misoffe, François Piétri, and Alfred Pose. All of them are admirers of Tardieu, and they do not even attempt to conceal their feelings. François Monnet’s monograph, *Refaire la République: André Tardieu, une dérive*

⁵ Wright, *France*, 466.

⁶ Wright, *France*, 469.

⁷ Maurice Augulhon, *The French Republic, 1879-1992* (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1995).

⁸ Augulhon, *French Republic*, 208.

⁹ Louis Albert, ed., *André Tardieu*, (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1957).

réactionnaire (1876-1945),¹⁰ published in 1993, is, on the other hand, too harsh in its assessment of Tardieu's political life.

Unfortunately, both have received much attention because there are no alternatives. The essay collection has been cited in many studies covering French politics during the first half of the century and figures prominently in the notes of the American Rudolph Binion's book *Defeated Leaders: The Political Fate of Caillaux, Jouvenel, and Tardieu*,¹¹ which treats Tardieu in a highly positive fashion. He writes about Tardieu becoming "more and more arrogant"¹² and the problems his personal history caused him in debates. Binion acknowledges that Tardieu was able to get a majority for nine of his eleven "big" legislative proposals, including the final version of France's social insurance system, yet he attributes Tardieu's failure to the resistance of parliament towards him. This seems to be a contradiction. Binion blames the French system for Tardieu's problems, although he covers several instances that clearly point to his personality. François Monnet's study is the main source for British historian Julian Jackson's darker portrait of Tardieu in his synthetic study, *France: The Dark Years 1940-1944*, published in 2001.

In a chapter titled "Rethinking the Republic, 1890-1934," Jackson argues that Tardieu's "ministerial declaration of November 1929 offered a program of economic modernization, a *politique de prospérité*. In subsequent speeches he proclaimed the end of laissez-faire and announced the need for an interventionist and technically competent state. All this came to nothing. Tardieu's legislative program was whittled away by sniping in

¹⁰ François Monnet, *André Tardieu, une derive réactionnaire (1876-1945)* (Paris: Fayard, 1993).

¹¹ Rudolph Binion, *Defeated Leaders: The Political Fate of Caillaux, Jouvenel, and Tardieu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960).

¹² Binion, *Leaders*, 307.

parliament: a year after it was announced, the modernization bill had not been voted.”¹³

While this statement is factually correct, it implies, just like Binion’s claim, that Tardieu did not have a majority in the Chamber of Deputies to push through such a proposal. The fourth chapter of this thesis will prove otherwise. Tardieu had a majority, and the bill was close to passage in December 1930 as illustrated by a close examination of the voting pattern of the deputies. Jackson also claims that Tardieu was “economically illiterate” and that his program to spur economic development and to improve the infrastructure of France was a blind shopping spree inspired by a surplus in the treasury. This chapter will demonstrate to the contrary that Tardieu’s plan was well thought out and that he knew exactly what he was doing, why he was doing it, and what effects the plan would have on the economy.

Although André Tardieu was, in fact, an able politician who had a vision for France’s future and commanded a majority in the Chamber, he failed in 1930. The main obstacle to a more successful career as head of government was his history, which is examined more closely in chapter 3. Tardieu had alienated too many people during his earlier years. Binion gives evidence pointing in this direction, but his conclusion leads him on a different path - blaming the institutions for Tardieu’s failure. There was never a doubt that he had great talent, but many could simply not accept him as the leader of a cabinet. Finally, before looking into Tardieu’s personality and the voting patterns in the Chamber, it is necessary to assess in chapter 2 the economic background that led up to the introduction of the bill for national retooling. This examination also helps to explain some of the particular requirements Tardieu demanded from such a project.

¹³ Julian Jackson, *France: The Dark Years* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 55.

CHAPTER 2: ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

On 1 November 1929, the president of the French republic, Gaston Doumergue, asked André Tardieu to form a government. This call followed an almost two-week-long interregnum, which had started with the demise of Aristide Briand's premiership on 22 October. Two distinguished politicians had already failed to assemble a cabinet, Edouard Daladier and Etienne Clémentel. Daladier was a Radical who had been elected as a deputy for the first time in 1919. He served as minister for the colonies under Edouard Herriot, his political teacher and role model, from 1924 to 1925. Daladier was looking for a majority on the Left, but failed despite the fact that Briand agreed to join him and that Tardieu promised not to combat him. Clémentel, a former Radical, who had served as minister for the colonies (1905-1906), of agriculture (1913), of finances (1914, 1924-1925), and of commerce (1915-1920), tried to find a majority in the center. Briand accepted the offer to stay on at the Quai d'Orsay as minister for foreign affairs, and Tardieu was willing to take over the ministry of the navy, but Clémentel was also unable to acquire a majority. The results of the elections of 1928 did not provide much flexibility for political maneuvering. The center-right actually held a slight majority with 330 out of 610 seats, and the fact that the 14 Communists refused to serve in any cabinet or even to support it made it more difficult for the Left to form a government.

Tardieu was the next natural choice because he was the only prominent figure who could assemble a ministry based on the center and the right. He met with his ministers and undersecretaries on 6 November at the ministry of the interior. The cabinet members discussed their views on domestic and foreign policy, and later, Tardieu cheerfully announced

to the press that they had reached complete agreement on all the issues under discussion.¹

The press was further informed that the new government would put an emphasis on “practical politics that could be realized with the financial resources at hand.”² Tardieu meant that he would increase the economic prosperity of the country without risking another financial crisis.

On 7 November, Tardieu, *président du conseil des ministres* and *ministre de l'intérieur*, stepped to the podium in the Chamber of Deputies to present the declaration of his government. He focused first on the accomplishments of France since the end of the First World War. The reconstruction of the devastated regions was completed; the nation had a balanced budget; the currency had been stabilized; short-term debts had been consolidated; and foreign debt was under control. Tardieu stated that after reconstruction, renewal had to follow and that his government was prepared “to guide the country on this march forward.”³ He announced a program to equip the nation with the help of available financial resources from the 1929 budget and a surplus of the treasury, which can best be described as “the banker of the budget.” The French treasury was a separate entity. It was supposed to provide money for the budget and keep it solvent until tax revenues materialized. The treasury issued bonds and borrowed money for both short and long terms. Tardieu described his initiative as “a decisive measure to accelerate the equipment of the nation.”⁴ He told the deputies that such a program, which would run for a period of five years, could be carried out immediately because the financial resources were already available. He proposed to spend a total of five

¹ *Le Figaro*, 7 Nov. 1929.

² *Le Figaro*, 7 Nov. 1929.

³ Journal Officiel, Chambre des Députés, Débats parlementaires (hereinafter cited as J.O.C., Débats), 7 Nov. 1929.

⁴ J.O.C., Débats, 7 Nov. 1929.

billion francs,⁵ splitting this amount into three major categories: 1.750 billion for agriculture and the infrastructure of the countryside, 1.450 billion for social advancements such as public health and schools, and 1.797 billion for the industrial and commerce sectors.⁶

This proposal, as Tardieu pointed out during his declaration, was possible only because by 1929 France had completely recovered from the First World War and had finally mastered the challenges that arose following that four-year-long struggle. The period between 1918 and 1928 is essential for understanding the new premier's motivation in announcing his program of prosperity. This chapter will, therefore, address the most pressing economic and financial issues that dominated the lives of the French people during the decade following the armistice.

France was one of the winners of the First World War, but the price the country had to pay for this victory was enormous. The most obvious loss was that of human lives. During the four years of the conflict, 8,660,000 men had fought in the French army and navy; 1,397,800 of them died or were declared missing.⁷ These numbers mean that 16.14 percent of all French soldiers did not return from the battlefields. Most of these casualties were common soldiers, young men in their prime who had been conscripted to defend the country against the German invaders. The war had, therefore, taken away a significant number of the most productive section of society. In addition, there were about 1,100,000 French who were disabled seriously during the war and not able to rejoin the work force.⁸ This enormous loss

⁵ \$1.250 billion today.

⁶ J.O.C., Débats, 7 Nov. 1929.

⁷ Alfred Sauvy, *Histoire économique de la France entre les deux guerres* (3 vols.; Paris, 1965-1975), 1: 440.

⁸ Eugen Weber, *The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1994), 11.

of men meant that fewer human resources were available for dealing with the physical damages the battles had left behind and that industry was deprived of an appreciable part of its manpower. The missing men also led to a decline in birth rates, a deficit especially grave for France's population, which had been almost stationary for many decades. France was now heading towards a demographic catastrophe because of an imbalance in the proportion of men to women and because of the children who had not been conceived during the war because the men were away. The disparity between the number of men and women was significant: in 1914, there were 1,035 women for every 1,000 men; after the war the number went up to 1,103, an increase of 6.57 percent. For the women in their early twenties, the difference was 1,200 to 1,000, and later in the twenties 1,323 to 1,000.⁹ These demographic realities were on the minds of French people and could be felt in everyday life.

The northern regions of the country were further casualties of the armed struggle. Most of the fighting during the conflict took place on French soil, and the effects of trench warfare were horrendous. The destruction of the land, the damage to buildings and equipment in the areas that had been occupied by the enemy was unprecedented. Shellfire had left huge craters, and chemical weapons had poisoned the soil. The section of France that suffered the worst consequences from the war, whether by battles or by occupation by the Germans, was in the ten departments in the north. This territory became known as the "devastated region," and although it only represented 6 percent of the total landmass of France, it had been the economic heartland of the country before the war.¹⁰ This small portion of France contained the majority of the coal mines and was the most highly developed industrial section of the

⁹ Weber, *Hollow Years*, 14.

¹⁰ William Ogburn and William Jaffé, *The Economic Development of Post-War France: A Survey of Production* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1929), 20.

nation, especially in the production of textiles and steel. Of the 8.2 billion acres of invaded and war-ravaged territory, all but 15 percent of the soil cultivated before the war was devastated and 94 percent of the cattle had disappeared. Furthermore, three-quarters (900,000) of the structures, including houses and farm buildings, were damaged or completely leveled. Of factories employing more than ten workers, about 9,000 were either completely destroyed or could not resume production immediately following the armistice. All of the 200 coal mine shafts and the 34 iron mines of the region were wrecked. The infrastructure was also seriously impaired:¹¹ in the richest of the ten northern departments, 5,000 miles of roads were impassable, 600 miles of railway lines had been completely destroyed, and almost 600,000 acres of farmland was out of production.¹² The situation was similar in the other nine departments.

The ravages of the war seriously undermined agricultural and industrial productivity levels. In 1919, the first full year of peace, production of wheat was down 42 percent when compared to 1913, that of corn was cut in half. The figures for livestock were also lower after the war. The number for sheep was down almost 45 percent, and for pigs it decreased by 36 percent.¹³ Industry did not fare better. The general industrial index was at 57 in 1919 (base 100 in 1913), it climbed to 62 in 1920 and fell to the post-war low of 55 in 1921.¹⁴ The level for the mining industry was at 44 percent for the year after the war ended, and that for the metal industry was at 29. The metal industry recovered significantly more slowly than the

¹¹ Ogburn and Jaffé, *Economic Development*, 20.

¹² Denis Brogan, *The Development of Modern France* (2 vols.; New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 1: 599.

¹³ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 462-463.

¹⁴ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 465.

general index and was not able to catch up with it during the 1920s.¹⁵ The development of industrial activity is especially significant when compared to that of other countries. In 1920, for example, industrial production in Great Britain was at the same level as it had been before the war, and the index for the defeated Germany was at 61, only one point lower than the number for France. In the following two years, Germany's figures were actually higher than France's, pointing to a faster recovery by the former Central power.¹⁶

The main problem that overshadowed all the other aspects of politics during the next ten years was that of finances. French politicians had mobilized the country's resources to expel the enemy occupying the most productive area of France. This effort came with a heavy price, but the leaders during the war refused to raise taxes in order to finance the war. Instead, Bons de la Défense National were issued. These government bonds were issued with a fixed percentage rate and were popular especially among the middle class, whose members displayed their patriotism by purchasing them. The bourgeoisie expected, however, to benefit from their investments through interest and to get their capital back. In addition to those short-term bonds, the government also enlarged the monetary supply, borrowed heavily from the Bank of France, and increased long-term debts. This system of raising funds for the war effort only delayed the problem of financing the armed struggle until after the war. The big questions after the armistice were, therefore, who would pay for the war and who would provide the resources to rebuild the devastated region.

The answers to these questions seemed obvious to every Frenchmen. France had paid following the loss of the Franco-Prussian War; this time, Germany would be presented with

¹⁵ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 465.

¹⁶ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 470.

the bill. It was only a matter of tallying up the amounts and of coming up with a schedule for transfers from the defeated neighbor. Soon after 1918, it became clear, however, that there would be some obstacles before this plan could be carried out, but until the failure of the Ruhr occupation in 1924, most French citizens and politicians continued to believe that Germany would eventually come up with the money to cover the French expenses. After Germany's consistent default in its payments, the French parliament, under the leadership of Prime Minister Raymond Poincaré, decided to send troops into the German Ruhr valley to extract reparations. This occupation was actually running a small surplus in 1924 and was expected to become more profitable the next year, but political pressures, which resulted from growing inflation at home, forced Poincaré to abandon the Ruhr policy.

The most pressing issue in post-war France was that of saving the franc. The currency had been artificially maintained at an exchange rate of 5.45 to the dollar during the war through the support of Great Britain and the United States. In 1919, those two countries discontinued their efforts to keep the French monetary unit stable, and by the end of the year it had fallen to 11 francs to the dollar.¹⁷ This loss was significant, especially if one considers that the French were used to the franc being one of the most solid currencies in the world. The development that took place during the years following the First World War shocked many Frenchmen and resulted in a loss of confidence in the once strong franc and in the politicians who were not able to stop the inflation, which was a result of increased government spending during the war and the inability to cover those expenses after it. Many actions taken by the governments between 1919 and 1926 actually contributed to the financial crisis.

¹⁷ Stephen A. Shuker, *The End of French Predominance in Europe* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1976), 53.

Without intervention by foreign countries, the franc lost half of its value during the first year compared to the dollar. This initial drop was only the beginning of a long decline. In 1923, it took 16.58 francs to buy one dollar and 75.73 to purchase one British pound (during the war the rate had been fixed at 25.22). Three years later, in the summer of 1926, the franc hit its low point at 31.44 to the dollar and 152.70 to the pound.¹⁸ The history of the franc after the war is dominated by inflation and depreciation. Most Frenchmen had expected that their currency would stabilize at the pre-war level, but they had to realize eventually that their money would never fully recover. The process that led to this realization was painful.

France victorious suffered greatly after the war. Not only did the value of the money decrease, but prices increased, leaving the consumer with less purchasing power. French men and women actually suffered after the armed conflict had ended, and many experienced poverty. They could not afford to buy the basic necessities of life. The general price index rose 364 percent from July 1914 to 1919. It climbed another 143 percent in 1920. In the following two years, the index fell below the figure for 1919, but in 1923 prices started to climb again, and the index reached its peak in 1926, when it was 718 percent higher than before the war.¹⁹ This development not only affected luxury goods, but manifested itself especially in basic food products such as vegetables, meat, and sugar. From 1914 to 1926, prices for vegetables rose 665 percent, and for meat by 538 percent.²⁰

One of the conclusions that can be drawn from the years following the war is that French politicians had only limited talents in economic and financial policies. The consensus

¹⁸ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 444.

¹⁹ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 495.

²⁰ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 495.

after the Armistice was that Germany should pay. The Commission for Reparations, which was set up during the negotiations of the peace treaty to assess the question of reparation, did not, however, make any concrete plans as to how much the Germans had to pay until 1921, and even after this date, the payments from Germany were not exactly pouring in. The Bloc National, a conservative coalition that comprised largely men who had served in the armed forces during the war, had the majority in the Chamber after the elections of 1919. The Bloc's members were reluctant to raise taxes to pay for the war debt and for rebuilding the devastated regions. Instead, they based the whole postwar budget on the expectation of reparations from Germany.

The Bloc National only had a few experienced men in its ranks. The majority of its deputies were new to politics and had not had the chance to develop its skills. They refused to do the only thing that would have made sense, to raise the income tax, because they had always been against it and because their constituents, who belonged to the middle class, would have been the hardest hit by such an action. The rebuilding of the country nevertheless started soon after the elections. The finance minister, Louis-Lucien Klotz, came up with a new system of bookkeeping, which masked the obvious problems of the country and gave the people a false sense of security. Klotz divided the budget into three separate sections, the "ordinary," the "extraordinary," and the "German." The first, the ordinary, was the regular budget, which included the usual activities of the state and was solvent. The extraordinary budget was conceived to receive special sources of revenue, such as the liquidation of war assets, and loans for unusual projects. The German budget was designed to keep track of all the efforts that fell under the heading of reparations, such as the reconstruction of the regions in the north. The deficit for the second two budgets was to be met by loans, and the German

budget did actually not receive any other money. The whole future of the French financial system was placed on the hope that Germany would pay. Meanwhile, investors were expected to supply money to the government through the purchase of government bonds. Klotz left the finance ministry in January 1920, the two following years saw no departure from the policies he established except the creation of a sales tax, which did not contribute enough revenue to lower the deficit. The majority in the Chamber remained opposed to any serious attempts to solve the situation by raising more tax revenue because France was already taxing its citizens highly, especially through the progressive income tax, which had been passed by the Chamber on 18 July and by the Senate on 31 July 1917 and placed a rate of 60 percent on the highest income level.

In 1922, Raymond Poincaré, one of the most respected and experienced politicians of France, formed a cabinet. He made it his task to force Germany to pay, and the program of his finance minister, Charles de Lasteyrie du Saillant was based on this expectation. Lasteyrie argued that France would have to have higher taxes if the budget were not balanced in a few years, but he was optimistic that an equilibrium could be established without using this last resort.

Poincaré's occupation of the Ruhr was designed to make Germany pay. Shortly before this military action was put into effect, the finance minister realized that he had to find a means to increase tax revenues. He proposed the *double décime*, which would have meant that almost all of the French taxes would have been raised by 20 percent. This notion was a radical departure from the governmental policies of the last four years. It was the first sign the people in power realized that higher taxation was necessary to finance reconstruction of war damages and to pay for the costs of the conflict, but the Chamber was not willing to pass

Lasteyrie's bill. The deputies were not convinced that the only solution to the problem was higher taxation. They still believed that Germany would pay.

The situation worsened during the following years. The occupation of the Ruhr could not be continued because of political pressures at home – objections from the parties of the Left -- and the lack of support from the former allies – Great Britain refused to participate. The abandonment of Poincaré's Ruhr policy demonstrated that France was not able to make Germany pay. In December 1923, the franc reached a new low. Over 82 francs were needed to purchase one British pound and slightly more than 19 could buy one dollar.²¹ The general price index had risen to 428 (base 100 in July 1914) and food was 387 percent more expensive than it had been before the war.²² The government was also losing the trust of the French investors. In 1923, the seventh loan of the Crédit National had a yield of 6.17 percent, but it only generated about 2 billion francs, and an issue of Bons du Trésor with an interest rate of 7.5 percent brought in only slightly over 6 billion. The final signal that the patience of the French investors was over came in January 1924. The eighth loan of the Crédit National, which was to yield 6.29 percent, was a complete failure, producing only 1.6 billion.²³

Lasteyrie's answer to the problem was his reintroduction of the *double décime*. He announced to the Chamber: "The country has enough common sense and real courage, when it clearly sees danger, to make at the right moment the necessary resolutions. It will understand that the question is a vital one."²⁴ The bill included budget cuts of 1 billion francs, the introduction of more serious penalties for tax evasion and fraud, and an increase in almost

²¹ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 444.

²² Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 495.

²³ Robery Murry Haig, *The Public Finances of Post-War France* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1929), 90.

²⁴ Haig, *Public Finances*, 92.

all direct and indirect taxes by 20 percent. The act passed on 22 March 1924 and was the first serious indication that the French government was abandoning the “the Germans will pay” attitude as the only solution to the financial problems.

The finance minister was, however, wrong in his expectation that the French people would understand this new policy and would be willing to carry the heavier burden. The program was political suicide, especially on the eve of legislative elections in 1924. The candidates of the Left attacked the *double décime* because it affected the working class and small shopkeepers and promised its abolition as well as the one of the turnover tax if they would come to power. In their plan, they proposed a tax on capital, which would likely hit hardest on the wealthy. The elections took place on 11 May and did return a new majority. The conservatives were beaten, and an alliance of Radicals and Socialists formed a cabinet. Raymond Poincaré’s career as premier seemed to be over, and the leader of this Cartel des Gauches, Edouard Herriot, headed the new government. The coalition between the Socialists and the Radicals soon displayed disunity, especially on financial and economic questions. It became clear, however, that the slogan “‘the rich will pay’ replaced the ‘Germans will pay.’”²⁵

The Cartel came to power because of French dissatisfaction with the failed Ruhr occupation and increased taxation. The alliance between the Radicals and the Socialists seemed to be strong during the electoral campaign of 1924. The Socialists supported their partner in the Chamber without ministerial participation. The relationship between church and state was of the utmost importance to the Radicals, and with support from the Socialists they attempted to reverse some religious policies implemented by the Bloc National. The

²⁵ Brogan, *Modern France*, 2: 591.

majority that the two groups had in the Chamber of 1924 was, however, not as solid as the mere numbers suggested. The Socialists on the far left were tempted to join the Communist party, and the right wing of the Radicals was often much closer to the moderate center of the Chamber than to their allies on the Left. The different outlook of the two parties was most evident when it came to economic and financial policies. The Socialists saw the only solution for solving the pressing economic crisis in a complete reconstruction of French society, whereas the Radicals adhered to the established economic order of the Third Republic. “The possibility was remote indeed that the Socialists, wedded to the principles of nationalization, high taxation, and state direction, could come to significant agreements on economic policy with the Radicals, who believed, like the small shopkeepers and other sections of the bourgeoisie they represented, in liberalism and low taxation.”²⁶ The Cartel might have been successful had the most prominent problems of the day not been in the realm of finances.

The first politician to be confirmed as prime minister by the Chamber of 1924 was Edouard Herriot. He was probably the most unfit person to put the country’s budget back in order because he was, according to the British historian, Denis Brogan, “taking financial problems too lightly” and believed France would “muddle through.”²⁷ Herriot appointed the sixty-year-old Etienne Clémentel as finance minister. The latter had been a deputy from 1900 to 1919 and was a member of the Senate at the time of his appointment. Like Herriot, Clémentel belonged to the Radicals, and he had served as the head of several ministries including the one for commerce and industry from 1915 to 1920. On 4 November 1924, the new finance minister presented his budget for 1925. It was not a radical departure from the

²⁶ Herbert Tint, *France since 1918* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1980), 23.

²⁷ Brogan, *Modern France*, 2: 588.

previous governments. In fact, Clémentel acknowledged the necessity to attain budgetary unity and equilibrium.

The new government had, furthermore, initiated the compilation of a complete assessment of the country's financial situation right after it came to power. This report, which was entitled "Inventaire de la situation financière de la France au Début de la Treizième Législature," was published as an appendix to the budget bill in December 1924. The Inventaire listed the fiscal and financial problems the new government had inherited from its predecessors. It estimated the public debt at 414.5 billion francs; foreign loans accounted for 136.7 billion, domestic ones 277.8.²⁸ Of the internal debt, nearly 160 billion had been contracted since the war, the money used to cover the deficits of the budget, which ran 42.6 billion in 1919, 38 billion in 1920, 28 billion in 1921, 24.7 billion in 1922, 18.1 billion in 1923, and 9.1 billion in 1924.²⁹ The first Cartel government criticized the fact that the previous postwar cabinets did not take sufficient initiative to raise taxes in order to finance the costs of the war. Clémentel saw the answer to achieving a budgetary equilibrium through increasing direct taxes and lowering indirect ones.

The problems of the budget were not as pressing as those of the Treasury. The main troubles resulted from the previous governments' policy of consolidating the budget through short-term loans. The state did not have the financial resources to return the capital to the investors in case they chose not to renew their bonds. Clémentel realized that the short-term bonds had to be replaced with long-term ones. The year 1925 was viewed as especially difficult because, besides the foreign debt maturities, the Treasury would be confronted with

²⁸ Journal Officiel, Chambre des Députés, Documents parlementaire (hereinafter cited as J.O.C., Documents), Annexe 441, Inventaire, 1924.

²⁹ J. O. C., Documents, Annexe 441, Inventaire, 1924.

the repayment, at the option of the holders, of almost 22 billion francs in domestic short-term debt. The Treasury needed all the money it could borrow and had to allow the lender to select the type of security he fancied. No solution to the problem of these maturing obligations was proposed in the budget bill. Clémentel intended to make a proposal at a later point because he hoped the situation would then be easier. In the meantime, the holders of bonds were left in the dark, and the government hoped for their trust.

Clémentel's budget did not fulfill any of the sensational promises the Cartel des Gauches had made during the electoral campaign. There were no provisions for the abolition of the *double décime* or the turnover tax. The approach was not significantly different from that of the last Bloc cabinet. The incomes of the liberal professions, such as doctors and lawyers who could evade audits under the client-privilege clause, and bonuses paid to company directors were supposed to come under stricter control. The governments proposed, furthermore, three new taxes; all of them were only minor alterations and were not expected to bring much revenue.

On 2 April 1925, Etienne Clémentel resigned because of differences with Prime Minister Herriot about the financial direction the government should take. He was succeeded the next day by Anatole de Monzie, but the Herriot government lost a vote of confidence in the Senate on 10 April 1925 because of financial irregularities concerning the amount of money in circulation. When Paul Painlevé took over the premiership seven days later, the Budget of 1925 had still not been passed. Painlevé was an experienced politician who was a member of the parliamentary group known as the Republican Socialists and had briefly served as premier during the war. His choice as minister of finance was the controversial Joseph Caillaux, who before the war had been both prime minister and finance minister. During the

war he had been associated with the call for a negotiated peace, and in 1920 he was convicted by the Senate, sitting as High Court, for “improper conversations” with German agents. The Radicals now demanded his return to active political life. Painlevé had no other choices because “the only man with a good financial record among their [the Left’s] own people was Caillaux.”³⁰

Clémentel’s budget finally passed on 13 July 1925 without any important changes to the tax statutes. Methods of control and assessment for the income tax were somewhat altered, and the three minor new taxes were passed. The first was the *taxe d’apprentissage*, which was levied on businessmen at 0.2 percent on salaries and wages paid, with the revenue supposed to aid vocational training schools; the second was a 0.01 percent charge on foreign currency transactions; the third consisted of the so-called replacement taxes for imports and sales by mines. The first Cartel government did not make any radical changes to the budgetary and financial system. It did not fulfill its campaign promises of abolishing the turnover tax or even the salt tax. The budget of the Herriot cabinet avoided the necessary painful solutions.

The government had three possible choices to deal with the problems of the Treasury, all of which would have inflicted some kind of hardship on the general population. The first was the one proposed by the Cartel des Gauches during the elections of 1924, a capital levy. The plan envisioned that a heavy draft upon all who owned property would supply enough money to pay the Treasury’s obligations to the bondholders. This conception brought many administrative problems with it and required the cooperation of property holders, who opposed it vehemently. It was expected that property holders would try to evade this tax and

³⁰ Haig, *Public Finances*, 117.

that the assessment of property value would prove to be difficult and take up many resources. The second probable action was to exchange short-term bonds for long-term securities at lower interest. This arrangement was just as controversial because it would have punished the people who had invested in the country, and, furthermore, it would have been a declaration of bankruptcy. The third was to debase the currency and let inflation run its course, with the obligations of the Treasury met at a lesser value.

The six finance ministers who followed Clémentel during the next fifteen months proposed legislation that went into all of these three directions. Caillaux refused to adopt the capital levy and tried to raise money through a new bond issue. Eventually, the Painlevé government could not count on the support of the Socialists anymore because they favored the tax on property. The break between the allies led to his resignation on 27 October 1925. By doing nothing to solve the problem, the government was *de facto* adopting the option of inflation. From April, the month Clémentel had resigned, to the end of October, the franc fell from 92.41 to the British pound to 109.20 and from 19.26 to the dollar to 22.54.³¹ The December bond maturities were approaching fast, and nothing had been done to meet the situation.

Paul Painlevé succeeded himself as prime minister, and this time he took the finance portfolio himself. His government was able to get a majority only because the Socialists abstained from voting. Painlevé proposed a capital levy and, under pressure from the Socialists, a moratorium on payment for the securities maturing on 8 December.³² The moratorium was voted down by 278 to 275 because a small group of moderate Radicals voted

³¹ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 445.

³² Haig, *Public Finances*, 225.

against it.³³ The second Painlevé cabinet therefore resigned. By the end of November, 122.64 francs were needed to purchase one British pound, and it took 25.32 francs to buy one dollar.³⁴

The following eight months witnessed five more finance ministers come and go. These included Louis Loucheur (28 November to 10 December 1925), Paul Doumer (10 December 1925 to 9 March 1926), Raoul Péret (9 March to 24 June 1926), Joseph Caillaux (24 June to 20 July 1926), and Anatole de Monzie (20 to 23 July 1926). All of them proposed different programs for taxation to solve the country's financial situation. From the time the Cartel des Gauches took over the government of France, seven different finance ministers had assessed the budgetary and financial situation of the French state, and every possible solution had been laid before the parliament, which in turn rejected all far-reaching proposals.

Almost in desperation, one of the finance ministers, Raoul Péret, who served in the Briand cabinet of 1926, formed a committee of experts to examine the budgetary and financial problems. They included one representative from the ministry of finance, three from industry, one from the Bank of France, six from the largest French banks, and two from universities. When the creation of this committee was announced, it drew fierce criticism from the Left, which argued that decisions were being taken away from parliament and placed into the hands of the propertied classes.³⁵ Nevertheless, the report of the experts was submitted to the Chamber on 3 July 1926. Its preface stressed the importance of stability for the franc and warned that the situation demanded immediate attention. Borrowing and inflation had to stop,

³³ J. O. C., Débats, 22 Nov. 1925.

³⁴ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 445.

³⁵ J. O. C., Débats, 1 June 1926.

and the obligations of the Treasury had to be met. The experts advised against a complete revaluation of the currency at the 1914 level and instead at a new lower one to be determined.

The experts stressed, furthermore, the need for budget cuts and higher taxes. They estimated that it was necessary to increase revenue for 1926 by 2.5 billion and by 5 billion for 1927.³⁶ The committee also covered the fact that raising direct taxes encouraged the export of capital to evade taxation and therefore contributed to the exchange crisis. The experts suggested the creation of a separate institution, which would deal exclusively with government bonds. Stabilization, they insisted, could take place only through long-term loans from abroad, credits by the Bank of France, and private and commercial credits.³⁷

The experts expected that the return to normality could happen in three phases. First would come a period of pre-stabilization, with the exchange rate fluctuating around a previously fixed benchmark; second would be a time of *de facto* stabilization during which the Bank of France would buy and sell gold as well as foreign currency at a fixed rate; and finally would come the *de jure* stabilization, which would restore the franc to the gold standard and establish its convertibility.³⁸ After the report was published, Joseph Caillaux, who had taken over the finance ministry from Raoul Péret, asked the Chamber for special powers to solve the country's financial situation, but a majority of Radical-Socialists, Socialists, Communists, and a conservative group around the deputy Louis Marin defeated the government by 288 votes against 243.³⁹

³⁶ J. O. C., Documents, Rapport du Comité des Experts, 3 July 1926.

³⁷ J. O. C., Documents, Rapport du Comité des Experts, 3 July 1926.

³⁸ J. O. C., Documents, Rapport du Comité des Experts, 3 July 1926.

³⁹ J. O. C., Débats, 17 July 1926.

Meanwhile, the franc continued to lose its value against the British pound and the U.S. dollar. The French currency fell to 143.68 in April, 155.06 in May, and 165.92 in June compared to the pound.⁴⁰ The same development can be seen when compared to the dollar. On the day Edouard Herriot was confirmed as new Prime Minister with the support of the Socialists on 20 July 1926, his reputation of being a stranger to financial and economic theories caused the franc to register at an all-time low of 235 to the pound at the end of the day.⁴¹ The average for the month of July was 199.03 to the pound.⁴² Only a single day later, the Herriot government fell.

The period between April 1925 and July 1926 clearly illustrated that the Cartel did not have the strength to pass a capital levy. The Chamber had voted down every other serious measure to consolidate the finances of France and in doing so, the deputies had accepted the policy of inflation. The political chaos and the inability to get things done had left a desire for firm leadership. The country was prepared to accept painful policies under the guidance of a trusted individual. The twenty-five months of cabinets formed by Radicals and more or less supported by Socialists had prepared the French for the return of Raymond Poincaré.

The most striking feature of economic life during the post-war period was the instability of the franc. The French currency did not depreciate to the same extent as the ones of the Central and Eastern European countries, but the decrease was still considerable. This decline holds true, as already demonstrated, when compared to strong currencies like the U.S. dollar and the British pound, but it is also evident in the loss of purchasing power. At the end

⁴⁰ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 445.

⁴¹ Haig, *Public Finances*, 159.

⁴² Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 445.

of the war, the franc could only buy 29 percent of the wholesale goods it had been able to purchase in 1913. Afterwards it fluctuated, reaching its high in 1922 at 31 percent and declining from then on to the low of 12 percent in 1926.⁴³ The most obvious reason for inflation in France after the war was the disproportionate increase in the circulation of money compared to the volume of commodities. In 1919, the bank notes in circulation amounted to about 34.774 billion francs (average of the end-of-month numbers from the Bank of France).⁴⁴ Prices were closely connected to money circulation. They rose with the amount of francs circulating in 1919 and 1920, fell with it in 1921 and 1922, and rose again from 1923 to 1926. From 1923 to 1924, the amount of francs increased from 37.353 to 43.352 billion, and from 1925 to 1926 it rose from 44.210 to 53.426 billion.⁴⁵ Before the war about 10.5 billion francs had been in circulation.⁴⁶

The main cause for the increasing quantity of money can be found in the advances to the state, a practice that had been adopted during the war and was continued after it. These loans came from the Bank of France, which had the issuance of paper francs as one of its functions. In time of great stress when the yields from taxation and from the sale of bonds did not provide enough to meet the deficits of the budget and temporary emergencies, the government authorized the Bank to increase its banknote issue. The proceeds of this process went to the state. Technically, these advances were loans with a low interest rate attached to them, but they were solely secured by the government's promise to pay. Advances to the state were used several times by various *Cartel* governments to fix holes in the budget. After

⁴³ Ogburn and Jaffé, *Economic Development*, 51.

⁴⁴ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 525.

⁴⁵ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 525.

⁴⁶ Ogburn and Jaffé, *Economic Development*, 55.

the failure of Painlevé's plan to introduce a capital levy and a moratorium for payments to the owners of government bonds in November 1925, for example, the deputies voted to increase the legal limit for advances from the Bank of France by 1.5 billion to keep the state solvent.⁴⁷ The same happened after the fall of the Herriot cabinet on 22 July 1926. Without a government and a plan to deal with the situation, the Chamber voted to transfer the rights to the balance of the **Morgan loan** to the Bank of France and authorized the latter to increase note circulation by the amount of the proceeds from this cession.⁴⁸

As demonstrated above, the practice of raising the legal limit for note circulation was popular among the deputies to keep the country solvent. Printing money was the easiest way of raising funds rapidly. The Herriot cabinet, which was formed after the elections of 1924, actually rediscovered this wartime practice before the deputies as a whole did. There had been discrepancies between the official and the actual amount of note circulation before the Cartel des Gauches came to power, but the amounts were always insignificant. Under Herriot's tenure as prime minister, the gap between the figures shown in the weekly situation reports and the real numbers started to grow more and more, and they also surpassed the legal limit several times. For 6 November 1924, the discrepancy was as high as 1,299 billion francs, and for 5 March the report included an amount that was almost 2 billion lower than the actual number.⁴⁹ This deception is another example of how unsound public finances were after the war and how desperately the men in power were looking for a way out of the crisis,

⁴⁷ Haig, *Public Finances*, 126.

⁴⁸ Haig, *Public Finances*, 161.

⁴⁹ Emile Moreau. *The Golden Franc: Memoirs of the Governor of the Bank of France* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991), 16.

even if the solution entailed illegal actions. In April 1925 the Senate censured the Cartel for the continued increase of note circulation.

One of the big drawbacks to the continued inflation was the flight of capital from France. Many investors lost their confidence in the government's ability to solve the situation and to put the country's finances back on a solid ground. More and more Frenchmen started to invest in foreign countries. This development could not only be observed within the ranks of the rich but also within the bourgeoisie. This social class, which had been the very foundation of the Third Republic, lost their trust in the French state. Capital was sent abroad and became scarce in France. During 1924, 1925, and the first half of 1926, the French bought great amounts of foreign money and built capital reserves in other countries. It has been estimated that ten billion francs were exported in 1924 and again in 1925. These amounts were exceeded in 1926, when about 17 billion francs left France.⁵⁰ It can be assumed that this massive flight of capital resulted from the widespread fear of the further fall of the franc because the money started to flow back after the currency had been stabilized. The flight of capital actually helped to accelerate the decline of the franc because of the vast amounts that were put on the market to purchase foreign currencies. As a result of this development, the French monetary unit lost more in terms of its value against other currencies than it did in terms of commodities.

The economy as a whole did fairly well after the war. On the eve of the war, French factories and mines lagged behind those of other nations in technical equipment. Antiquated instruments were still in use on production sites all over France. After the most heavily industrialized part of France had been occupied by German forces in 1914, the French started

⁵⁰Ogburn and Jaffé, *Economic Development*, 75.

to modernize and build new factories to compensate for the loss of the industrial output of the northern regions. The growth of heavy industry and mass production was accelerated in the uninvaded parts of France. Substitute industries developed in the center and the south. This process took place mostly in the branches that produced goods needed for the conduct of the war, such as the textiles, metallurgy, mining, electricity, and chemicals. By the time the conflict was over, the entrepreneurs who owned these factories were able to draw on the great profits they had made during it to expand in the postwar period. Furthermore, the Treaty of Versailles returned Alsace and Lorraine to France, both of which were heavily industrialized. Especially Lorraine proved to be a valuable addition with its large ore fields. It was also the greatest European source of bauxite, which enabled the development of an aluminum industry.

The most significant improvements after the war concerning industrial capacity and means of production took place in the devastated regions. Denis Brogan dubbed the reconstruction of this area “the greatest economic achievement of post-war Europe.”⁵¹ The French realized that this incredible task was not only an obligation but also the opportunity to modernize. It took only seven years to complete the restoration, and once it was done France had completely new industrial equipment in its most industrialized regions. In this context, the Great War was a blessing because it forced the factory owners to modernize. The government played an essential role in reconstruction through loans and payments. In 1920, the budget provided 13.084 billion francs for the devastated regions. This amount was surpassed in the two following years: in 1921, 17.774 billion and in 1922, 14.181 billion.⁵²

⁵¹ Brogan, *Modern France*, 2: 599.

⁵² Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 453.

Out of the 9,300 factories that had been destroyed, 8,200 were rebuilt or repaired by the beginning of 1926.⁵³ In the process, many smaller units were merged into larger ones, leading to the conclusion that reconstruction was completed. The 200 coal shafts that had been damaged during the war had also been completely restored and improved by 1926. The number of pneumatic pick-hammers had, for example, increased from 1,600 in 1913 to 17,300 in 1925.⁵⁴ There were other improvements that could not be directly connected to reconstruction, including increasing the capacity of blast furnaces and the installation of new coke ovens, both of which were pursued in the north. The machine-building industry had improved enormously during the war to supply the much-needed manufactured metal articles. This development can be observed in the car-making industry. The production of automobiles had increased by 238 percent by 1921 when compared to 1913 (base year). By 1924, the index registered at 422, and by 1926, it reached 543.⁵⁵ France surpassed the prewar industrial production level in 1924, standing at 109 (1914=100), when Great Britain registered at 91 and Germany at 80. In 1926, France's industrial output was 26 percent higher than it had been in 1913.⁵⁶

The fall of the franc proved to be a positive trend for French exports. Inflation and rising wholesale prices usually go hand in hand, but prices in other countries also rose after the war, and the dramatic loss of value the French currency had to endure made products from France highly competitive on the world market. Exports rose because French prices were relatively lower than those of countries with currencies on the gold standard throughout the

⁵³ Ogburn and Jaffé, *Economic Development*, 118.

⁵⁴ Ogburn and Jaffé, *Economic Development*, 118.

⁵⁵ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 466.

⁵⁶ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 470.

1920s. In 1920, France exported 9.7 million metric tons of industrial materials and 1.9 million metric tons of various fabrics.⁵⁷ These numbers increased continuously until 1928. In 1922, 19 million metric tons of industrial materials and 2.6 metric tons of fabrics were shipped to other countries, and in 1926 the numbers jumped to 26 million and 48 million tons respectively.⁵⁸

Inflation had a positive effect on the export industry and also stimulated domestic sales because with the decline in purchasing power, people were more likely to buy goods rather than save money. Many manufactured products were viewed as more likely to keep their value than the currency. Inflation was good for many producers in France because they could still find markets, and wages usually increased at a lower pace than wholesale prices, with the result that labor remained relatively cheap. Many companies, which had made investments in their production facilities through issuing bonds, also profited from the depreciation of the currency because the real cost of interest payments was lower. But in the end, this development hurt the companies just as did the government, because the investors refused to buy French bonds and started to transfer their money to other countries.

Thus, at one level, economic progress in France after the Great War was not seriously impaired by the rapid inflation, which was actually beneficial in some cases. The average middle-class investors were, however, hit hard by the loss of the franc's value. By the summer of 1926, public opinion became more and more agitated at the inability of the leaders to deal with the financial problems. Aside from their own leaders, many of the French blamed foreign tourists and businessmen for the fall of the franc, and a bus of Americans was

⁵⁷ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 476.

⁵⁸ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 476.

attacked in Paris.⁵⁹ On 11 and 21 July 1926, there were hostile demonstrations on the streets outside the Palais Bourbon, criticism aimed at the Herriot government, but also, as the *London Times* put it, “against the fatuousness of the Chamber.”⁶⁰

After the fall of the Herriot cabinet on 21 July 1926, Raymond Poincaré was called upon to form a government of National Union. For a time, the party game was up, and the trusted leader assembled a cabinet including the leaders of various groups. According to the French economic historian Alfred Sauvy, he was able to do so because he had refrained from any violent attacks on the members of the Cartel des Gauches after his loss of the premiership in 1924. Poincaré built a small cabinet with only thirteen ministers, but the personalities he included were a display of strength and power. Among the thirteen were six former and three future prime ministers.⁶¹ The list included André Tardieu, Paul Painlevé, Aristide Briand, Louis Barthou, and Edouard Herriot, who had just failed as premier, but was entrusted with the ministry of education. Poincaré had offered cabinet posts to Herriot and Tardieu in 1922, but Herriot had declined out of respect for Poincaré’s archenemy, Caillaux, and Tardieu had refused because of his close ties with Georges Clemenceau, another opponent of the prime minister. This time, Tardieu accepted the technical ministries of public works, the merchant marine, and the liberated regions. Poincaré took the portfolio for finances himself.

Raymond Poincaré was one of the most prominent figures in French politics at the time. He had lost the elections of 1924 because the country had not been willing to tolerate higher taxation in the form of the *double décime* to solve the budgetary and financial

⁵⁹ Tom Kemp. *The French Economy 1913-39: The History of a Decline* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1972), 79.

⁶⁰ Haig, *Public Finances*, 161.

⁶¹ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 83.

problems and was disillusioned with the premier's Ruhr occupation. In 1926, the public was, however, willing to accept the bitter medicine that was necessary to cure the financial ills.

Poincaré was born on 20 August 1860 in Bar-le-Duc, a town in Lorraine. He served as deputy of the Meuse department from 1887 until 1903 and then as its senator from 1903 until 1913. Although he was a lawyer by profession, Poincaré soon earned a reputation for having a talent concerning finances and budgetary issues after becoming a deputy. In 1890, he joined the budget committee of the Chamber, for which he was named the spokesman only three years later.

Poincaré served as minister of public instruction and finances several times between 1893 and 1906, but none of his tenures lasted more than ten months. He formed a cabinet for the first time in 1912 and held the office of premier and minister of foreign affairs for a little over a year. Like the cabinet he formed in 1926, the one of 1912 was also billed as national union. Poincaré gained enough confidence and support for his successful foreign policy to engage in a victorious campaign for the office of president of the republic in 1913. After his term at the [presidential] Elysée palace ended, Poincaré was reelected to the Senate in 1920.

On the day Herriot had announced the formation of his short-lived cabinet, the franc fell to an all-time low of 235 to the pound. The news of the constitution of a government under the leadership of Poincaré had the exact opposite effect. The French currency recovered immediately to a rate of 200 to the pound on 23 July 1926.⁶² In the following days, the new government drew up a tax bill and submitted it to the finance committee of the Chamber, which compiled a report right away. Discussion on the tax bill started and ended on 31 July, and after making some amendments the finance committee had proposed, the

⁶² Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 84.

Chamber voted its approval 295 to 188.⁶³ When the Senate met on 3 August, the spokesmen of its finance committee, Henry Chéron, recommended the ratification of the bill, and the Senators followed his advice, 250 to 13.⁶⁴

Even before the debate on the new tax bill could start, Poincaré had to solve the immediate problems of the treasury. In a letter that he sent to the president of the parliamentary finance committee, the prime minister assessed the precarious situation of the treasury: “The margin [-- 688 million francs --] was insufficient to provide for the end of the month [July] maturities, which absorb in general from 1.2 to 1.5 billion. The government had, however, at no time planned a new rise in the limit of the advances from the Bank of France. Convinced that the restored confidence of the public in the credit of the state would lead to a rapid amelioration of the treasury situation, and resolved on the other hand to obtain from parliament without delay the vote of all the taxes necessary to reestablish at once the balance between public revenue and expenditures, it [the government] decided that an exceptional and temporary advance should suffice the treasury.”⁶⁵ On July 30, Poincaré made arrangements with private banks to loan almost one billion francs to the state to carry the treasury over until the end of the month.

Poincaré’s program did not contain any radical new approaches to public finance. It was an orthodox plan, which emphasized the importance of a balanced budget. In order to achieve this equilibrium, the new cabinet proposed budget cuts and raising taxes, especially indirect ones. The tax law of 3 August clearly illustrates that the new government was

⁶³ J. O. C., Débats, 31 July 1926.

⁶⁴ Journal Officiel, Sénat, Débats parlementaires (hereinafter cited as J.O.S., Débats), 3 Aug. 1926.

⁶⁵ *Revue de Science et de Législation Financières*, 24 (1926): 674.

concerned with the fright the French taxpayers had displayed in their flight from the franc to foreign securities. This migration of capital was usually attributed to the unstable currency and the high taxation in France. The government took the approach of raising taxes which the taxpayer could not escape rather than impose taxes which theories of social justice might dictate. Poincaré proposed, therefore, to increase indirect taxes while actually lowering some direct ones. The argument behind this action was that France depended on the goodwill of the large taxpayers because they had the means to escape taxation more easily than everybody else. The new government assumed that lowering the rates for the highest brackets would actually lead to a return of capital that had been invested in other countries and was usually not mentioned on the income declarations in France.

The highest rate of the general income tax was cut from 60 percent to 30 percent. The rates for the inheritance and estate taxes were also cut, and at the same time they were made less steeply progressive. The annual transmission tax on securities was lowered by almost 40 percent, and tools that were designed to check the evasion of income from revenue resulting from investments such as the coupon bonds were abolished. The law included a provision that gave the government the authority to raise indirect taxes up to six times the pre-war levels, and decrees were soon issued increasing almost all these specific indirect taxes, for example on sugar and coffee, and many of the stamp taxes. The general sales tax was set at 2 percent for wholesale and retail, and it was extended to exports as well. Customs duties were raised, and to bring in the much-needed revenue for 1926, the wine tax was also heavily increased. Furthermore, postal rates were marked up, and more was taxed on automobiles. The advocates for higher direct taxation were able to amend the bill. Several lower brackets of the income tax rates were actually raised. Taxation on income from land and securities

went up from 12 to 18 percent; profits from businesses saw an increase from 10 to 15 percent; and taxes on labor, including wages, non-commercial income, and agricultural profits, were raised from 7.20 to 12 percent.⁶⁶ The law even included some form of a capital levy. It imposed a one-time tax of 7 percent on the first sale of real estate or of a business.⁶⁷ In addition, the law included several minor alterations to the tax system.

The bill was passed by the Chamber and the Senate in record time, but Socialists and Communists did voice their objections. The Socialist Vincent Auriol declared, for example, that the government was proposing “a policy which the country wishes no more,” and he criticized the indirect taxes “not only for the social injustices they bring but also for their economic consequences, for their repercussions on the cost of living, and likewise, on inflation.”⁶⁸ Auriol did admit that the income tax rate of 60 percent was too high, but he condemned the action of abolishing regulations that were supposed to prevent tax evasion. He spoke out in favor of more controls. Poincaré had, however, the winning argument to get the deputies to vote for the bill. “If the resources we ask of you are not voted on without delay, the state would be delayed in receiving 16 million francs a day, 660,000 francs an hour, and 11,000 francs per minute.”⁶⁹ The prime minister convinced the Chamber, and it finally approved a measure that was designed to deal with the financial problems that had plagued France since the end of the war.

Poincaré’s program went further than passing new taxes. By the law of 7 August and the constitutional law of 10 August, the Caisse d’Amortissement [Amortization Fund], which

⁶⁶ J. O. C., Débats, 31 July 1926.

⁶⁷ J. O. C., Débats, 31 July 1926.

⁶⁸ J. O. C., Débats, 31 July 1926.

⁶⁹ J. O. C., Débats, 31 July 1926.

the experts had proposed in their report on 3 July of the same year for the management of bonds, was established. The constitutional amendment was actually passed by a ceremonial joint session of both chambers at Versailles. This action removed the Bons de la Défense National and the Bons Ordinaires du Trésor from the treasury and placed them under the control of the autonomous Caisse d'Amortissement. To cover the interest payments for the securities, the *Caisse* was given control over the tobacco monopoly, which it was to manage and whose revenue would be at its disposal. In addition, the new institution would receive subventions from the general budget if needed and the revenues from the inheritance tax, estate tax, and the newly created 7 percent tax on the first sale of real estate and businesses. These taxes no longer appeared in the general budget, and the Caisse was set up as an independent entity operating outside of the budget.

The next problem was the Budget for 1927. In the two previous years, finance ministers had had to fight fierce battles to get their proposals through the Chamber.⁷⁰ When Poincaré introduced his bill on 27 July 1926, his primary aims were “the achievement of budgetary equilibrium, amortization of the public debt, and adoption of indispensable measures to attract or retain capital in our country.”⁷¹ Neither the Chamber nor the Senate dared to tamper much with Poincaré’s proposal, and the amendments were only small and insignificant. The budget benefited from the payments that Germany was now making under the provisions of the Dawes Plan, which since 1924 had revised reparations schedules. Poincaré’s major goal was to limit spending and to use some of the transfers from Germany to pay off loans other than the ones for which the Caisse was responsible. The premier strongly

⁷⁰ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 367-368.

⁷¹ J. O. C., Documents, Annexe 3248, Projet de loi, budget general de l'exercice 1927, 27 July 1926.

believed that his budget was on solid ground and that it was a further step towards monetary stabilization. He informed the deputies that “we [the government] have the firm intention henceforth to do away with any appeal to the Bank of France for the satisfaction of the needs of the state.”⁷² The deputies approved its final version on 18 December 1926 with 450 to 140 votes,⁷³ a French budget passed before the start of the fiscal year for the first time since 1923.

The governor of the Bank of France, Emile Moreau, was impressed with Poincaré’s actions. On 18 July 1926, he had concluded “that politics present a considerable obstacle to the financial recovery of France.”⁷⁴ On 1 August 1926, however, he noted in his diary that the prime minister was effective in convincing the deputies to pass the government’s proposals in a speedy manner. “A single session was sufficient for the Chamber to examine them. Poincaré’s masterly explanation from the rostrum contributed in no small way to this speed. He knows the language in which one must speak to the deputies.”⁷⁵ On 5 August, after the declaration by Poincaré that he could not “envisage stabilization until after a period of recovery of the franc” the British pound dropped to 165 francs.⁷⁶

The recovery of the French currency started immediately following the confirmation of the Poincaré government in July 1926. The franc began to regain value against the British pound and the American dollar. Compared to the British currency, the French gained 76.17 francs and registered at an exchange rate of 122.86 francs to one pound.⁷⁷ This rate was the

⁷² J. O. C., Documents, Annexe 3248, Projet de loi, budget general de l’exercice 1927, 27 July 1926.

⁷³ J. O. C., Débats, 18 December 1926.

⁷⁴ Moreau, *The Golden Franc*, 36.

⁷⁵ Moreau, *The Golden Franc*, 58.

⁷⁶ Moreau, *The Golden Franc*, 63.

⁷⁷ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 445.

best since December of the previous year. The U. S. dollar also lost value against the franc. In July, it took 40.95 francs to purchase one dollar, at the end of the year only 25.33.⁷⁸

Industrial production developed in a positive direction, its general index rising to an all-time high of 127 for 1926,⁷⁹ an increase of 16.67 percent over the previous year. The price index reached 718 in 1926, but fell significantly the following year to 630.⁸⁰ The year 1926 was the first one since the outbreak of the war that witnessed a budget surplus. The two years following the signing of the armistice had seen deficits of almost 27 billion for 1919 and over 17 billion for 1920; in 1926 the budget had a surplus of close to 1.1 billion francs.⁸¹

The economic situation in France became more and more favorable. The year 1927 was relatively quiet. The debates in the Chamber concerning financial policy were dominated by the consensus among the majority to follow Poincaré's leadership. On 7 April, the prime minister submitted his proposal for the budget of 1928. Like the previous one, it had the same goals in mind. The budget was passed by the Chamber 392 to 125 on 11 December 1927,⁸² and the Senate followed suit the same month. The British pound and the American dollar stayed close to rates of December 1926 throughout 1927, clearly illustrating that Poincaré had achieved *de facto* stabilization only five months after he had taken office. The country was on the right track, but the *de jure* stabilization would not come until after the elections, which were to be held on 22 and 29 April 1928.

⁷⁸ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 445.

⁷⁹ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 465.

⁸⁰ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 495.

⁸¹ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 513.

⁸² J. O. C., *Débats*, 11 December 1927.

These elections confirmed the actions of the Poincaré cabinet. The parties of the center and the right saw their position strengthened, and the Left as a whole lost 36 seats; the Communists alone saw their number of deputies reduced from 28 to 12.⁸³ Poincaré had convinced the voters that financial success and stabilization had been achieved under his leadership. His cabinet of national union could continue its work with the participation of the Radicals, who stayed on for the time being.

On 21 June 1928, Poincaré gave a speech before the Chamber reviewing his financial policy of the past two years:

We avoided violent remedies. We sought to reestablish budgetary equilibrium by voting indispensable taxes. We organized a rational and steady amortization of our floating debt. At home we reassured bondholders. Abroad we faced up to our obligations. We find ourselves, yesterday and today, in a position to pay, thanks to the steady execution of the Dawes Plan. One of the principle causes of the depreciation of the franc, Gentlemen, was the enormous advances that the state had to ask of the Bank of France. We applied ourselves to repay them, not at once, but little by little, and in less than two years we have almost completely succeeded. We have redeemed our floating debt and have successfully cancelled all short-term National Defense bonds...[we] have returned to the treasury the elasticity which had been completely lacking for several years.⁸⁴

The time had come to make the stabilization of the French currency official; the “Monetary Law” was passed on 24 June 1928. The governor of the Bank of France noted enthusiastically in his diary: “We are experiencing a historic day. We are crowning the financial and monetary reconstruction of the past two years. We are restoring a healthy currency to France and are remedying, as far as possible, the damages caused by the war and postwar periods.”⁸⁵ The Chamber voted 452 to 18,⁸⁶ the Senate unanimously. The law placed

⁸³ Brogan, *Modern France*, 2: 597.

⁸⁴ J. O. C., *Débats*, 21 June 1928.

⁸⁵ Moreau, *The Golden Franc*, 519.

the French currency back on the gold standard and established its convertibility at 65.5 milligrams of gold (900 thousandths fine). The franc was therefore fixed at one-fifth of its prewar value, but the experience of the years since the end of the war and the roller coaster ride the French population had to endure made this stabilization a success. Emile Moreau commented the following day, “stabilization is accomplished. The new franc is born.”⁸⁷ The ten years since the end of the war had convinced the French that they were lucky to have a stable currency even if it was only worth 20 percent of its prewar value.

The country had solved its financial problems, and France had been set on the right track. Yet this stabilization contributed to the dissolution of Poincaré’s cabinet of national union because such unity was no longer necessary. A rift between the Radicals and Poincaré occurred later in the year. The proposed 1929 budget provided funds for certain Catholic missionary groups, a provision that enraged the traditionally anticlerical Radicals. Their party congress, which was held at Angers in October 1928, attacked the government vehemently, and the delegates adopted a resolution forcing the Radical ministers to resign their posts.⁸⁸ They followed the orders of their party on 6 November 1928.

André Tardieu had proven to be an effective minister and had impressed many of his countrymen, especially with his involvement in the rebuilding of the devastated region. When the Radicals left the cabinet, he was offered the ministry of the interior. He accepted this post despite the warnings of his good friend Henry Moysset, who saw in Tardieu “the quality of a statesmen,” who could move beyond “the traditional division between left and right” and

⁸⁶ J. O. C., *Débats*, 24 June 1928.

⁸⁷ Moreau, *The Golden Franc*, 520.

⁸⁸ François Goguel, *La politique des parties sous la IIIe République* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1958), 249.

“build a modern France.”⁸⁹ The Radicals had held the office of minister of the interior since the beginning of the century, and Moysset cautioned Tardieu that the party might never forgive him if he were the one who preempted them from this position. Moysset feared that Tardieu would be classified by the Radical party as a member of the reactionary right if he accepted Poincaré’s offer.⁹⁰

Poincaré continued his policies of a balanced budget and orthodox money management, and his budget proposal for 1929 was passed on 31 December 1928. It would become the third budget since the end of the war to generate a surplus. Poincaré resigned in July 1929 because of his poor health. Aristide Briand took over and kept Tardieu as minister of the interior. The Briand cabinet lasted only until 22 October, and two weeks later, André Tardieu was confirmed as his successor.

The new premier took office during a period of economic growth. The stabilization of the franc had not impaired French exports because the currency was still slightly undervalued. The general index for industrial production reached 139.5 in 1929 after 127 for the previous year.⁹¹ The price index, which had stood at 630 in 1927 and at 634 in 1928, actually fell to 623 in 1929.⁹² Nevertheless, through his tenure as minister of public works and for the liberated regions, Tardieu was well aware that the country had fallen behind other industrial nations in the development of infrastructure. From 1924 to 1927, when the shortage of capital was most acutely felt, numerous undertakings for the electrification of railways, the

⁸⁹ Monique Clague, “Vision and Myopia in the New Politics of André Tardieu,” *French Historical Studies* 8 (Spring 1973): 105.

⁹⁰ Clague, “Vision and Myopia,” 105.

⁹¹ Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 465.

⁹² Sauvy, *Histoire économique*, 1: 495.

amelioration of ports, and other public work projects had to be stopped. Only the most pressing projects for public improvements were carried out during this period; others had to wait until the budget began to show adequate surpluses.

In Tardieu's opinion this time had come. His proposal for national retooling came out of his conviction that France lagged behind other industrial nations. He viewed the accomplishment of repairing the damage from the war as only the first step. His program was designed to improve and modernize the country. It included many features that would later be part of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal in the United States. National retooling meant the mechanization of agriculture and providing the infrastructure needed for the modernization of industry such as the construction of dams for hydroelectric power and improving the transportation networks, including roads, harbors, and waterways. The plan called for the construction of schools, hospitals, and research laboratories, for reforestation, and for the equipment of rural communities with railroad and telephone service, and with electricity and clean drinking water. National retooling was a program of public works which was supposed to improve the quality of life for everybody and provide the necessary infrastructure for the development of a modern industry.

Although the program, which was formally introduced on 25 November 1929, seemed to be straightforward and based on solid funding, it would never come up for a vote in the Chamber. Fighting for its passage was one of the most frustrating experiences of Tardieu's premiership. A consensus among the deputies could not be reached on this issue, and every major opposition group came up with its own idea for retooling the nation. The Chamber was divided, and the Radicals, Socialists, and Communists were unwilling to give André Tardieu the chance to create a legacy as the modernizer of the French economy and infrastructure.

The effects of Poincaré's association with saving the franc on the elections of 1928 were still too fresh in the memories of the deputies of the Left, and they did not plan to give Tardieu the same power. Tardieu's failure can be explained by examining the composition of his majority as well as by an inquiry into his personality. The next chapter will examine the latter.

CHAPTER 3: TARDIEU'S CAREER

Parisians, it has often been remarked, are different from other Frenchmen. They grow up in a city where history looks down upon them from the grand majestic buildings. They are said to have a combative nature and a complex of superiority over the people from the provinces. "The greatness of France must appear to a young Parisian like a family possession"¹ because it is always around. It can be seen in the boulevards, the statues, and the buildings. Paris is the economic, cultural, and political capital of France. All these factors contribute to the chauvinism of the *homo parisiensis*.

André Pierre Gabriel Amédée Tardieu was such a *homo parisiensis*. He was born there on 22 September 1876. The roots of his family in the capital went as far back as the seventeenth century. The traditional professions of the Tardieus were in the field of the arts. Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries they made a name for themselves as painters and engravers. Several of André Tardieu's ancestors belonged to the Royal Academy of Fine Arts. His grandfather, Amédée, was a barrister, who took a position in the foreign service. He married Charlotte d'Arpentigny de Malleville, who was known for her musical talent. They had two sons, Jacques and André Louis Amédée. The latter studied law and married Marguerite Blot in 1876. Their first child was born in the same year, and according to bourgeois tradition, it got the first name of the father, André. Elisabeth, André's sister, was born one year later.

The young Tardieu grew up in privileged surroundings. He was part of a well-established upper-middle-class family whose members were proud of their republican tradition. According to André Tardieu, the family actually held a grudge against his great uncle Ambroise because he had been the physician of Napoleon III during the Second

¹ Louis Albert, ed. *André Tardieu* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1957), ix.

Empire.² Tardieu's family supported the Third Republic wholeheartedly and had been in favor of its two predecessors as well. Despite frequent criticism about his convictions, the later politician always stayed true to the republican idea. Tardieu did attempt to change some aspects of the French system, but he never abandoned the basic principles of republicanism, which were passed on to him through his father and his grandfather.

André Tardieu started his formal education in 1888 when his father enrolled him in the Lycée Condorcet. The future premier was an outstanding student who early on displayed his curiosity, his thirst for facts, and also his wit. Anatole de Monzie, a classmate and later a colleague in the Chamber of Deputies, recalled that one of the teachers was annoyed by Tardieu's excessive and detailed knowledge. He asked him about the hair color of Alexander the Great. André replied, "the hair of Alexander the Great was green, Monsieur, because it was made out of laurels."³

One year after Tardieu started school, he had his first political emotion. It occurred when Georges Boulanger, the revanchist general and threat to the Republic, ran for the Chamber of Deputies in a by-election in Paris. This attempt to become a deputy from Paris, the center of republicanism, was a test to gauge the political strength of the general. The republican candidate was a workman called Edouard Jacques. "My father's and my grandfather's enthusiasm for this Jacques, whom I did not even know, astonished my childish mind,"⁴ recalled Tardieu later. Jacques was a Radical-Socialist who had taken part in the Revolution of 1848 and who had been serving as president of the General Council of the

² Rudolph Binion, *Defeated Leaders: The political Fate of Caillaux, Jouvenel, and Tardieu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), 198.

³ Michel Junot, *André Tardieu: Le Mirobolant* (Paris: Editions Denoel, 1996), 15.

⁴ André Tardieu, *La Révolution à refaire* (2 vols., Paris: Flammarion, 1936), I, 10.

Seine since 1887. Boulanger won, and Tardieu wrote that “in the evening everyone was sad at home, including me.”⁵

In school, André Tardieu’s story was one of success. He won the award for best student seven years in a row. He also fared well in nationwide contests, often representing his *lycée*. In 1892, he took home the first prizes for history, for French composition, and for translation into Latin. In the following year, he repeated his success in these three fields and added geography to the list. In 1884, he won for French composition and for history. In his last year at the *lycée*, Tardieu had the honor to represent his school in a national intercollegiate scholastic tournament, the Concours général des lycées et collèges de France. The results of the competition were announced on 30 July 1895. André Tardieu won for translation into Latin, Latin composition, translation into Greek, and French composition. The man who handed him his medals was the minister of national education, Raymond Poincaré. It was the first time their paths crossed, and it certainly would not be the last. Neither of them could know that they would become both adversaries and collaborators in the future and that eventually Tardieu would be the person who would fit the title of Poincaré’s successor the closest.

Following his graduation, Tardieu was accepted to the Ecole normale supérieure and the Faculty of Letters. He attended the first for less than a month before enlisting in the army. An unfortunate accident which left Tardieu with a broken shoulder ended his military career for the moment, and he enrolled into the Faculty of Law and Letters, from which he graduated with a degree in letters one year later.

⁵ Tardieu, *Révolution*, I, 10.

At this point it was unclear in which direction Tardieu's path would lead him. Family connections opened the doors for the prodigy into the diplomatic service of his country. His first position brought him to Berlin in the fall of 1897 as the attaché to the French ambassador, the Marquis de Noailles, a personal friend of his grandfather. It was Tardieu's task to take care of the diplomatic correspondence, but he also used his stay in the German capital to learn the language, in which he was fluent by the time he left in the spring of 1898. After a short stay in the foreign ministry, he became the political secretary of the new premier, René Waldeck- Rousseau, in June 1899. Once again, family connections had made this advancement possible: Waldeck-Rousseau was an old friend of André's father, and the nephew of the prime minister was engaged to Tardieu's sister.⁶

Along with his move into administration, Tardieu began to make a name for himself as a journalist. In 1901, he started writing for *Le Figaro*, one of France's most widely-read dailies, concerning himself primarily with international affairs. He found a hero in the American Theodore Roosevelt, who was then vice president of the United States. On 3 December 1902, he wrote about the up-and-coming politician in these terms: "he has a clear passion for the national interest [and] the spirit of national union, which is superior to the battles between parties and makes the people stronger in their convictions."⁷ Tardieu's friend Michel Misoffé argues that those lines of the young journalist are illuminating. They preview the guidelines the later statesman Tardieu would use to conduct his own policies.⁸

⁶ Binion, *Defeated Leaders*, 201.

⁷ *Le Figaro*, 3 December 1902.

⁸ Michel Misoffé, *La Vie volontaire d'André Tardieu* (Paris: Editions des Portiques, 1930), 28.

Only two years after he started at *Le Figaro*, André Tardieu ended his collaboration abruptly because the editor, Gaston Calmette, claimed his articles were too opinionated. Only two months later, Tardieu was hired by *Le Temps*. Although it had a relatively small circulation, this newspaper was the most influential publication in France, if not in Europe. “Hotels abroad served it with breakfast; statesmen and scholars cited it for authority; loans failed on the Bourse if they did not have its backing.”⁹

At first, Tardieu covered a variety of issues, but he felt the most comfortable with diplomatic news and became an expert on the Orient because that was the area the foreign editor usually did not cover himself. The knowledge he gathered through his work at *Le Temps* was the basis for Tardieu’s first book, *Questions diplomatiques de l’année 1904*. After the foreign news editor resigned in January 1905, Tardieu accepted the offer to take over this position. He immediately reorganized *Le Temps*’s net of correspondents into a force only slightly short of an espionage service. He also restructured the archives of the paper, making it a valuable reference library. Through his work for *Le Temps*, Tardieu became a power with which to be reckoned. His influence and prestige grew immensely, and he enjoyed his new position and took advantage of it. Later in his life, Tardieu described the work at this newspaper: “Under the affectionate sway of Adrien Hébrard [the editor], *Le Temps* was an irresistible outfit. All of its musty walls extended an atmosphere of liberal parliamentary tradition. I was able to wage the roughest of campaigns without anyone ever bothering or restraining me.”¹⁰

⁹ Binion, *Defeated Leaders*, 203.

¹⁰ Tardieu, *Révolution*, I, 11.

Tardieu's editorials were widely read, and he slowly gained more and more power over the foreign policy of France. One of the secretaries at *Le Temps* noted that Tardieu usually arrived at the office around 11:30 in the morning after having visited the French foreign ministry, the Quai d'Orsay, where he was usually received either by the minister himself or by one of the high-ranking directors.¹¹ His connections at the ministry gave Tardieu access to information that was unavailable to other journalists, and discussions with the officials gave him further insights and credibility. After returning from the Quai d'Orsay, Tardieu went to work on his editorial, which he wrote by hand and never revised after putting it down on paper. His articles were well researched; they always included a historical reference; they were short and to the point. Tardieu was not overly concerned with details, instead concentrating on the major issues involved. He was able to structure his analysis in a manner that made it accessible to general readers, and he always offered his own solutions to solve the problems at hand.

Tardieu's editorials concerning the issues leading up to and surrounding the diplomatic negotiations about Morocco, which opened in Algeciras on 16 January 1906 were especially noted. He became an expert on the subject and in the following year made it the subject of his second book, *La Conférence d'Algésiras*. The German chancellor, Bernhard von Bülow, remarked on Tardieu's role in international politics, "there are six great powers in Europe and a seventh, André Tardieu."¹² André Siegfried, the French political analyst and author, wrote about Tardieu, "he wields more power than a foreign minister."¹³

¹¹ Junot, *André Tardieu*, 31.

¹² Junot, *André Tardieu*, 38.

¹³ Binion, *Defeated Leaders*, 242.

In 1908, André Tardieu visited the United States of America for seven weeks. He gave lectures at Harvard University on French foreign policy and then went traveling to study the country. Out of his experience came a third book, *Notes sur les Etats-Unis*, which was published the same year. A mere seven weeks in America gave Tardieu enough material to comment on various issues. He was especially impressed with the American form of government. He provided a brief portrait of now President Theodore Roosevelt, whom he described as the perfect combination of optimism, action, and character.¹⁴ Tardieu also admired the clear separation of powers and the strong position of the American president, so different from the ceremonial function of the French president. He wrote: “The right of the chief of state to have a personality is one of the most striking traits of American democracy, and one we ought to envy. By a degree of fate our history has confused the fight for the Republic with the fight against personal power. There is nothing to prove the two terms inconsistent.”¹⁵ He went on to single out what he considered the weakness of the French parliamentary system: “We have humiliated the executive power in the face of the legislative power; we cannot go on this way with impunity. Our Republic has become a body without a head, and in France the headless never last long.”¹⁶

André Tardieu did not, however, limit himself to covering political differences between the United States and France. He felt competent to address art forms as well. One example is his invidious comparison of American musical comedies to those in France, remarks by which this opera lover displayed a certain arrogance:

¹⁴ Tardieu, *Notes sur les Etats-Unis* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1908), 102-103.

¹⁵ Tardieu, *Notes sur les Etats-Unis*, 205.

¹⁶ Tardieu, *Notes sur les Etats-Unis*, 207.

Take an average French vaudeville show. Subtract whatever appeal, in the absence of psychological interest, an ingenious and well-knit plot may have. Mix it up thoroughly by working half a dozen irrelevant adventures into the main sequence of events. Imagine that the actors are all acrobats and that on any pretext, or even without pretext, they start turning somersaults, leaping out of windows, or dancing jigs. Flavor the foregoing with songs also having nothing to do with the subject.¹⁷

At home, Tardieu's influence was still growing. In October 1909, the foreign minister, Stéphen Pichon, authorized Tardieu to negotiate a new treaty for a final settlement with Germany concerning Morocco. In December, he and Baron Oscar von Lancken, the German chargé d'affaires in Paris, prepared a draft for such an agreement. It provided that the French state recognize the economic interests of Germany in the region and that it would not move to impede them. Germany acknowledged that France had special political interests in addition to economic ones and that it therefore had the right to take steps towards the consolidation of internal peace and order in Morocco. The treaty practically gave France the blessing of Germany to govern Morocco as long as Germany's business ventures would not be hindered. The treaty further implied that the creation of joint-ventures between the two countries was desirable. The foreign ministers of both countries were satisfied with the draft.

While the German government was still considering the treaty, negotiations were under way for giving Germany something in return for its concessions in Morocco. Officials of the Reich raised the question of a merger between the French company N'Goko Sangha, which had the exclusive rights to commercial activity in the French Congo, and the German Südkamerun Company, which operated in the German possession. As an advisor of N'Goko Sangha, Tardieu started negotiations with the German Südkamerun Company, which was represented by von Lancken, to form a consortium. N'Goko Sangha argued that because the company was giving up some of its rights in order to ensure the conclusion of the treaty

¹⁷ Tardieu, *Notes sur les Etats-Unis*, 81.

between France and Germany, it should receive a monetary compensation from the French government. At first, several French officials, including Pichon and the minister of colonies, Georges Trouillot, supported such a payment.

Obviously, Tardieu would have earned a fee as the advisor for N’Goko Sangha if the indemnity were to be paid. Slowly, some members of the Chamber of Deputies became suspicious of the role of Tardieu had played in the negotiations of the treaty, his part as advisor for the company, and his position as foreign editor of *Le Temps*, who was continually pushing for a settlement concerning N’Goko Sangha. Tardieu observed:

It all began by murmurs, by discreet allusions, whispered on the sly. There was a scandal to be broken. Private interests had pillaged the Treasury. Corrupting gold was flowing. Only stalwart virtue could resist. No details – there was no hurry. The affair ripened in a haze of equivocation. Responsible ministers felt bearing down on them the unanimous suspicion of the men who did not themselves know, but who knew the men who knew. The foreign affairs committee groveled under reprobation. Deputies would point to the meeting room of the budget committee, where behind closed doors the conspirators were sharpening their knives, and in hushed voices they would say: Momentous things are going on in there!¹⁸

The budget committee of the Chamber did indeed hold hearings about the indemnity issue, and Tardieu appeared before it to defend the plan of a payment, stating that the company was doing the country a favor in signing away many of its rights because the merger of the two companies would make Germany more accepting of France’s dominance in Morocco. Therefore, Tardieu argued, N’Goko Sangha, deserved compensation. Several ministers spoke out against it, and in the end, after recognizing that there was no majority for an indemnity, even the foreign minister, Pichon, abandoned the idea of compensating N’Goko Sangha. Up to this point, Pichon had been the closest person to Tardieu in the government. The two had consulted throughout Pichon’s tenure at the Quai d’Orsay. Tardieu had always

¹⁸ Tardieu, *Le mystère d’Agadir* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1912), 328-329.

supported the minister publicly, but now that Pichon had abandoned Tardieu, Pichon felt the repercussions immediately. He could actually read them in *Le Temps* because Tardieu wasted no time. He reexamined his attitude towards the government's foreign policy and on 31 January 1911, published a harshly critical editorial concerning the separate negotiations of France and Great Britain with Germany about Turkish railways. His main concern was the fact that the Entente powers were not working together in those negotiations and that each country conferred with Germany on its own. He viewed this division as a fatal mistake for the French government, which, according to Tardieu, had missed an important opportunity to strengthen ties with France's most important ally. He wrote:

If the Franco-Russian alliance on the one hand and the Franco-British Entente on the other have not been broken or even relaxed, where does the impression come from that they have? From this, in our opinion: that these combinations, even though they have lasted, have in two years proven almost utterly sterile. They exist, but it is as if they did not exist. They are praised, but they are not used. They are a pretext for compliments, not a basis for action. They lie idle in the archives. They have passed the age of fecundity; they no longer create. From within their majestic frames, a picture of ataxia meets our astonished glances. In the face of an active Triple Alliance, we have a dormant Triple Entente. Peace is not threatened, to be sure. France is not isolated, certainly. But in the bosom of peace, in the heart of our alliances, of our ententes, of our friendships, we are not sowing, and tomorrow's harvests will not fill our granaries.¹⁹

Here was a serious denunciation of the government's foreign policy. Tardieu accused the foreign ministry of being inactive and missing important opportunities for strengthening relations with Russia and England. Especially at a time when war with Germany seemed increasingly inevitable, the neglect of consulting within the alliance seemed dangerous. Tardieu's charge did not go by unnoticed. During a debate in the Senate on foreign policy on 3 February, Gustave de Lamarzelle, a senator from the Right, informed his audience:

¹⁹ *Le Temps*, 31 January 1911.

The day before yesterday, after leaving the Chamber, I had the good fortune to find the newspaper *Le Temps* at home. It contained an article, unsigned to be sure, but whose author we all know – he has with you, and in all parties undisputed authority, which is all the greater in the present debate since Monsieur Tardieu, I might as well name him, is an optimist, a man who has consistently supported the policy of the foreign minister.²⁰

Lamarzelle went on to read the whole article, and Pichon could reply only the following:

Monsieur de Lamarzelle brought up an article from the newspaper *Le Temps*. One week ago the author of this article found our foreign policy perfect. Then, suddenly, he declared that nothing was right with it any longer. I do not know, I do not care to know, what might have determined such a rapid turnaround.²¹

At this point Lamarzelle interrupted with the cryptic rejoinder, “you certainly know better than we do.”²²

This episode illustrates that Tardieu was a powerful ally to have but that he demanded support without reservation. Once crossed, he became an enemy. Tardieu began to criticize France’s foreign policy right after the foreign minister had turned against him on one issue. Apparently, Tardieu was less concerned with his own credibility than with inflicting harm on Pichon, for Tardieu’s new attitude was a radical departure from his previous writings.

The article of 31 January was not only a reaction to the events surrounding N’Goko Sangha but also a report on consultations about railroad construction in the Ottoman Empire. The project was supposed to be a joint-venture among Great Britain, Germany, France, and Turkey. For the line between Homs and Bagdad, Bernard Maimon, a British citizen with ties in the administration of the Ottoman Empire, envisioned cooperation between a British and a French group of investors. Maimon approached Tardieu and asked him to head the French

²⁰ J.O.S., Débats, 3 February 1911.

²¹ J.O.S., Débats, 3 February 1911.

²² J.O.S., Débats, 3 February 1911.

group because of his connections in the Quai d'Orsay. Pichon was sympathetic to Maimon's plan, but the French diplomat Paul Cambon, who conducted the official negotiations, saw the project more as a French one than as a joint-venture, and because of this attitude the British supported it only halfheartedly. In the end, a compromise was made, but all parties involved were disillusioned by this time. Tardieu was especially dissatisfied with the lack of support he received from Pichon. In one of his articles aimed against Pichon in February 1911, Tardieu used information from secret proposals made by the French ambassador to the Ottoman Empire. Only a few days later, Maimon and one of his associates who worked as an attaché of the Quai d'Orsay were charged with theft of confidential documents from the foreign ministry. Maimon was later apprehended and sent to prison for two years. Tardieu was never officially accused of any wrongdoing, but his name was connected to the affair, especially because it seemed that he once again used his political connections and his position as a journalist to further personal business interests.

The political effect of these two episodes, N'Goko Sangha and the construction of the Homs-Bagdad railroad line, was to make Tardieu many enemies on the Left. In their eyes, Tardieu was working for his own benefit, with his agenda more important to him than that of the government. The great leader of the French Socialist party, Jean Jaurès, spoke out against him in broken sentences from the podium of the Chamber on 8 October 1912:

Gentlemen, it is a serious matter if a man having at his disposal day by day as a mouthpiece in the international realm a newspaper that has held the greatest sway in chancelleries for the longest time; it is a serious matter and a sad thing if this man, whose displeasure ministries all too often dread, should have been able, for reasons, for pretext of national interest, to attempt to put over business deals in which he and his friends were personally involved. And what turmoil in our diplomacy, what confusion, what wavering, what discredit for our diplomacy abroad when the rest of the world has observed that it is in deals of this sort that official diplomacy darkly winds up. I do not mean to call into question on this point the personal responsibility of Tardieu [on Maimon's theft], for I do not want to go beyond proven fact. Monsieur

Maimon was in the affair the correspondent, the negotiator, the partner of Monsieur Tardieu, and it was for him that the agent stole documents from the Quai d'Orsay, which were then commented on in the newspaper *Le Temps*. The role played during the Pichon ministry by a great journalist of *Le Temps*, Monsieur Tardieu, in all of these affairs, in all of these deals, will prove one of the greatest causes for astonishment and for shame in the history of France.²³

Despite this open accusation, no formal charges were ever brought against André Tardieu. His career continued to flourish, although he had certainly made enemies who would not forget the events surrounding N'Goko Sangha and Homs-Bagdad. In the period during which the affairs unfolded, Tardieu stayed on as editor of foreign affairs for *Le Temps* and added several other positions to his workload. He held the position of deputy inspector for the ministry of the interior. This job included traveling to the various departments of France and assessing the administration there. In 1909, he became a professor of diplomatic history at the Ecole des sciences politiques. In 1911, he added a professorship for diplomatic history at the Ecole de guerre. He also worked as foreign editor for *Le Petit Parisien* and as a daily columnist for *La Patrie*, in Bordeaux. Tardieu was a frequent lecturer, published a book each year, and wrote for other domestic and foreign newspapers. In 1913, he was promoted to general inspector for the ministry of the interior and was made an officer in the Legion of Honor.

The scandals impeded Tardieu's career not at all. His connections obviously prevented him from being dragged into the allegations. It is safe to say that the people in power protected Tardieu because they believed he had information to hurt them as well. No high official dared to touch him because they were afraid that if he were to fall, he might take them with him. Although Tardieu had no official function in the highest echelons of France's government at this time, he was a powerful man who was willing to use his resources to make

²³ J.O.C., Débats, 8 March 1912.

or break people. His opponents were clearly disgusted with the amount of influence the journalist of *Le Temps* had and how he took advantage of it shamelessly. Many deputies from the Left started to distrust Tardieu because there was an air of intrigue and backroom diplomacy around him. The fact that a man could overcome two serious scandals without any harm made him even more suspicious. Instead of going downhill, Tardieu's career seemed to have accelerated after N'Goko Sangha and Homs-Bagdad.

In 1914, he ran for a seat in the Chamber of Deputies for the district of Versailles, a conservative bastion. His main opponents were a Radical-Socialist and an anarchist, neither with much chance. Tardieu did not run for a certain party or with a thought-out platform; as customary for candidates of the Right, he relied on his name rather than that of a party. Conservatives usually based their campaigns on their status as a notable. During the first week of sessions in the newly elected legislature, Tardieu broke one of the golden rules of French parliamentary decorum when he refused to shake the hand of Jaurès. The experienced conservative deputy Albert de Mun told him, "you are wrong, *mon petit*. You are a deputy, you must adopt the manners of one."²⁴ Tardieu did not, however, have much time to adjust to the ways of conduct in the Chamber because the Great War began soon after he was elected.

Tardieu enlisted immediately and was given a position as lieutenant on the staffs of General Ferdinand Foch and of Commander-in Chief Joseph Joffre. Tardieu was mainly occupied with paperwork, but he asked Joffre, who quickly promoted him to the rank of captain, several times for a combat unit to command. As usual, Tardieu eventually got what he wanted: he was put in charge of an elite infantry company in 1915. He was delighted and

²⁴ Tardieu, *Révolution*, II, 109.

enjoyed this new experience. He later noted that he “got to know real people and [learned] how to talk to them, which was something I had not been taught at the Lycée Condorcet.”²⁵

In 1917, Raymond Poincaré, since 1913 president of the Republic, appointed Tardieu as high commissioner for France in the United States. Tardieu had, through his articles, just contributed to the fall of the Aristide Briand ministry and the new premier, Alexandre Ribot, had reason to be grateful but also weary of Tardieu. Ribot offered Tardieu this new position, which seemed especially suitable for him because he was known as an admirer of the United States and had just published a well-received “program of cooperation” in *Le Petit Parisien*, which enthusiastically welcomed America’s entry into the war. Once in Washington, it was Tardieu’s responsibility to coordinate the efforts of planning between the two countries now that the Americans had entered the war, and in addition, he had to raise money from private organizations and secure loans from the American government and banking institutions. After the war was over, Tardieu returned to France where Premier Georges Clemenceau recruited him for the planning of the peace conference and later made him an official member of the French delegation. The two had become close during the last year of the war as Clemenceau had relied on Tardieu’s help in dealing with the Americans. In June 1918, he made Tardieu the general commissioner for Franco-American war cooperation. This appointment meant that Tardieu was now also responsible for the relations with American troops on French soil. By the time the war ended, Tardieu was one of the most experienced French officials when it came to dealing with the Americans. Clemenceau recognized this ability and decided to use it, especially because U.S. President Woodrow Wilson announced that he would attend the peace conference personally. During the negotiation, Tardieu and

²⁵ Tardieu, *Révolution*, I, 13.

Clemenceau grew even closer, and the premier left most of the details and the drafting of the agreements to his younger friend.

Tardieu became the confidant of Clemenceau during the negotiation of the treaty. He was the most important Frenchmen after the “Tiger” at the Paris conference. On 6 November 1919, Clemenceau created a new ministry for the liberated regions of Alsace and Lorraine, and Tardieu accepted the offer to head the new department. He was also reelected to the Chamber in the general elections of 1919. The new parliament came to be called the Chamber of the Blue Horizon because it consisted of so many veterans who wore the blue uniform of the French army. This new parliament rejected Clemenceau when the time in January 1920 came to elect a successor to President Poincaré. Clemenceau lost to the uncontroversial yet dull Paul Deschanel in a preliminary unofficial ballot, Clemenceau’s authoritative style and his strong personality having given many of the deputies and senators reason to believe that he would transform the weak office of the presidency and continue to play an active part in policy-making for seven more years if elected. Clemenceau took the loss as a personal insult and refused to be nominated for the proper vote. One day after the formal election of Deschanel on 18 January 1920, he resigned and retired. Tardieu refused to stay on at his post as minister for the liberated regions under the new premier, Alexandre Millerand. Although the sixty-year-old Millerand had had an outstanding political career: elected to the Chamber of Deputies in 1885, minister of commerce under Waldeck-Rousseau from 1899 until 1902, minister of public works under Briand from 1909 until 1910, Poincaré’s minister of war in 1912, and after the war in 1919, Clemenceau’s administrator for the recovered regions of Alsace and Lorraine, Tardieu went into opposition.

Tardieu founded a new parliamentary group under the name *opposition clemenciste*, taking the name of his patron. He could have had a leading role in the conservative majority, but he could not forgive the Chamber for how it had treated Clemenceau and therefore preferred to wait. Two deputies, Edouard Ignace and Georges Mandel joined him. Mandel was born in 1885 and shortly after the turn of the century at the age of only seventeen started working as a journalist in Paris. Through this occupation he became acquainted with Clemenceau and despite the forty-four year age difference, the two became friends. In 1906, when Clemenceau was named minister of the interior, Mandel joined him as an under-secretary. Later the same year, Clemenceau became prime minister, and Mandel got a post as an aide to the cabinet. During the war, Mandel stayed in Paris and used his role as a journalist to criticize the various governments and to agitate for a return of Clemenceau to power. When Clemenceau became premier in November 1917, he made Mandel his chief of staff. Mandel played an essential role during this ministry and finally, after two failed attempts, was elected to the Chamber in 1919. Mandel was the person whose career was tied the closest to Clemenceau. He displayed his gratitude through complete loyalty that lasted until Clemenceau's death. Ignace was first elected a deputy in 1914. In 1917, Clemenceau made him an under-secretary for military justice. During his tenure, Ignace was mainly concerned with espionage issues within France. Tardieu, Mandel, and Ignace carried on the task of defending Clemenceau's policies and especially the peace treaty in the Chamber. Tardieu was convinced that the Chamber would eventually recognize his superiority and that he would emerge as the new leader, but the deputies resented Tardieu. Senator Jean Philip summed up the attitude towards him, "it was impossible to like so arrogant a man, who, instead of making you forget his unquestionable superiority, insolently and brazenly asserted it over you."²⁶

In the coming years, Tardieu defended the Treaty of Versailles vehemently in the Chamber. He made it his main task to speak out against any retreat from the final product of the Paris Peace Conference. Tardieu believed strongly that Germany had to pay for the destruction it had caused during the war. He launched his first attack on 22 July 1920, when Millerand defended his recent negotiations at Spa with Germany. Tardieu confronted the premier and told him, “I think that you, *monsieur le président du conseil*, have accepted some dramatic changes to the treaty.”²⁷ He made it clear that his group insisted the treaty be carried out without any amendments or compromises and that nobody who would depart from its principles would get his support.

In 1920, Millerand succeeded President Paul Deschanel, who had suffered a nervous breakdown and resigned from the office. Tardieu and Mandel supported Millerand’s bid for the highest office because they hoped the vacant position of premier would then fall in their hands. Instead, President Millerand called on Georges Leygues to succeed him as prime minister. Leygues was a respectable but undistinguished moderate republican who had served as minister several times. When he was overthrown only four months later, Millerand entrusted the formation of a new government to Aristide Briand, who based his majority partly on the Right and partly on the Center. Tardieu abstained from the first vote of confidence, but soon after became one of the most vocal opponents of Briand’s policies.

On 25 October 1921, Tardieu addressed the Chamber with his goal to alienate the Right from the government; Mandel had started this task on the previous day. Tardieu was successful in convincing some deputies from the Right to join his opposition, but the Center-Left Radicals, who had until then only given sporadic support, rallied behind Briand and

²⁶ John M. Sherwood, *Georges Mandel and the Third Republic* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970), 58.

²⁷ J.O.C., *Débats*, 22 July 1920.

ensured a comfortable majority for his cabinet. Edouard Herriot, their leader, explained the decision of many Radicals to support Briand. He acknowledged that his party expected little from the government, but that the vote for Briand was to prevent Tardieu and Mandel from getting into power.²⁸ Paul Cambon, the French diplomat, noted that Briand “had been saved by Tardieu and Mandel. In spite of their great talent, the chamber cannot tolerate either of them, and especially not Tardieu.”²⁹

At the end of 1921, the *clemencistes* adopted a new approach to get their point across and to continue the fight for strict enforcement of the Versailles Treaty. They extended their efforts to appeal to the general population and not only to the deputies. Clemenceau instructed Tardieu, “to draft a budget proposal for a newspaper, show it to [Georges] Wormser [one of Clemenceau’s oldest friends and collaborators], and then bring him to me so that I can talk to both of you about it.”³⁰ The Tiger wanted the newspaper to work against the abandonment of the treaty, but he also saw it as an excellent tool for Tardieu’s personal advantage. Clemenceau noted, “it is for him [Tardieu] that I am founding this newspaper.”³¹ In January 1922, the *Echo national* appeared in the midst of Briand’s consultations with Lloyd George at Cannes. On the front page it listed Georges Clemenceau as founder and André Tardieu as political director. The first issue repudiated French foreign policy since Clemenceau had left office. Claiming that the wrong men were now in charge, *Echo national*

²⁸ J.O.C., Débats, 26 October 1921.

²⁹ Paul Cambon, *Correspondance, 1870-1924* (3 vols., Paris: Editions Bernard Grasset, 1940), III, 398-99.

³⁰ Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, *Clemenceau* (Paris: Fayard, 1988), 881.

³¹ Duroselle, *Clemenceau*, 881.

asked its readers, “to establish the peace, did we have to call on those who almost lost the war?”³²

Clemenceau was delighted with the advent of the new publication. He wrote to a friend:

“Tardieu has thrown himself vigorously and courageously into the battle and clearly defined his position. If he continues along this line, he will be able to exercise great influence over the country, which seems to be waking up. We are well launched; it remains to be seen whether the unfortunate French people will follow us.”³³

Only a few days later, Briand resigned. The attack by Clemenceau and Tardieu had played a significant role. Millerand then charged Poincaré with the formation of a new government. Poincaré stood for a stronger stand than Briand against Germany, and although he did not view the Treaty of Versailles as a masterpiece, he saw the provisions it entailed as the minimum to which France was entitled and therefore he was expected to adhere to it and avoid further concessions. Poincaré offered cabinet posts to both Tardieu and the leader of the Radicals, Herriot, representing the furthest right and left he would go. Herriot refused, but three other Radicals accepted positions. Tardieu also turned Poincaré’s offer down, citing differences in opinion concerning domestic policies and the fact that Poincaré had supported the previous governments. Yet, Clemenceau informed Poincaré: “My friends and I have not taken a set position against you. If you take a firm stand towards Germany, and if you end the politics of abandonment and concessions, we will be the first ones at your service. But if you

³² “Notre but,” *Echo National*, 10 January 1922.

³³ Jean Jules Henri Mordacq, *Clemenceau au soir de sa vie, 1920-1929* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1933), 188.

continue the politics of Briand, which Tardieu called “the politics of an exhausted dog,” we are prepared to cause you difficulties.”³⁴

Although Poincaré did take a tougher stance in negotiations with Great Britain about enforcing the treaty and was less reconciliatory towards Germany, he failed to compel compliance. Tardieu soon started attacking him, and the young conservative deputy Paul Reynaud noted, “I was shocked by the systematic opposition of Tardieu and Mandel towards this [Poincaré’s] government.”³⁵ Reynaud was in fact actually an admirer of Tardieu; he noted: “The rising star in the parliamentary circle is Tardieu. Brilliant journalist of the Conference of Algésiras, former high commissioner of France in Washington during the war, principal writer of the Treaty of Versailles. He is the most brilliant man of his generation, clever and cynical.”³⁶ One reason for the violent attacks Mandel and Tardieu launched against Poincaré was the fact that they, as well as Clemenceau, believed that Poincaré had been one of the leading figures against Clemenceau’s bid for president in 1920.

When Poincaré occupied the Ruhr in 1923 in an effort to force Germany to pay agreed upon reparations, Tardieu’s criticism was not silenced. Finding much to complain regarding the operation, he attacked the premier frequently in *Echo national* and occasionally from the podium of the Chamber. During one debate, Tardieu accused Poincaré of conducting the campaign with hesitations and called it the turning point of treaty enforcement, as Verdun had been of the war: “After three years of weakness and retreat, I believe that the occupation of the Ruhr is a decisive moment in the history of the country. It is the Verdun of the peace; it

³⁴ Mordacq, *Clemenceau*, 181.

³⁵ Paul Reynaud, *Mémoires* (Paris: Flammarion, 1960), 158.

³⁶ Reynaud, *Mémoires*, 139.

cannot be repeated.”³⁷ In 1924, when talks were underway to end the Ruhr occupation, Tardieu opposed them. Far from advocating retreat, he argued for further advance. One British observer found that “he was prepared to take more vigorous action than the prime minister for the sake of obtaining a settlement.”³⁸ In the elections of 1924, the voters demonstrated what they thought of Tardieu’s politics – turning him out. Tardieu accepted his defeat, quit politics, and closed down *Echo national*.

Tardieu vanished from the political life until 1926, when friends urged him to seek a comeback through a by-election. He was intrigued by the district in Belfort that was proposed to him because it had traditionally been in the hands of the Radicals and a victory by him would be a sensation. Tardieu could not refuse this temptation. The campaign was perfect for him because unlike the proportional voting of the elections in 1924, this time it was a contest between two men. He had a clear opponent, and the Left rallied, seeking to prevent his being successful. In the end Tardieu was able to get a majority in the first round.

Upon returning to the Chamber, Tardieu continued his policy of attacking whoever was premier. Aristide Briand was again at the helm, and on several occasions Tardieu charged him with incompetence in dealing with the financial crisis in which the country found itself. After Briand resigned in July 1926, Poincaré, regarded as a financial expert, was called upon to form another ministry to solve the grave situation of the French currency. He offered Tardieu and three Radicals places in his cabinet. The Radicals accepted, and this time Tardieu did as well. The reconciliation with Poincaré inevitably meant the break with his patron Clemenceau, who commented: “This is what I can not understand, how men like

³⁷ Edouard Bonnefous, *Histoire politique de la Troisième République* (7 vols., Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1956-1967), III, 354.

³⁸ Sisley Huddleston, *Poincaré: A Biographical Portrait* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1924), 163.

Tardieu could accept to enter into his [Poincaré's] ministry. After all that happened between Poincaré and him, he should have declined.”³⁹ Tardieu was given charge of public works, the merchant fleet, and the liberated regions. He justified his decision by citing the great danger France found itself in at the time. He hoped that Clemenceau would understand his change of mind, but he misjudged this situation completely.

In the new government, Tardieu was a rising star. He performed well in his three areas of his responsibility, and his new attitude of cooperation did not go unnoticed. During the elections of 1928, in which Tardieu was reelected, the Center and the Right were able to expand their representation in the Chamber while the Radicals lost seats. The Radicals started reexamining their position in the Poincaré ministry, and eventually its three members resigned in late 1928. Tardieu had proven to be an effective minister and had impressed many of his countrymen, especially overseeing the completion of the rebuilding in the devastated regions. With the departure of the Radicals, he was offered the ministry of the interior. He accepted this post. The Radicals had held the office of minister of the interior since the beginning of the century, and at this point, Tardieu's friend Moysset cautioned him that the party might never forgive him if he were the one who preempted them from this position. Tardieu ignored the warning.

In 1929, Tardieu carried out a controversial action. He ordered the Paris prefect of police to place several Communists in preventive custody after the Communist party announced revolutionary demonstrations for 1 August 1929. One month later, Tardieu proudly declared that “the internal peace had been maintained for one year without a single

³⁹ Mordacq, *Clemenceau*, 110.

attempt of rebellion.”⁴⁰ His action concerning the Communists did not, however, make him any friends on the Left. It was not only the Communists who were alienated by the action of 1 August but also many Socialists.

After Poincaré retired in early 1929, Aristide Briand again became prime minister, and despite their hard feelings of the past, Tardieu stayed on as minister of the interior. When this cabinet lost its majority later in the year on 22 October, there followed a two-week-long interregnum. President Gaston Doumergue first called on the Radical Edouard Daladier to form a government. Daladier had been first elected as a deputy in 1919 and had served as minister for the colonies in the Herriot cabinet from 1924 to 1925. Daladier looked for a majority on the Left, but he failed despite the fact that Briand agreed to join him and Tardieu promised not to combat him. Then, Doumergue called on Etienne Clémentel, a former Radical, who had served as minister for the colonies (1905-1906), of agriculture (1913), of finances (1914, 1924-1925), and of commerce (1915-1920). Clémentel tried to find a majority in the Center. Briand accepted the offer to stay on at the Quai d’Orsay as minister for foreign affairs, and Tardieu agreed to take over the ministry of the navy, but Clémentel failed to find a majority.

On 1 November, after two failed efforts, Doumergue called on Tardieu to assemble a ministry. At this point, a majority based on the Center-Right was the only alternative because attempts to form one on the Left and on the Center had failed. Tardieu, the only politician who stood out among the conservatives, was the natural choice at this point. He started to build a cabinet and met with his ministers and undersecretaries on 6 November. The cabinet members exchanged their views on domestic and foreign policy, and

⁴⁰ Junot, *Tardieu*, 225.

Tardieu later announced that they had reached complete agreement on all the issues they had discussed.⁴¹ The press learned that the new cabinet intended to place an emphasis on “practical politics” that could be realized with the financial resources at hand.⁴²

Tardieu’s cabinet consisted of men from the Center and the Right. He invited the Radicals to join and even offered them the ministry of the interior, but they refused because they mistrusted him – he had always been their enemy – and because they did not want to be part of a cabinet which someone else controlled. Tardieu tried to include as many groups as possible because he did not want his government to be associated with any single party. Despite those efforts, the leftist newspaper *La République* urged the Radicals to “desert a reactionary majority.”⁴³

On 7 November, Tardieu, premier for the first time and retaining the ministry of the interior, stood at the podium in the Chamber of Deputies to give the declaration of his government. He focused first on the accomplishments of France since the end of the Great War. The reconstruction of the devastated regions was almost completed; the nation had a balanced budget; the currency had been stabilized; short-term debts had been consolidated; foreign debt was under control. Tardieu stated that renewal had to follow reconstruction and that his government was prepared “to guide the country on this march forward.”⁴⁴ He announced an initiative that would be “a decisive measure to accelerate the equipment of the nation.”⁴⁵ Tardieu told the deputies that such a program, which would run for a period of five

⁴¹ *Le Figaro*, 7 Nov. 1929.

⁴² *Le Figaro*, 7 Nov. 1929.

⁴³ *Le Figaro*, 7 Nov. 1929.

⁴⁴ J.O.C., Débats, 7 Nov. 1929.

years, could be carried out immediately because the financial resources were already available from the 1929 budget and a surplus from the treasury.

The deputies seemed to have been surprised by the proposal and were not sure how to react. The Socialist Alexandre Varenne noted that the budget was not as balanced as the government made it out to be, and the Communist Marcel Cachin called Tardieu and his policies “demagogic.”⁴⁶ Those comments illustrate the confusion the proposal caused on the Left. After all, for the leader of a Center-Right cabinet to propose a progressive program to accelerate social and economic development was unheard of in French politics. The declaration was received very positively in the conservative *Le Figaro*, André Chaumeix calling it a precise declaration with a practical program.⁴⁷ He also noted that while the idea of a program for national retooling might not be new to the deputies, it would certainly catch the interest of the public.⁴⁸

After long debate the Chamber voted the following day. The government received a majority of 79, 332 to 253.⁴⁹ *Le Figaro* described this majority as a “nice present, a pleasant surprise” for a cabinet that went through “a baptism of fire.”⁵⁰ The vote showed, however, an obvious polarization. Tardieu was able to get all the votes from the Right, most of the Center and the independents, but he could convince only 3 out of the 241 deputies of the Left parties

⁴⁵ J.O.C., Débats, 7 Nov. 1929.

⁴⁶ J.O.C., Débats, 7 Nov. 1929.

⁴⁷ *Le Figaro*, 8 Nov. 1929.

⁴⁸ *Le Figaro*, 8 Nov. 1929.

⁴⁹ J.O.C., Débats, 8 Nov. 1929.

⁵⁰ *Le Figaro*, 10 Nov. 1929.

to vote for him.⁵¹ This opposition of the Left would prove to be an obstacle for Tardieu's program of national retooling, and his majority would become smaller and smaller as time went on. In order to carry out necessary but controversial reforms, the government needed a much bigger initial basis of support because historically deputies were more likely to vote for a cabinet after a ministerial declaration than on specific issues. This slippage would be especially true for a government headed by Tardieu because he lacked the ability to unite people. As Eugen Weber trenchantly remarked, "Tardieu refused to suffer fools gladly - a fatal flaw in every politician."⁵² He polarized and was not willing to play the political game of give and take in order to convince deputies to side with him. Less than three months later, on 17 February 1930, the government lost a vote of confidence in the Chamber on an issue concerning the 1930 budget, falling short by five votes, 286 to 281.⁵³ Tardieu's fragile majority had disappeared almost overnight.

President Doumergue called on the Radical Camille Chautemps to form a new government. Chautemps was the son of a prominent family. His father, Emile, had served as a deputy for sixteen years and as a senator for thirteen. Emile Chautemps was also a member of two cabinets in 1895 and 1914, both of which lasted less than a year. Camille entered politics at the age of 34 in 1919, and had been minister of the interior and minister of justice between 1924 and 1926. On 25 February 1930, he delivered a short ministerial declaration to the Chamber. During the following debate, several Radicals criticized Tardieu for not accepting an offer from Chautemps to join the new government, especially because Tardieu

⁵¹ *Le Figaro*, 10 Nov. 1929.

⁵² Eugen Weber, *The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s* (W.W. Norton & Company, 1994), 117.

⁵³ J.O.C., *Débats*, 17 Feb. 1930.

had often complained of how the Radicals turned his offer down in 1929.⁵⁴ At the end of the day, Chautemps failed by eight votes to win confidence.⁵⁵ For the third time in five months, the Left had been unable to gain a majority for a government made up of men from its ranks. These defeats meant that the Center-Right Poincaré majority remained ascendant even though it sometimes failed to keep the cabinet from its own ranks in power. And so Tardieu got a second chance. His new cabinet was assembled on 2 March 1930, without the Radicals whom Tardieu invited to join.

During the debate following the declaration, Tardieu addressed the hostility of the Radicals, who had forced him “to ask for a vote of confidence forty-one times” during the seventy-five sessions of his first cabinet.⁵⁶ He reminded them that the elections of 1928 provided the possibility to form a majority without their party. He acknowledged that “[the Radical party] was naturally divided between two tendencies” because it was “an old bourgeois party,” but that it also “contained more advanced elements.”⁵⁷ “[They] always want to be at the center and the motor of every operation,” but “today the Radical-Socialists are not more than 115, they have to understand that 300 members can be gathered [in this Chamber] without their direction.”⁵⁸ As always, Tardieu was confrontational. Perhaps he recognized that no offer of friendship from him would be accepted. At the end of the day the cabinet asked for the confidence of the deputies and got a majority of 53, 316 to 263.⁵⁹ *Le*

⁵⁴ J.O.C., Débats, 25 Feb. 1930.

⁵⁵ J.O.C., Débats, 25 Feb. 1930.

⁵⁶ J.O.C., Débats, 5 March 1930.

⁵⁷ J.O.C., Débats, 5 March 1930.

⁵⁸ J.O.C., Débats, 5 March 1930.

Figaro commented that the Socialists and the Radicals had failed to carry out their revenge for 25 February 1930.⁶⁰

On 19 March 1930, at the gathering of the presidents of the *Chambres d'agriculture de France*, Tardieu spoke about the farmer-friendly policies his government had enacted. He named several different programs that were designed to help people in rural areas and noted that there would already be more money for the countryside if “the Chamber had adopted the program for national retooling, which was presented on 8 November and deposited on 25 November 1929. [But] after five months there has not even been a report by the finance committee.” He declared, “the politics I conduct are the politics of collaboration with all vital forces of the country.”⁶¹ This barb was clearly aimed at making the committee members present a report to the Chamber and at shaming the Radicals to work with the government instead of sabotaging it.

On 1 June 1930, Tardieu openly criticized the Radicals again during a speech he delivered at Dijon. The premier told his audience that he was following the policy of his two predecessors, Raymond Poincaré and Aristide Briand, in offering collaboration to all republican parties, but the Radicals refused to accept this invitation. He was, however, still willing to work with the Radicals “for the good of the country.”⁶² He also emphasized that the government had been able to accomplish a great deal, “of eleven big projects, nine have been approved. This is a result of which every government could be proud.”⁶³ Nevertheless,

⁵⁹ J.O.C., Débats, 5 March 1930.

⁶⁰ *Le Figaro*, 6 March 1930.

⁶¹ *Le Figaro*, 19 March 1930.

⁶² *Le Figaro*, 2 June 1930.

⁶³ *Le Figaro*, 2 June 1930.

the price, he said, had been very high. His government had had to debate every line and every word in its bills. Tardieu claimed that it was apparent that the Radicals were working against his politics, and not because they oppose the policies but “because of the composition of our majority.”⁶⁴

It was impossible for the Radicals to work with Tardieu because he had offended them too many times. He asked them to join his government both times and was deeply wounded when they refused to do so, but he himself had declined a position in the proposed Chautemps cabinet of February 1930. He was at master at making enemies not friends, and he overestimated the appeal of his offers. The Radicals were certainly aware that Tardieu was trying to carry out a program they had previously proposed and were not willing to let him have the credit for it, especially because he made it the cornerstone of his policies and advertised it vehemently. Tardieu had an air of arrogance about him, and the way in which he accused his opponents publicly did not help winning them over to his side. He probably made the most enemies during the time following Clemenceau’s retirement. The constant attacks in *Echo national* and from the podium on the majority in the Chamber were too much and alienated many deputies. Tardieu wanted to work above the division between Left and Right in the Chamber but he was the wrong person to do so because he was a polarizer. As the moderate deputy Henri Queuille put it, “Tardieu is a symbol, you are either for or against him.”⁶¹

⁶⁴ *Le Figaro*, 2 June 1930.

⁶¹ Junot, *Tardieu*, 254.

CHAPTER 4: TARDIEU AND THE CHAMBER

André Tardieu's first cabinet was confirmed on 8 November 1929. The cornerstone of his ministerial declaration on the previous day had been a program for national retooling. The reactions of the deputies to this proposal were mixed. As usual, the Chamber of Deputies split along party lines. The conservative Pierre Tattinger, founder of the *Jeunesses Patriotes* and the newspaper *Le National*, congratulated the government on the introduction of a clear, precise program that would move France towards "modern life." He also praised Tardieu as "a modern statesman."¹ Louis Delsol from the center defended the government and its policies. He stated that a moderate government was the only choice at this point because it was the only one that could carry out the reforms for which the country had long been waiting.²

Criticism came from the Socialist deputy of Toulouse, Albert Bedouce. He had doubts about the resources to finance the program and demanded more details about the origin of the money. The minister of finances, Henry Chéron, explained that 1.5 billion would come from a surplus of the 1929 budget, 1 billion from profits of the government's trade with foreign currencies, and the final 2.5 billion from an existing account at the Bank of France, which was at the minister of finances' disposal.³ Bedouce also contended that the financial resources specified for the program were insufficient for its purpose. The 1.5 billion the government proposed for ports, roads, channels, and electricity were not enough, according to Bedouce. The Chamber's finance committee had earlier estimated the amount needed for this portion of

¹ J.O.C., Débats, 8 Nov. 1929.

² J.O.C., Débats, 8 Nov. 1929.

³ J.O.C., Débats, 8 Nov. 1929.

the plan at 7 to 8 billion over a five-year period. Bedouce was also annoyed that Chéron now proposed 3.5 billion for social and economic development yet had refused to give the committee even 1 billion for that fifteen days earlier.⁴ When the vote on confirmation was taken, the government received a majority of 79, 332 to 253.

This chapter will provide both an examination of the composition and development of this majority and an inquiry into the methods used by the opposition to slow the process of the bill and prevent it from becoming law. It is, therefore, an attempt to explain Tardieu's failure and the problems of the French political system in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Tardieu's proposal for national retooling was supposed to enable the country to catch up with other European nations. By 1929, the economy had fully recovered from the war and surpassed the production levels of 1913. The devaluation of the franc actually played a major part in the fast recovery because it made French products more competitive against the ones from countries with stronger currencies, like Great Britain, in the international market.⁵ The majority of the French population lived a more prosperous life by the end of the 1920s than they had before the war. The quality of their lives was improving in the second half of the decade not only because of better economic conditions but also through an increase in leisure time and new technologies. Electricity, telephones, radios, and movie theaters became more widespread throughout France.⁶

On 25 November 1929, the formal bill was introduced, and in accordance with legislative procedure, sent to the finance committee.⁷ The text called for decisive action to

⁴ J.O.C., Débats, 8 Nov. 1929.

⁵ R.A.C. Parker, *Europe 1919-45* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1967), 165.

⁶ Weber, *Hollow Years*, 60-63.

⁷ J.O.C., Débats, 25 Nov. 1929.

accelerate the development of the nation in order to open up new possibilities to people regardless of their social standing. Tardieu emphasized the fact that for the first time since the Great War financial conditions allowed such an effort.⁸ The government had 5 billion francs available to devote. The goal of the program was to give the nation the tools necessary to become a more modern society. It was designed to spark economic, social, and intellectual development. The text continued that while resources for this program were available, the government had to be cautious because it did not want to initiate another financial or monetary crisis. The program had, thus, to go hand in hand with a conservative fiscal policy. Here was a chance to strengthen France's economy, social sector, and infrastructure, but the resources were not unlimited.⁹

The plan provided funds for three major areas: agriculture, social and educational improvements, and industry and commerce. Agriculture was one of the major recipients of funds because it was the foundation "of a balanced economic development in France."¹⁰ It would receive a total of 1.730 billion francs over the five-year period. Three hundred million would go to the electrification of the countryside because that progress would make life easier for the rural populations and would increase farm production. The bill contained 300 million to supply drinking water to households. One hundred twenty million would be used for the reforestation and the acquisition of forests, which were part of the plan because of the importance seen in soil conservation. Reforestation efforts would get 70 million, and 50 million would be used to purchase forests in order to preserve them in their natural state. The

⁸ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

⁹ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

¹⁰ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

government also planned to give 40 million to the Institute des Recherches Agronomiques and 15 million to the Institute National Agronomique for studies on how to intensify agriculture, on how to develop more disease-resistant species, and on how to mount more effective pest control. Thirty million were intended for better statistical research in the field of agriculture. The disaster relief fund for agricultural communities would receive 300 millions, and the same amount would go into the fund for the advancement of communes and departments. This fund already existed and provided money for projects in poor communities. Efforts to connect isolated mountain villages to the existing road system would receive 50 million, and 225 million would be invested in automated phone systems for the countryside. The bill also called for the creation of a radio network to connect the countryside to the cultural and intellectual centers of the nation. The amount of 50 million was reserved for this project.¹¹

The second part of the bill consisted of social and educational programs because, it argued, nothing could be accomplished by improving the material status of the people without simultaneously assuring their physical and intellectual welfare.¹² For this sector, the bill provided 1.450 billion francs. Four hundred million would be invested in the fight against tuberculosis because “more people die of this disease in France than in any other European country.”¹³ The money would be used for education about the causes of tuberculosis and to provide treatment beds. The bill called, additionally, for 300 million to construct new hospitals. Half a billion would be used to build new primary schools, which became necessary because of the movement of people to the cities and their suburbs. Part of the

¹¹ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

¹² J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

¹³ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

money would also go into the renovation of existing schools because many municipal governments did not have the money to carry out all the repairs. Secondary schools would receive new equipment, especially laboratories for scientific experiments, worth 170 million, and technical schools would receive 50 millions for new tools and other resources to prepare their students better for the job market. Thirty million were reserved for subventions and advances to be used in the construction of playing fields and stadiums.¹⁴

The biggest portion of the 5 billion was reserved for industry and commerce. The Tardieu cabinet reasoned that the growth of these two sectors would benefit the whole population and that it was the government's responsibility to provide adequate means of transportation and communication for domestic as well as international trade. The bill called for an investment of 1.820 billion in this sector.¹⁵ Six hundred million were intended for the expansion of the existing road and highway networks, and 200 million would be spent on fixing existing routes and making them safer. Out of this amount, 150 million would go to national highways, 50 million to departmental roads. The bill designated 100 million to maintain and improve the natural waterways and channels, and 600 million to upgrade maritime ports and guiding lights. The program singled out the ports of Dunkerque, Le Havre, Rouen, Bordeaux, and Marseille as needing the most immediate attention. Twenty-five million were assigned to improve conditions for the merchant marine and the maritime fishing industry, which would also have access to a 5-million-credit fund to modernize their equipment. The plan provided 200 million for the construction of hydraulic power plants and

¹⁴ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

¹⁵ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

power lines to distribute electrical energy. Thirty million were allocated for the national office for tourism because of its importance for the recreational industry.¹⁶

The government also suggested the establishment of a special account for the 5 billion total, to ensure that it would not be used for anything else and to remove it from the influence of any future budgets. The administration of the funds was also addressed: the money would be distributed by the various ministries, which would in turn be responsible to supply reports to the minister of finances on how it was spent.¹⁷ This section was a provision to limit the influence of the Chamber of Deputies and its committees on the practical implementation of the program.

In the following months, three counterproposals were introduced to the Chamber. The rationale was to slow down the passage of the government proposal. The opposition was not willing to leave the battlefield without a fight, especially when it came to a potentially popular bill that had already received a significant amount of coverage in the press. The counterproposals came from three different parliamentary groups. In order to explain the shifting of majorities in the Chamber of Deputies and the fate of Tardieu's bill for national retooling, it is necessary to examine the various groups in the Chamber, belonging to the Left, the Right, or the Center. It is, however, necessary to state that the French groups were different from the ones in Great Britain and the United States. Parties and parliamentary groups in France were not well defined and there were certain groups in the Center half of whose members would vote for a ministry and half against. Above all, the French parliament was made up of individuals, who could often be convinced by an eloquent speech.

¹⁶ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

¹⁷ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2479, 25 Nov. 1929.

The Left consisted of four major groups, five counting the Communists. The Radical-Socialists, often simply called the Radicals, was the largest. Its 125 deputies were mostly elected by the lower middle classes of the countryside and the towns. The program of this group was anticlerical and against economic domination by large-scale capitalists. The Radicals were the most prominent defenders of the Third Republic but feared that decisive social changes – the creation of a massive working class -- would make their party obsolete. Nevertheless, the favorite allies of the Radicals were usually the Socialists. The Socialists, or United Socialists, had one hundred deputies. The group retained its traditional revolutionary rhetoric and Marxist traditions, but the Socialists of 1928 were, in fact, parliamentary and pretty much a democratic party.

The two smaller groups on the Left were the *Républicains-Socialistes* (Republican Socialists)/*Groupe du Parti Socialiste et Socialiste Française* (Group of the Socialist Party and French Socialists) and the *Indépendants de Gauche* (Independents of the Left). Both can best be described as social democrats. One of their main goals was participation in government. As political scientist André Siegfried summed it up: “After all, it does not really matter whether there are eighteen Republican Socialists, or twelve members of the Republican Socialist party and French Socialists, or sixteen Independents of the Left. The interesting point is that this section of the Chamber produces a record number of Cabinet ministers per square yard.”¹⁸ Unlike the United Socialists, these three groups were willing to work with the Center. Together, these four groups held approximately 40 percent of the seats in the Chamber. The Communists, who politically belonged to the Left but practiced “non-participation,” refusal to accept government office, held thirteen seats.

¹⁸ André Siegfried, *France: A Study in Nationality* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), 83.

The Center consisted of four major groups. The Gauche Radicale (Left Radicals) was the largest with over fifty deputies. They tended to side with the Left when it came to political issues and with the Right when material and economic issues were in the forefront. The Gauche Unioniste et Sociale (Unionist and Social Left), sometimes also listed under the name Gauche Sociale et Radicale (Social and Radical Left) consisted of former Radicals who had left the party in 1928 because they preferred Poincaré to the Cartel des Gauches. The Action Démocratique et Sociale (Social and Democratic Action) had close to thirty members, who were mostly interested in governing and not ideology. The largest group in the Center was called Républicains de Gauche (Republicans of the Left)/Alliance Démocratique (Democratic Alliance). The name is misleading because this group had nothing to do with the Left. Its members can best be categorized as moderate republicans. Many of them were deputies from conservative districts who after the election tried to get as close to the Center as possible. Tardieu belonged to this group. In general terms, “it was liberal in outlook, representing orthodox finance and capitalist business interests.”¹⁹

Obviously, the Center was a diverse group. The left wing of the Gauche Radicale really belonged to the Radicals, and the right wing of the Républicains de Gauche was closer to the Right than to anything else. If united and disciplined, the 162 deputies of the Center could have played an important part and could have dominated the Chamber. A united Center would have been able to form cabinets under its leadership, but disparate and disunited, it was reduced to working as the junior partner of either the Left or the Right. Like most of the others, the groups of the Center only came together for elections, but besides that, they did not

¹⁹ David Thomson, *Democracy in France: The Third Republic* (London: Oxford University Press, 1949), 105.

have programs or platforms – each deputy was on his own and many were deeply rooted in their constituencies, paying attention only to the public opinion at home when a vote came up.

The most important group on the Right was the Union Républicaine Démocratique (Democratic Republican Union) with over 100 deputies. In many aspects this association could equally as well have been placed in the Center, but its stand concerning religious matters and hierarchy made it a conservative force. This group was a party of social defense consisting of capitalists and bourgeois Catholics. A second group on the Right was made up by the deputies without an affiliation, also called the Indépendants. This “group” was interesting because it consisted of truly independent deputies, but it was also the home to the last of the Royalists. The third group on the Right was named Démocrates Populaires (Popular Democrats) and consisted of fewer than twenty deputies. The deputies belonging to this group were conservative Catholics, hardly distinguishable from royalists, but they claimed that they believed in democracy and were working for its advancement, not its abolishment. The Démocrates Populaires would fit under today’s term of Christian democracy.

To sum up: The elections of 1928 gave the Left 40 percent of the popular vote, which translated into 271 seats in the Chamber of Deputies. Twenty-two percent of voters chose the Center, earning it 165 seats. The 23 percent of votes for the Right gave it 158 seats, and the Communists with 11 percent of the popular vote got 12 of its candidates elected.²⁰ The parliamentary groups, especially those of the Center and the Right, were made up by like-minded deputies who did not have to obey any party or group discipline. When it came to a vote, each deputy was on his own.

²⁰ For the percentages of the popular vote see Siegfried, *A Study in Nationality*, 92.

The following examination of selected votes taken in the Chamber of Deputies is based on Table, which can be found at the end of this chapter. The table lists the deputies of the Chamber of 1928, the parliamentary group to which they belonged, and their decision in ten relevant votes. It is the basis for illustrating how majorities shifted and for developing a theory about patterns that occurred.

Like his predecessor Aristide Briand, André Tardieu relied on the Poincaré majority from the elections of 1928, but the composition of the majorities differed significantly. Briand was able to count on some goodwill from the Left, especially from the Radicals. The first vote of confidence for the Briand cabinet of 1929 illustrates this phenomenon quite clearly. The new premier was able to gain a majority because 132 deputies abstained from voting and 17 were not even present.²¹ The group of the Radicals, which had withdrawn its support for Poincaré earlier in the same year, gave Briand its indirect support by not taking part in the vote. Almost 100 Radicals abstained, 7 voted for, and 7 against the new government. Briand's major support came from the groups of the *Républicains de Gauche* (64 total) and the *Démocrates Populaires* (19 total), both of which backed him without exception. Five legislators from the *Gauche Unioniste et Sociale* abstained, and the rest (13) sided with the new cabinet. All but one member from the ranks of the *Action Démocratique et Sociale* (29 total), favored Briand, and from the *Indépendants de Gauche* (15 total), 1 voted no, and 5 abstained. Briand also got support from the Right: only 10 deputies from the *Union Républicaine Démocratique (Fédération Républicaine)* (102 total) did not vote for his government. The new premier was thus able to get a majority of 325 to 136. His main

²¹ All the data referring to the distribution of votes in the Chamber has been taken from the J.O.C., *Débats*, 1929-1930. For more detail see Table 1.

support came from the Center and the Center-Left. He was also able to get a significant number of votes from the Right. Briand's cabinet was initially also tolerated by the Radicals.

Briand was able to stay in power until 22 October 1929, not even three months. This period was short, especially considering that the Chamber was not in session for most of the lifespan of this cabinet. The government lost a vote of confidence because many Radicals changed their minds. Only 3 voted in favor of the government, and 13 abstained. In addition, the Gauche Radicale cast 12 votes against Briand, and 20 members of the Union Républicaine Démocratique voted no or abstained.

Tardieu's majority came from the Center and the Right. He got all the votes (19) from the Démocrates Populaires (7 members of this group had abstained when Briand fell). Altogether, 27 deputies who had abstained a few weeks earlier voted for Tardieu. Forty parliamentarians who had voted against Briand voted for Tardieu, with the most obvious 15 members of the conservative Union Républicaine Démocratique and 10 deputies from the far-right Indépendants, but also 3 Radicals, 4 from the Gauche Radicale, and 3 Républicains Indépendants. In addition to the Démocrates Populaires, Tardieu managed to get complete support from the Action Démocratique et Sociale (29), the Union Républicaine Démocratique (Fédération Républicaine) (102), and the Républicains de Gauche (64). Only 2 members of the Gauche Unioniste et Sociale, 6 of the Indépendants de Gauche, 4 from the Gauche Radicale voted against him. Tardieu was even able to get the support of 8 Radicals. His majority was clearly based in the Center but had far more support from the Right than that of his predecessor.

Most of the 8 Radicals who voted for Tardieu on 9 November 1929 would withdraw their support later, but 3 men stayed by him throughout his tenure as premier. Jacques-Louis

Dumesnil, the deputy from Seine-et-Marne, was one of them. He had been in the Chamber since 1910. In 1930, Dumesnil actually joined the cabinet as minister of the navy, and later he would become minister for air-traffic under the conservative Pierre Laval. Dumesnil was subject to much criticism from his group and eventually left the Radicals. The same happened to another supporter of Tardieu from the ranks of the Radicals, Eugène Lautier, who left the group for the Indépendants de Gauche late in 1929. The third was that of the deputy of Gers, Joseph Masclanis, who was, when he ran for reelection in 1932, accused of being a Radical dissident by the leading newspaper of his district.

The government introduced its bill for national retooling on 25 November 1929. Roughly one month later, on 24 December, Albert Bedouce and Léon Blum introduced a counter-project for the Socialists to the government's proposal.²² They called Tardieu's program "limited" and "arbitrary," saying that the country needed more than "the method of little presents." The Socialists' program proposed an investment of more than 30 billion for a period of seven years. The money was supposed to come from existing credits (3 billion), advances from the Bank of France on expected reparation payments from Germany (26 billion), and the issue of government bonds (3 billion a year over seven years amounting to a total of 21 billion). Despite providing much more money, the financing involved many risks, especially because it depended on payments from Germany and government bonds in a time when the financial markets were becoming more and more unstable as a result of the crash on the New York stock exchange.

The first category of the Bedouce-Blum bill called for national services to the public. Under this heading, the minister of public works would receive 5.4 billion for building and

²² J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2677, 24 Dec. 1929.

improving roads, highways, waterways, and guiding systems for the ports. For better telephone and postal service, and for a radio network, 2.6 billion were reserved. Four hundred million would be used to improve the existing aviation facilities. The hospital system was supposed to get an investment of 1 billion, and 400 million would be used to take care of public monuments and museums. The same amount was to go to the establishment of bureaus of commerce and tourism in all major cities.²³

The second category consisted of government subventions for improvements at ports, which would get 3 billion, and for the construction of new waterways, receiving the same amount. The Socialists also planned to invest 4 billion in the infrastructure of the colonies. Four hundred million were supposed to help build new airports. Another 4 billion were designated to be used to improve agricultural production and to raise the standard of living in the countryside. Regional hospitals would get 2 billions, and rural and departmental roads would be improved with an investment of 2.5 billion. The plan allocated 1 billion for the construction of new schools, with 2 more billion for research in various areas, loans, assurances, and some other smaller projects.²⁴

At the end of 1929, the finance committee had two completely different bills concerning national retooling, but it would not be long until more were introduced and sent to the committee. On 29 January 1930, the Radicals, under the leadership of Maurice Palmade, introduced their own bill, differing from the proposals of either the Socialists or the government. The Radicals criticized the cabinet plan for not going far enough and called it

²³ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2677, 24 Dec. 1929.

²⁴ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2677, 24 Dec. 1929.

“insufficient for modernizing France.”²⁵ They proposed an investment of 35 billion over a period of ten years, but, according to their plan, the government did not have to provide all the money to carry out the projects. The Radical proposal was based on collaboration between the national government and local entities. Both were to invest in certain projects, and in addition to that investment, the national government would also provide an advance, which would have to be paid back later by the locality.²⁶

The ministers would distribute a total of 14.8 billion, to be divided amongst them as follows: agriculture, 6 billion; public works, 4.840 billion; mail services, telegraphs, and telephones, 1 billion; aviation, 400 million; colonies, 1 billion; merchant fleet, 300 million; interior, 300 million; public instruction, 320 million; hygiene and social assistance, 400 million; and commerce, 240 million. In addition, the government would hand out advances amounting to 10.2 billion. These advances were the loans to the regional governments and would have to be paid back within 30 years at an annual interest rate of 1 percent.²⁷ The local governments were also supposed to invest in some of the projects. The authors of the bill estimated this amount at 10 billion. The 35 billion of investment in the country’s progress would consist of 25 billion from the national government, including 10.2 billion of advances, and 10 billion from local entities.²⁸

The Radicals addressed the issue of financing their program and actually cited many different possibilities, but they did not supply a definitive solution. Like the Socialists, they counted on reparations from Germany amounting to 12 billion and on issuing government

²⁵ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2811, 29 Jan. 1930.

²⁶ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2811, 29 Jan. 1930.

²⁷ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2811, 29 Jan. 1930.

²⁸ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2811, 29 Jan. 1930.

bonds. The bill did not, however, include a coherent financial plan, and the problem of administrating such an extensive program was also not covered in depth.

On 17 February 1930, André Tardieu's government lost a vote of confidence by five votes, 286 to 281.²⁹ Tardieu's majority had seemingly deteriorated, but it was actually the minister of finance who attached the question of confidence to a vote concerning the budget after he gave a less than stellar performance in a debate before the Chamber. In comparison to the vote in November, the government lost votes from most groups, proving again that it is easier to get approval after a broad declaration of government than on concrete issues and topics. This time, 17 deputies from the Gauche Radicale withheld their support, 2 votes less came from the Radicals, and 6 Républicains de Gauche were not convinced by the minister's speech. Tardieu especially lost votes on the left of his majority. Six deputies from the Gauche Radicale who had voted yes in October did not do so in February. The same is true for 6 Républicains de Gauche, 5 Indépendants de Gauche, 3 deputies from the Action Démocratique et Sociale, and 5 from the conservative Indépendants.

Camille Chautemps, a prominent Radical, was asked to form a new government. On 25 February 1930, he delivered his ministerial declaration to the Chamber, but lost the vote of confidence, falling 8 votes short of a majority (277-292).³⁰ All of the Socialists (100) voted for Chautemps, and all but 3 Radicals (125 total) rallied behind the cabinet assembled by their colleague. Chautemps also fared well among the Républicains-Socialistes (27 out of 31), and got some nods from the Gauche Radicale (19 out of 54). The Right and most of the Center united to prevent the success of a Radical. All members of the Action Démocratique et

²⁹ J.O.C., Débats, 17 Feb. 1930.

³⁰ J.O.C., Débats, 25 Feb. 1930.

Sociale (29), the Démocrates Populaires (19), and the Union Républicaine et Démocratique (Fédération Républicaine) (102 total) voted no. Two from the Gauche Unioniste et Sociale (18) voted in favor of Chautemps. The Communists voted against him as well. They could have actually secured Chautemps's success, but they rejected the Radicals just as they rejected all other groups.

The Poincaré majority could not be defeated, although it sometimes failed to keep in power the cabinet from its own ranks. The Center and the Right were completely united to make sure that no leftist government would be confirmed. André Tardieu therefore got the chance to assemble a new cabinet, which he presented to the Chamber on 2 March 1930. He created two new ministries, for public health and for the national economy, and reestablished a ministry of the budget, which had been terminated after the premiership of Paul Painlevé in 1924. He also put a new man in charge of finances, Paul Reynaud, who was a member of the Alliance Démocratique.³¹ Tardieu gave a short speech that was interrupted many times by deputies from the Left. He announced that the program of 8 November 1929 was also that of the new government. When the time came to cast the votes, the Center and the Right remembered 17 February and made sure it would not be repeated. Tardieu got all the votes from the Action Démocratique et Sociale (29), the Démocrates Populaires (19), the Indépendants (37), and the Union Républicaine et Démocratique (Fédération Républicaine) (102), and all but one from the Gauche Unioniste et Sociale (18). Two members of the Républicains de Gauche (64) abstained. At the end of the day the second Tardieu government had a majority of 53, 316 to 263.

³¹ *Le Figaro*, 4 March 1930.

Yet the tactics by the leftwing opposition to delay the bill concerning the national retooling continued. On 12 March 1930, a third counter-project was introduced to the Chamber and sent to the finance committee. This bill was fathered by the group of the *Républicains – Socialistes*, César Chabrun and Maxence Bibié among them. The proposal did not address the other programs at all. It called for distributing 65 billion francs: 9 billion for agriculture, 6 billion for the social sector, 10 billion each for road construction and maintenance and for ports and interior waterways, 15 billion to further the availability of electricity, and another 5 billion to improve the merchant fleet, aviation equipment, mail, and telephone services.³²

The authors of this bill came up with an elaborate system of distributing the money, but their financial planning lacked clarity. They gave several suggestions for where the money could come from but did not include a specific plan in their bill. The local governments were expected to contribute around 15 billion, leaving the national government with a cost of roughly 50 billion. The moderate Socialists proposed to float a loan of 6 billion, which was supposed to be secured with expected reparation payments of 12 billion over a period of 10 years. The bill proposed cuts of 300 million in the military budget and the budget of public works, which would amount to 3 billion in savings over the next decade. Another billion was supposed to come from accounts of the treasury at the Bank of France. For the other 40 billion, the authors suggested loans for specific projects that would eventually produce revenue. They planned, for example, to finance the electrification of the countryside completely with borrowed money because they expected it to be an investment in

³² J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2995, 12 March 1930.

the development of a profitable business which would be able to pay the loans off with the money it generated.³³

The guidelines for the administration of the program were much more carefully considered than the financial planning. The program provided for the classification of all projects into two categories, those of primary and secondary urgency. The first group included social and agricultural development, for which the program provided 15 billion francs. The authors' basic idea was that every department should receive at least 150 million.³⁴ They proposed that each prefect should make a list of necessary projects in his department within two months after the bill became law. These lists would be reviewed by the responsible ministers, who would then decide which ones needed the most immediate attention. The funding for projects of primary urgency would be distributed over a period of five years.³⁵

The projects of secondary urgency, which would get funds amounting to 50 billion, would have a planning period of two years and then run for eight years. This category was divided into two subcategories, departmental programs and national and regional ones. The council of each department was to hold a special meeting to derive plans for its social and economic development. The regional councilmen were to seek the advice of local industrial, artisan, commercial, tourist, and sports organizations, as well as look to the plans of other

³³ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2995, 12 March 1930.

³⁴ That is actually how they came up with the amount of 15 billion. They multiplied 150 million by 92 departments and then rounded the result of 13.8 billion up to 15 billion.

³⁵ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2995, 12 March 1930.

departments. The ideas were also to be discussed by the municipal assemblies and then presented to the cabinet “with all the necessary charts, tables, and notes from the meetings.”³⁶

For regional and national projects, the bill suggested that the department for public works set up commissions to plan and monitor the different activities. Hydroelectric construction, for example, would have been divided among five commissions, one for every major river in France.³⁷ The work on ports would be under the control of three commissions, one each for the North Sea and Channel, the Atlantic, and the Mediterranean Sea. Each commission would first evaluate the situation in its area and then propose projects to the minister of public works. Both groups of secondary urgency would then go to the national council of economics, and after their revision the cabinet would make plans to carry the projects out. The authors concluded that the discussions about the activities should be conducted with great speed.³⁸

Dissatisfied with the progress of the bill for national retooling, Tardieu addressed it during the speech he gave on 1 June 1930 in Dijon. He stressed the importance of the project and the need to discuss and vote on it, as on several others, before the summer vacation of the legislature. Tardieu called these bills “an indispensable element of our foreign, financial, and economic policies.”³⁹ Two days later, he took another action to accelerate to progress of his bill. Tardieu sent a letter to the chairman of the finance committee, Louis Malvy, a Radical, emphasizing the significance of the program and the need to carry it out as soon as possible. He underlined the importance of modernizing the country, especially because “the progress in

³⁶ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2995, 12 March 1930.

³⁷ Seine, Rhin, Rhône, Garonne, and Loire.

³⁸ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 2995, 12 March 1930.

³⁹ *Le Figaro*, 2 June 1930.

science offers new means of communication, industrial processes, and social development.”⁴⁰ He also proposed the establishment of a consultative committee to examine the projects and to help with their execution. The committee would work together with the administration and be headed by the president of the national council for economics, which already advised the administration on economic issues. Tardieu also made revisions to the government’s bill, acknowledging that the idea for them came from the counter-projects. The cabinet now supported the notion that the ventures which were likely eventually to produce revenue could be financed through loans. Tardieu proposed, therefore, that the improvements to the postal and telephone service, the construction of sports fields and stadiums, the creation of water distribution systems, and the building of hydroelectric power plants and lines be excluded from the bill. The money to be spent on these projects would instead go to non-productive areas, which were not expected to return money any time soon. One hundred fifty million would be used for the reconstruction of the medical school in Paris, 30 million for renovations of the museum in the Louvre, 25 million for the construction of storage facilities for agricultural products, 35 million for the export of agricultural products, 160 million for the building of fast ships to ensure the service between France and Algeria, and 400 million for the development of a merchant air fleet and improvements of airports.⁴¹

The *rapporteur* (floor leader) of the finance committee, Louis de Chappedelaine, finally delivered the report on 3 July 1930. He talked first about the meaning of the term *outillage national*, which he described as the combined assets of the country that benefit all people. Chappedelaine noted that France had been depleted during the war and that many

⁴⁰ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 3388, 3 June 1930.

⁴¹ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 3388, 3 June 1930.

resources had gone towards the rebuilding of the devastated regions. The result was that there had been no money available to improve the “country’s equipment.” The committee report concluded that public services were insufficient and required immediate improvement.⁴² Chappedelaine emphasized that some of the proposed projects had already received the resources the bill provided for them through laws that had been passed after the cabinet introduced the program. The finance committee agreed that an initiative for the further retooling of the nation would stimulate the economy, especially agriculture. The committee members noted that money was available for such a plan, that it could be carried out without requiring investments from private enterprises, but that the volume and the duration of the program should be limited because of the financial instability in the world.⁴³

The committee had looked at all four suggestions and found the cabinet’s plan to be the cheapest, although from their point of view its implementation appeared to involve more than 5 billion. The money provided by Tardieu’s plan would be met by 2.373 billion in investments from local governments. Therefore, the finance committee argued, the total added up to 7.373 billion.⁴⁴

On some recommendations, the committee was in conformity with the cabinet. It believed that the plan should last not longer than five years and that no more than 3.5 billion should be spent each year.⁴⁵ It also agreed with the organization for administering the program. Over all, the finance committee was more favorable to the cabinet’s proposition for the retooling of the nation than to the other plans. Nevertheless, they constructed their own

⁴² J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 3658, 3 July 1930.

⁴³ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 3658, 3 July 1930.

⁴⁴ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 3658, 3 July 1930.

⁴⁵ J.O.C., Documents, Annexe 3658, 3 July 1930.

plan by borrowing ideas from all four proposals. For example, the committee incorporated the idea of a combination of local funds and money from the federal government in its own scheme.

A short discussion about the four projects and the report of the finance committee took place on 8 July 1930, with Chappedelaine summarizing the findings. The schedule of the session permitted only a brief debate, but André François-Poncet, the under-secretary for the national economy, declared the cabinet's position on the issue. He made clear that the cabinet rejected the committee's conclusion and that it would retain its original plan. In the name of the government, François-Poncet asked the chamber to "approve our project for retooling the nation, not some improvisation."⁴⁶ The position of the government was that its program was the most coherent and should be put into effect without alterations. The government believed that this action was the only option for passing such a program in a timely fashion. Tardieu's cabinet was afraid that the Chamber would inflate the proposal and that the debate would last forever, therefore missing the goal of stimulating France's economy before the recession, which had already affected most other industrialized countries, could also reach France.

The subject was not discussed in the Chamber again before the summer vacation because the committee in charge of the agenda argued that there were no open spots in the tight parliamentary schedule. On 20 November, the deputies started to discuss the three counter-projects. The debate was dominated by Albert Bedouce defending the program of the Socialists, César Chabrun praising that of the *Républicains-Socialistes*, and Maurice Palmade propagandizing the one of the Radicals. François-Poncet, representing the government, noted that all three conceptions could not be financed and argued that the cabinet's plan was the

⁴⁶ J.O.C., *Débats*, 8 July 1930.

only one that had a chance to be realized.⁴⁷ Tardieu's government was influenced by Poincaré's conservative spending policies, which he had used during his tenure from 1926 to 1929. Poincaré had earned himself the title of savior of the francs, and Tardieu was not willing to launch a risky project which had the potential of destroying the budget equilibrium. Tardieu was conservative when it came to fiscal and budgetary questions, and he believed in the doctrine of a balanced budget. The three proposals from the groups on the Left had the potential of destroying the equilibrium.

The three counter proposals were discussed again during the session of 26 November, and on the following two days all three were defeated, Reynaud having declared the votes a matter of confidence. Chabrun's bill was rejected by 78 votes,⁴⁸ Bedouce's by 39, and Palmade's by 23.⁴⁹ The votes followed the known pattern: the Radicals and the Socialists and some others voted in favor of the counter proposals while the groups surrounding the Action Démocratique et Sociale and the Union Républicaine et Démocratique (Fédération Républicaine) voted against them. The only reason that the margin was slightly smaller than on 5 March 1930, when Tardieu's second government was invested, can be found in the fact that eleven Communists voted for all three proposals; previously, they had always opted for "no" during the votes covered here.

The cabinet's proposal was finally discussed on 2 December 1930. The questions and objections regarding the plan had all been heard before. The deputies questioned the availability of the financial resources and many other trivial things, and the debate carried

⁴⁷ J.O.C., Débats, 20 Nov. 1930.

⁴⁸ J.O.C., Débats, 27 Nov. 1930.

⁴⁹ J.O.C., Débats, 28 Nov. 1930.

over onto 4 December 1930. Then, the deputies started to propose and vote on amendments to the bill. Reynaud tried to convince his colleagues that the bill was meant to be simple and easy to execute.⁵⁰ As Tardieu had emphasized in his speech at Dijon, the cabinet had to fight over every word, but when the Socialist Henri Tasso asked for a vote to send the bill back to the finance committee for further deliberation, Reynaud posed the issue of confidence. The government won with a majority of 25 votes.⁵¹ Clearly, the bill was close to passage.

On the same day, the Senate, where Tardieu's enemies were stronger than in the Chamber, was holding a debate on the general policies of the government. The composition of the Senate was distinctly different from that of the Chamber. Senators were elected by electoral colleges in their districts for nine years. One third of the Senate was to be renewed every three years to guarantee continuity. This system led to a paradox in French politics because the Senate usually lagged behind the current political mood of the country – “it did really redress the balance, leaning to the Left when the Chamber was to the Right and to the Right when the Chamber was to the Left.”⁵² The session of 4 December can best be described as the showdown between Tardieu and his opponents. The Radical Senator René Héry led the charge. He criticized the cabinet for its “arrogant rhetoric” and “aggressive and insulting tone towards the republican parties.”⁵³ He described it as the collaborator of big money and business interests. Héry argued that the economic situation of France was worsening, putting partial responsibility on the world economic crisis. But he saw another cause for this development in the policies of the cabinet, which he accused of encouraging the “madness of

⁵⁰ J.O.C., Débats, 4 Dec. 1930.

⁵¹ J.O.C., Débats, 4 Dec. 1930.

⁵² Brogan, *Modern France*, 709.

⁵³ J.O.S., Débats, 4 Dec. 1930.

speculation” that led to the so-called Oustric affair. In his view, the government as a whole was responsible for this scandal because it failed to prevent it and therefore put the savings of ordinary people at risk.

The Oustric affair was named after the financier Albert Oustric, who had gained control over several small provincial banks and used them for risky transactions on the stock market. When his scheme crashed, many innocent savers lost a great deal of money, and it was slowly becoming apparent that certain government officials had at least peripheral involvement. Héry did not, however, name any individual, but claimed instead that the policies of the Tardieu cabinet contributed to the Oustric affair because they were aimed not at helping workers and the lower middle class but at accommodating monied interests. He dismissed the 5 billion for national retooling as a joke.

Héry also accused Tardieu personally of playing favoritism on the departmental level. Apparently, the premier promised more money for public projects to prefects who belonged to the parties that were the basis of his majority than to the ones of the Left. Accusing the government of being antirepublican, he asked the senators: “My dear colleagues, what kind of regime is this? Come on republicans, can you still recognize the republic under this regime?”⁵⁴ He went on arguing that the cabinet had only its own interests at heart and that its main objective was putting the Right in a good position for the elections of 1932.

To this blatant grandstanding, Tardieu’s rebuttal was a model of restraint. He argued that he was in fact a good republican and that the financial situation in France was much better than anywhere else. He attributed this well-being to various factors, including France’s retention of the gold standard and his own policies of modest spending during the last thirteen

⁵⁴ J.O.S., Débats, 4 Dec. 1930.

months. Tardieu emphasized that his program for national retooling would have an impact while not putting a strain on the budget. He also dismissed Héry's claim that the working classes were ignored during his tenure as prime minister, pointing out that legislation was passed continuing the perfection of social security. He appealed to the Senate to judge his cabinet with objectivity: "We may not have done better than others, but we have certainly done as well. We have always done our best. Our acts are before you. In the interest of stability, I demand that you judge what we have done with your own conscience and decide if anything deserves a vote other than that of your confidence."⁵⁵ Tardieu emphasized, furthermore, the importance of this meeting between the Senate and the government because it had been anticipated for almost a month and had received plenty of attention in the press. According to him, the country was waiting for the outcome. "The government, over which I have the honor to preside, could fall tonight among you."⁵⁶

Senator Henri de Jouvenel responded to Tardieu. He argued that the country was divided and that Tardieu himself made reconciliation impossible as long as he was in power. According to Jouvenel, France was split into two blocs, and the healing of this division became more and more unlikely the longer a cabinet stayed in power relying on the support of what he termed "extremists." He finished his speech by insisting that the balance of the country depended on the fall of this government. Following such accusations, Tardieu could not avoid demanding a vote of confidence. He fell short by 8 votes, 147 voted against, while 139 voted for him.⁵⁷ *L'expérience Tardieu* was over, and the plan for national retooling was

⁵⁵ J.O.S., Débats, 4 Dec. 1930.

⁵⁶ J.O.S., Débats, 4 Dec. 1930.

⁵⁷ J.O.S., Débats, 4 Dec. 1930.

shelved. A vote on the issue was not taken until early 1932, but by then the plan did not really resemble his anymore.

André Tardieu had to deal with an opposition whose only goal was to bring him down. The Left could not, however, form its own majority because it was still in a minority from the elections of 1928. Tardieu had Poincaré's majority behind him. Nevertheless, the opposition tried everything to obstruct the government's policies, especially when it came to the equipment of the nation. As journalist Georges Suarez pointed out, "this is a perfect example of what happens when electoral considerations and personal ambitions come in the way of implementing policies."⁵⁸ The sole purpose of the proposals from the Left was to delay discussion on the government's bill. The politicians from the Left must have known that their plans were too expensive to be implemented.

The Left tried to prevent a government, which they denounced as reactionary, from carrying out progressive reforms, especially only two years before an election. The equipment of the nation would definitely have been a modern and popular reform, and the Left might have thought of Tardieu in light of Otto von Bismarck, who gave the German population a social security system to lessen the appeal of the Social Democrats. Tardieu's plans did not have the magnitude of Bismarck's, but if they had been enacted in time, they might have lessened the blow of the Great Depression. Tardieu's repeated appeals to the Radicals could have also been a propaganda tool. He must have known well that they could not join his government because of the resolution at the Congress of Angers, which forced the radical ministers in Poincaré's government to resign in October of 1928.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Georges Suarez, "L'outillage national et les parties," *Revue de Paris*, 1 Feb. 1932, 602.

⁵⁹ J.O.C., *Débats*, 5 March 1930.

The Senate debate of 4 December 1930 illustrates Tardieu's problem effectively. He was viewed by the Left as the ultimate reactionary. His actions before 1924 had made him too many enemies and none of them were willing to forgive him. Although there was no concrete evidence against Tardieu, he was guilty by association. The Radicals had twice refused to join his cabinets, and Tardieu therefore had to rely on the Right. The course the Senate debate took made it impossible for Tardieu to continue, though according to the constitution the government was not obligated to resign after a lost vote in the upper house. He had been denounced as anti-republican and blamed for dividing the country. These accusations left him no possibility other than to ask for a vote of confidence and because he lost it, he had to follow through and accept the consequences. Otherwise, he would have spoiled his chances of ever becoming premier or a minister again. Tardieu had a working majority in the Chamber, but his personal history caused his defeat in the Chamber.

TABLE: VOTING PATTERNS IN THE FRENCH CHAMBER OF 1928

Group/Deputy	Confidence Briand 07/ 31/ 29	Confidence Briand 10/ 22/ 29	Confidence Tardieu 11/ 08/ 29	Confidence Tardieu 02/ 17/ 30	Confidence Chautemps 02/ 25/ 30	Confidence Tardieu 03/ 05/ 30	Contre-Proj. Chabrun 11/ 27/ 30	Contre-Proj. Bedouce 11/ 28/ 30	Contre-Proj. Palmade 11/ 28/ 30	Confidence Tardieu 12/ 04/ 30
Action Démocratique et Sociale										
Autrand, Jean	Y		A Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Ballu, Guillaume	Y		A Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Barbier, André	Y	Y	Y		A	N Y		N	N	Y
Baudouin-Bugnet, Pierre	Y		A Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Blondel, Edmond	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Brière, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Bussat, Edouard	Y		N Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Delsol, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Didry, Alfred	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Dior, Lucien	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Fabry, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Faget, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Francois-Poncet, André	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Frey, Charles	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Gignoux, Claude-Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Laquière, Raymond	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Lauvray, Léon	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Lecacheux, Joseph	Y		N Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Legué, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Lorin, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Maginot, André	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Molle, Jules	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Paturaud-Mirand, Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Peter, Emile	Y	Y	Y		A	N Y		N	N	Y
Reibel, Charles		N	N Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y
Reynaud, Paul	Y	Y	Y	Y		N Y		N	N	Y

(Table continued)

Ricci, Gaston	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Scapini, Georges	Y	Y	Y		A	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Thureau-Dangin, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Vidal, Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y

Communiste

Aurin, Louis												
Beaugrand, Georges	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Beron, Emile	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Berthon, André	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Cachin, Marcel	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Clamamus, Jean-Marie	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Desoblin, Augustin	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Doéblé, Victor	N	N	N	N			N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Doriot, Jacques		A		A		A		A		A		A
Duclos, Jacques	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Fraisseix, Jules	N	N	N	N		A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Mourer, Jean	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Piquemal, Alexandre	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	

Démocrates Populaires

Antier, Ernest	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bahier, André	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Berger, Maurice	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bilger, Camille	Y		A	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Brom, Joseph	Y		A	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Champetier de Ribes, Auguste	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Durand, Auguste	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Gallet, Charles	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Jadé, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Labach, Jean	Y		A	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Lerolle, Jean	Y		Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Meck, Henri	Y		A	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y

(Table continued)

Pezet, Ernest	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Pinault, Etienne	Y		A	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Reille-Soult, François de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Seltz, Thomas	Y		A	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	Y
Simon, Paul	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Trémintin, Pierre	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Walter, Michel	Y		A	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y

Gauche Radical

André, Adrien	Y	Y		A	N	Y	N	N	A	A	N
Barillet, Georges	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	A
Bascou, Olivier	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Blanc, Marie	Y	Y	Y	Y		A	Y	N	N	N	N
Bokanowski, Maurice											
Bouilloux-Lafont, Maurice	Y	Y	Y		A	Y		A	N	A	Y
Candace, Gratien		A	Y	Y	Y	N		A	N	N	Y
Carlier-Caffieri, Jules	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Cels-Couybes, Jules	Y		N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Chappedelaine, Louis de		A	N	N	N	Y	N		A	A	A
Charlot, Etienne	Y	Y	Y		A	Y		A	N	N	Y
Charrier, Marcel		A	N	N	N	Y		A	Y	N	N
Chaulin-Servinière, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y		A	Y		N	N	Y
Chéron, Adolphe	Y	Y	Y	Y		A	Y		N	N	Y
Daniélou, Charles-Léon-Claude	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	Y	A	A
Dariac, Adrien	Y		N		A	N		A	N	N	N
Debève, Jean-Jacques	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	Y
Deligne, Maurice	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	Y
Delmotte, Gabriel	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	Y
Dormann, Maurice	Y		N	Y		N	Y		N	N	A
Eynac, Laurent	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y
Fels, André de		A	Y	Y		N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Fringant, Charles	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	Y	Y
Gérard, Gaston	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	Y

(Table continued)

Gonnet, Coutrand	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	
Gourdeau, Gaston		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Guernier, Charles	Y		N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Labroue, Henri	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Landry, Adolphe	Y	Y		A	N	Y		N	N	N	N
Largier, Edouard	Y	Y	Y	Y		A	Y	N	N	N	Y
Laurent, Jean	Y		N	N	N	Y		A	N	N	Y
Le Trocquer, Yves	Y	Y	Y								
Le Veizouët, Henri-François	Y		N		A	N	Y		A	A	N
Lemelle, Gustave	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N
Lillaz, Henri	Y		N	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N
Loucheur, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			A	N	N	N
Mallarmé, André	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N
Manaut, René	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N
Martin, Germain	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N
Masclanis, Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y			A	Y	N	N	N
Millot, Léon	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N
Odin, Jean	Y	Y	Y		N		A	Y	N	N	N
Outrey, Ernest	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N
Pacaud, Raoul		A	N		A	A	Y		N	N	N
Pic, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N
Piérangeli, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N
Poillot, Jules	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N
Porterat, René	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	N
Rimbert, Fenand	Y		N		A	N	Y		A	N	N
Roux-Freissineng, Pierre	Y	Y		A	Y		N		N	N	N
Thomson, Gaston	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	N	N
Tranchand, Aimé	Y	Y		A	N	Y	Y		N	N	N
Gauche Unioniste et Sociale											
Augagneur, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			A	N	Y	Y
Boucheron, Georges	Y		N	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N
Boyer, Edmond									N	N	N

(Table continued)

Boyer, Jules	Y		N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Brun, Fernand	Y		N	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Buyat, Louis	Y		Y		A	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Camuzet, Etienne		A	Y	Y	Y		A	Y	N	N	N	Y
Cathala, Pierre	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Cazaud, Clement	Y		Y	Y	Y		A	A	N	N	N	Y
Delesalle, Charles		A	N	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Dien, Louis		A		A	Y		A	Y	N	N	N	Y
Eymond, Edouard	Y		Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Franklin-Bouillon, Henry	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Goy, Jean		A	N		A	N	Y		A	A	A	A
Jacoulot, Vincent		A	N		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Leguet, Firmin	Y		Y		N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Meunier, Albert	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Morinaud, Emile	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Puybaudet, Gaston Ponte de	Y		Y	Y		N	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y
Riché, Etienne	Y		Y	Y								
Verlot, Constant												

Indépendants de Gauche

Bardon, André	Y		Y	Y		A	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Besset, Lucien	Y		N	Y		A	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Blacque-Belair, Aimery	Y			A	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	Y
Dahlet, Camille		A	N		A	N		A	N	Y	Y	N
Delmont, Alcide	Y		Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Dollat, Jacques	Y		Y	Y		A		A	Y	N	N	A
Guernut, Henri		N	N	N	N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N
La Chambre, Guy	Y		Y		N	N		A	N	A	Y	A
Malingre, Paul	Y		N	Y		A	N	Y	N	N		A
Paté, Henry	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Patenôtre, Raymond	Y		Y		A	A	A	A	N	N	N	Y
Perrin, Albert		A	N	N	N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N
Renaitour, Pierre		A	N	N	N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N

(Table continued)

Roche, Lucien	Y		A	Y		N	Y	Y		A	N	N	Y
Rolland, Camille	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		A	N	N	Y
Rouquier, Louis		A	A	N		N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	N
Thébault, Léon									Y	Y		Y	N
Varenne, Alexandre		A	N		N		Y	N	Y	Y		Y	N

Indépendants

Andigné, Geoffrey d'		A	A	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Barbot, Alphonse		A	N	Y	Y			Y		N	N		Y
Bergey, Abbé	Y		N	Y		A	N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Bougère, Ferdinand	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Bringer, Louis	Y	Y			A	Y		A	Y		A	A	A
Brocard, Félix	Y	Y		Y		N	N	Y		N	N		A
Brogly, Médard	Y		A	Y		N	N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Chambrun, Pierre de		A	N	Y	Y		A	Y		N	N	N	Y
Desbons, Jean	Y		N	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Desgranges, Jean-Marie	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Escartefigue, Marius	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Faure, René	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Harcourt, François d'	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Haye, Henry	Y		N	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Juigné, Jacques de		A	N	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Kerouartz, Oswen de										N	N	N	Y
La Ferronnays, Auguste de		A	N	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Laniel, Henry		A	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Le Cour Grandmaison, Jean										N	N	N	Y
Le Cozannet, Yves		A	N	Y	Y		N	Y		A	A	A	A
Mandel, Georges	Y	Y		Y		A	N	Y		N	N		A
Molinié, Jean	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Neyret, Jean	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Payen, Isere	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		N	N		A
Payer, Andre	Y		N	Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y
Ramel, François de	Y	Y		Y	Y		N	Y		N	N	N	Y

(Table continued)

Rochereau, Victor	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Rodez-Benavent, Henri de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Schuman, Robert	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Taudière, Emile	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Taurines, Jean	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Vallat, Xavier	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Vincent, Emile	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y

No Group

Bellanger, Robert	Y	Y	A	N	Y	A	N	N	N	N
Falcoz, Henri	A	A	A	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	A
Foulon, Maurice	Y	Y	A	N	A	Y	N	N	N	Y
Hauss, René	Y	A	Y	N	N	N	N	A	A	N
Laffont, Paul	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Le Pévédic, Joseph	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Lesesne, Gustave	A	Y	A	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Poncet, Paul	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rothschild, Maurice de	Y	A	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Sabiani, Simon	Y	Y	Y							
Stürmel, Marcel	Y	Y	Y							

Républicain Radical et Radical-Socialiste

Accambray, Alphonse	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Albert, François	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Ales, Jean	Y	A	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Amat, Jean-Baptiste	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Amiot, Urbain										
Archimbaud, Léon	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Aubaud, Raoul	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Augé, Fernand	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Baron, Etienne	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Bastid, Paul	A	N	N	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Bazile, Gaston	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N

(Table continued)

Bellocq, Léopold	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Beluel, Ernest	A	A	N	N	Y	N		A	N	Y	N
Bergery, Gaston	A	N	N	N		N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Bernier, Paul	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Berthod, Aimé	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Bertrand, William	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Bonnet, Georges	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Borel, Emile	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		A	A	A	A
Borrel, Antoine	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Bouat, Armand	A										
Bouligand, Pierre	A	N	N	A	Y						
Bouyssou, Léo	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Briquet, Camille	A	N	N	N	Y	N		A	A	A	N
Brunet, Auguste	A	A	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	
Bruyas, Claude	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Cadoret, François							Y	Y	Y	N	
Caffort, Charles	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Canu, Eugène	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	
Carron, Hyacinthe	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Castel, Léon	A	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Catalan, Camille	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Cazals, Noël	A	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Chammard, Jacques de	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Chassaing, Eugène	A	N	N	N	Y	N					
Chautemps, Camille		N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Chevrier, Henri	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Colomb, Pierre	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Connevot, Henri	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Coponat, Jean	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Cot, Pierre	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Courrent, Paul	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Courtehoux, Jules	A	N	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Cuttoli, Jules	A	A	N	Y	Y	N		A	A	A	Y

(Table continued)

Daladier, Edouard		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		A	
Dalimier, Albert		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Delabarre, Philippe		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Delbos, Yvon		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Deyris, Pierre		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Dézarnaulds, Pierre	N		N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Ducos, Hippolyte		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Dumesnil, Jacques-Louis		A	N	N	N	Y	Y		N	N	N	Y	
Durafour, Antoine		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Durand, Julien		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Even, Pierre		A	N	N									
Faugère, Georges		A	N		A								
Fayolle, Julien	N		A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Fays, Louis		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Férin, Raymond		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Ferrand, Camille		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Garat, Joseph		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Gasparin, Lucien	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y		N	N	N	Y	
Geistdoerfer, Michel		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Gout, Henri		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Graeve, Jean-Marie	Y			A	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	
Gratien, Auguste	Y			A		A	Y	Y		N	N	Y	
Guersy, Raoul		A	N		A		A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Guichard, Louis		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Guilhaumon, Charles		A	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		A	Y
Guy, Henri		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Hauet, Albert		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Hérard, Jean		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Herriot, Edouard		A	N	N	N	Y	N		A		A	A	N
Hesse, André		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Jacquier, Paul		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Jaubert, Jean		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	
Jouffrault, André		A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	

(Table continued)

Lalanne, Gaston	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Lambert, Charles	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Lamoureux, Lucien	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Lassalle, Robert	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Laumond, Jean-Baptiste	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Lautier, Eugène	A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	
Le Louédec, Jules	A	N	N								
Ledoux, Ferdinand							Y	Y	Y	N	
Lévy-Alphandéry, Georges	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Longuet, Théophile	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Lorgeré, André	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Malvy, Louis-Jean	A	N	N	N	Y	N		A	A	Y	A
Marchandeaup, Paul	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Marcombes, Philippe	A	N	N	N	Y	N		A	A	Y	N
Margaine, Alfred	A		A	A	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Marie, André	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Massé, Emile	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Massimi, Dominique	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Maupoil, Henri	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ménier, Georges	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Merle, Adolphe	A	N	N								
Meyer, Léon	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Miellet, Gaston	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Mistler, Jean	A		A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Mitton, Jules				N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Montigny, Jean	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Nogaro, Bertrand	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ossola, Jean	A	N	N	N		A	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Paganon, Joseph	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Palmade, Maurice	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Pascaud, Edouard	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Peigné, Emile	A										
Perfetti, Camille	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

(Table continued)

Pieyre, Marius	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Poittevin, Gaston	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Proust, Louis	A	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Queuille, Henri	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rameil, Pierre	A	N	N	N	Y	N				
Raude, Eugène	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Richard, René	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Robert, Maurice	A	N	N	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rodhain, Auguste	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Roumagoux, Eugène	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Roy, Eugène	A	N	N	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rucart, Marc	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Schmidt, Jammy	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Sclafer, James	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Sire, Pierre	A	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Ternois, Henri	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Tessan, François de	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Valensi, Théodore										
Vernay, Alfred	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N

Républicains de Gauche

Amet, Camille	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Baréty, Léon	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Boisseau, Léon	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Boissel-Dombreval, Emile	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bonnevay, Laurent	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bouhenry, Camille	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bouissoud, Charles	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Boullanger, Narcisse	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bréant, Ernest	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bureau, Georges	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Castellane, Stanislas de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Caujole, Paul	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	Y

(Table continued)

Coty, René	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Detailleur, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Dignac, Pierre	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Doussain, Gustave	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Drouot, Maurice	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	A	Y
Filhoud-Lavergne, Jean-Paul	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Flandin, Pierre-Etienne	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Fougère, Etienne	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Gellié, Jean-Marie	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Gianotti, Antonin	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	A	Y
Gramont de Lesparre, Antoine						Y	N	N	N	Y
Grimaud, Ernest	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	A
Grinda, Edouard	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y				
Guérault, François	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Héraud, Marcel	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Honorat, Alphonse	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Léglise, Gabriel	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Legros, Georges	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		A	N	N	A
Leygues, Georges	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Liermann, Léon	Y	A	Y							
Lupel, Pierre de Louvel-	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Marteau, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Massé, Auguste	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Masse, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Mazerand, Georges	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Minvielle, Prosper	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Montjou, Edgard Gaborit de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Mottu, André	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Nomblot, Charles	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Parenteau, René	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Patenôtre-Desnoyers, Henry	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y
Perreau-Pradier, Pierre	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Petsche, Maurice	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y

(Table continued)

Picot, Yves	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Piétri, François	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Puech, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Quesnel, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Régis, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Ricolfi, Humbert	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Rocca-Serra, Camille de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Rollin, Louis de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Salmon, Alfred	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Sevestre, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Sibille, Maurice	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Stern, Jacques	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Surmont, Charles	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Tardieu, André	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Tastes, Lionel de	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Taton-Vassal, Louis	Y	A	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Thibault, Albert	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Thoumyre, Robert	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Tricard-Graveron, Pierre		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Vincent, Maurice	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y

Républicain Socialiste et Socialiste Française

Antériou, Louis	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Appell, Pierre	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A
Basset, Joseph	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bénazet, Paul	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Berthezene, Charles		A	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	A
Bibié, Maxence	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Bouëssé, Joseph	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	A	A	A
Bourgot, François	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A
Brandon, Raoul		A	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	A
Bravet, Emile	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Breton, Andre-J.-L.	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y

(Table continued)

Briand, Aristide	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Brunet, Frédéric	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Chabrun, César	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	A
Debrégéas, Gabriel	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	A	A	A	A
Descubes, Louis	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Diagne, Blaise	Y	Y	A	N	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y
Faure, Emile (Indre-et-Loire)	Y	Y	A	N	Y	A	N	N	Y	Y
Forcinat, Albert	Y	Y	N							
Forgeot, Pierre	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Hennessy, Jean	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Painlevé, Paul	N	N	N	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Philippoteaux, Henri	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Planche, Camille	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Pomaret, Charles	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pouzet, Edouard	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Pradon-Vallancy, Hubert	A	N	N							
Riffaterre, Camille	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Triballet, Henri	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Vincent, Léon	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Viollette, Maurice	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N

Parti Socialiste

Albertin, Fabien	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Ambrosini, Toussaint	N	N	N	N	Y	N	A	A	A	A
Andrand, Henry	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Antonelli, Etienne							Y	Y	Y	N
Auriol, Vincent	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Baron, Charles	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Barthe, Edouard	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Bedouce, Albert	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Bérenger, Raymond	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Besnard-Ferron, Louis	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Blancho, François							Y	Y	Y	N

(Table continued)

Blum, Léon	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Boudet, René	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Bouisson, Fernand	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Boutet, Charles	N	N	N	N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N
Bracke, Alexandre	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Brunet, René	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Buisset, Séraphin	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Burtin, René	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Cadenat, Bernard	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Cadot, Louis	N	N	N	N	Y	N				
Calvet, Jean	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Camboulives, Laurent	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Capgras, Antoine	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Carmagnolle, Hubert	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Castanet, Léon	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Chastanet, Jean	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Chommeton, Léon	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Chouffet, Armand	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Compère-Morel, Adéodat	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Constans, Paul	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Cotin, Charles	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Deguisse, Jean	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Delcourt, Pierre	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Evrard, Raoul	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Faure, Paul	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Février, André	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Fiancette, Eugène	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Fié, Arsène	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Frossard, Ludovic	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Frot, Eugène	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Gamard, Henri	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Gardiol, Louis	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Georges, Richard	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N

(Table continued)

Goniaux, Charles	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Goude,Emile	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Gouin, Félix	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Goujon, Lazare	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Gounin, René	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Gros, Arsène	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Gros, Louis	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Grumbach, Salomon	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Guillon, Claude	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Héliès, Louis	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Hymans, Max	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Jardel, Pierre							Y	Y	Y	N
Lafaye, Gabriel	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Lafont, Ernest	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Laroche, Ernest	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Laville, Jean	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Lebret, René	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Lefebvre, François	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
L'Heveder, Louis							Y	Y	Y	N
Locquin, Jean	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Louart, Jacques	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Luquet, Alexandre	N	N	N	N	Y	N				
Maës, Alfred	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Marquet, Adrien	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Marsais, Louis	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Masson, Hippolyte	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Mazaud, Pierre							Y	Y	Y	N
Mistral, Paul	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Moch, Jules	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Monnet, Georges	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Monzie, Anatole de	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Morin, Ferdinand	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Moutet, Marius										

(Table continued)

Nadi, Jules	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Nicollet, Paul	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Nouvelle, Georges	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Parsy, Auguste	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Paul-Boncour, Joseph	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Paulin, Albert	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Payra, Jean										
Peirottes, Jacques-Laurent	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Pélissier, Yvan	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Ramadier, Paul	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rauzy, Alexandre	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Ravanat, Jounès	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Renaudel, Pierre	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Reynaud, Auguste	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Richerand, Etienne	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rivière, Albert	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rognon, Etienne	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rouger, Hubert	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Roux, Rémy	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rucklin, René							Y	Y	Y	N
Salengro, Roger	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Salette, Lucien							Y	Y	Y	N
Sérol, Albert	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Simounet, Gaston	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Sixte-Quenin, Anatole	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Sizaire, Henri	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Spinasse, Charles	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Tasso, Henri	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Tellier, Alphonse	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Thivrier, Isidore						N	Y	Y	Y	N
Thomas, Jean-Marie	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Tonnellier, Rodolphe	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Tricoteaux, Eugène-Romain	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N

(Table continued)

Uhry, Jules	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Vassal, Jean				N	Y		A	Y	Y	N

Union Républicaine Démocratique

About, Gaston	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Adam, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	A	N	Y
Amidieu-du-Clos, Pierre		A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	A
Anquetil, Paul	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Antoine, Georges	Y	Y	Y		A	N	Y	N	N	Y
Appourchaux, Jules	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Aramon, Bertrand d'	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Audiffret-Pasquier, Etienne d'	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Auriol, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bergerot, Charles	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Blaisot, Camille		A	A	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Bloud, Edmond	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Boissin, Joseph							N	N	N	Y
Bonnefous, Georges	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bonnefous, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bouteille, Désiré	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Braise, Félix	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bret, Georges	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Cadic, Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Calliès, Alexis	Y		N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Capron, André	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y				
Cautru, Camille	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Chassaigne-Goyon, Paul	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Constans, Adrien	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Coutel, Charles		A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Cravoisier, Henry	Y		A	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Delorme, Jean-Baptiste	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Delpont, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Denais, Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y

(Table continued)

Dessaint, Ernest	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Dubois, Louis	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Dubois Fresney, Jacques	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Duclaux-Monteil, Jules	Y	Y	Y							
Dumaine, Paul	Y		A Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Dumat, Louis		A	N Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Dupin, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Duval, Alexandre	Y		N Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Duval-Arnould, Louis	Y		N Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Engerand, Fernand	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Escudier, Paul	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Evain, Emmanuel	Y		N Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Faure, Emile (Seine)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Ferry, Désiré	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Flandin, Ernest	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Fougère, Henry	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Fould, Archille	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Fournier-Sarlovèze, Mortimer	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Gaumet, François	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Grandmaison, Georges de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Groussau, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Guérin, Gustave	Y		N Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Haut, Pierre Jacobé de	Y		N Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Inizan, Vincent	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Join-Lambert, André	Y		N Y		A	N	Y	N	N	Y
La Groudière, Bernard de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Lamazou-Betbeder, Pierre	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Lasteyrie, Charles de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Le Corbeiller, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Le Guen, Victor	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Le Mire, Henry	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Lefas, Alexandre	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Lissar, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y

(Table continued)

Ludre, René de Frolois-	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Lyons de Feuchin, Henri de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Macouin, Clovis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Marin, Louis	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Mathieu, Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Menil, Albert	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Merlant, François	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Moncelle, Edouard	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	A
Monicault, Pierre de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Montaigu, Hubert de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Moustier, Léonel de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Nicolle, Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Niel, Jean							N	N	N	Y
Nominé, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Oberkirch, Alfred	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Péchin, Charles	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Peissel, François-Marius	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Pernot, Georges	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Pfleger, Joseph	Y	Y	Y							
Plichon, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Polignac, François de	Y		N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Queinnec, Jacques	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Rieder, Joseph				Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Rillart de Verneuil, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Roquette, Henri	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y				
Rotours, Guillaume des	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Roulleaux-Dugage, Henry de		A	Y	Y			N	N	N	Y
Sabatier, Auguste	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Saint-Just, Victor de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Sallès, Antoine	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Schleiter, Victor	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Sérot, Robert	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Soulier, Edouard	Y		A	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y

(Table continued)

Tailliandier, Maurice	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Taittinger, Pierre	Y		A	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Tinguy de Pouët, Jean de	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Vallette-Viallard, Pierre	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Warren, Edouard de		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Wendel, François de		A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Weydmann, Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Wolff, Jules	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Ybarnegaray, Jean	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y

* Sources: For the voting tallies see Journal Officiel, Chambre des Députés, Débats parlementaires. The group affiliation can be found in the Journal Officiel. The full names of the deputies came from Jean Jolly ed., *Dictionnaire des Parlementaires Français: Notices biographiques sur les ministres, députés et sénateurs français de 1889 à 1940* (8 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960).

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The Tardieu experience, or as Maurice Agulhon put it, “the meteoric passage” of André Tardieu, lasted only a little over one year. The man who had seemed destined to play a prominent role in France’s politics bowed to the will of the Senate majority on 4 December 1930, and with him the program for national retooling was shelved. A law in this area was not enacted until early in 1932, but at that point it was too late to have an impact on the suffering economy, which by then was feeling the full impact of the world economic crisis. The program that was eventually passed resembled Tardieu’s only in spirit. It had been watered down by the Chamber of Deputies across the board.

The question of fairly assessing Tardieu’s premiership remains unanswered. Certainly, his cabinet understood more about the economic realities of the time than most French governments then or later. Inspired by his tenure as minister of public works, Tardieu devised a program that would help France to catch up with the rest of Europe in industrialization. Poincaré’s ministry of 1926 followed a course of conservative spending in order to save the franc. During his premiership, many public works projects were put on hold. For this reason and others, France now lagged behind other nations. The bill for national retooling was a progressive piece of legislation that originated from Tardieu’s belief that industry in France had to be improved and that its development needed stimulation.

Tardieu was no modern economist, but he knew what kind of impact a program like his would have on commercial and industrial development. He was also aware that such a project would be popular and that its positive effects would be felt among the working classes, therefore possibly reducing the appeal of socialism. Tardieu believed that government should play a role in guiding the country’s economy; he was no adherent to the

politics of laissez-faire. He aimed at increasing national income without upsetting budgetary equilibrium. This point is crucial because it shows that Tardieu remembered the previous years, especially the period after the victory of the Cartel des Gauches in 1924. The Cartel placed the nation's economy and currency at risk with its spending policies. Tardieu was conservative when it came to the issue of a balanced budget, thus rejecting the more expensive proposals of the Left. His patriotic conviction led him to the belief that something needed to be done to ensure France's success in the future, but not at risk to the national economy. In retrospect, the passage of Tardieu's proposal could have had a positive effect on France's economy by stimulating business through public works projects just in time before the Great Depression hit, therefore lessening the blow.

The expected popularity of a large-scale public works project was a principal reason why the Left sought to delay its passage. These parties were unwilling to let a government based on the Center and the Right get credit for such a progressive law. The Left was successful at delaying the bill, but just before Tardieu stumbled in the Senate, the proposal was close to passage in the Chamber. Tardieu did have a majority in the legislature: The Center and the Right could not be defeated, and they were on Tardieu's side. His majority had learned the lesson from February and was determined not to let the cabinet fall short on a vote of confidence again. Tardieu had more problems than some other political leaders, and the blame goes to his personality and history. He was not an easy person to get along with. He had an air of arrogance, and his conduct before 1924, especially the period after Clemenceau's fall, made him many enemies. Politicians from the Left, both in the Chamber and the Senate, remembered the scandals surrounding N'Goho Sangha and the Homs-Bagdad

railroad line. They also neither forgot nor forgave the fervent attacks in Tardieu's editorials and from the podium of the Chamber on post-1922 cabinets.

Tardieu's reliance on the Right for his majority made it impossible for the Radicals to join his cabinet. The division between Left and Right that dated back to the early days of the Third Republic remained too deep. The Right retained its image of a counterrevolutionary, reactionary force. Tardieu clearly tried to overcome this division. He attempted to reform the conservative forces and to mold them into a single, progressive-conservative bloc. He envisioned a system modeled after the ones in the Anglo-Saxon democracies, with two strong parties that were able and willing to overcome partisanship on certain issues when the future of the nation was at stake. Julian Jackson is wrong when he argues that Tardieu tried to rally a majority around his person. He wanted to create a new party that would oppose the Cartel des Gauches, but France was not ready for such a system.

Tardieu's affiliation with the Right was the stumbling stone for his second cabinet. Some senators argued, during the debate of 4 December 1930, that Tardieu's government was anti-republican and that it divided the country. Tardieu refuted these claims, but when the Senate refused him confidence, he had to resign. To do otherwise would have been proof to many that he was anti-republican. He would have eliminated any chance of becoming premier in the future. Tardieu did not leave politics after his fall. In fact, he was part of the next successful cabinet, under the leadership of Pierre Laval, which was formed after the failure of the Radical Senator Théodore Steeg to obtain a majority. In this government, the Parisian Tardieu took charge of the ministry of agriculture. In 1932, he became head of a caretaker government that was confirmed to bridge the few months before new elections would take place. During the national union cabinet of Gaston Doumergue in 1934, Tardieu

proposed plans for constitutional reform aimed at creating a system close to that of the United States, but they were never enacted. Tardieu quit politics in 1936 and left Paris for the south of France. He was still concerned with politics, but did not take on an active role in the Chamber or any cabinet. French politics defeated the man who might have been the nation's savior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Sources

I. Official Publications

Journal Officiel, Chambre des Députés, Débats parlementaires.

Journal Officiel, Chambre des Députés, Documents parlementaires.

Journal Officiel, Sénat, Débats parlementaires.

II. Newspapers and Periodicals

L'Echo National

Le Figaro

Le Temps

Revue de Science et de Législation Financières

2. Secondary Sources

I. Books

Agulhon, Maurice. *The French Republic, 1879-1992*. Trans. Antonia Nevill. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1993.

Albert, Louis ed. *André Tardieu*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1957.

Binion, Rudolph. *Defeated Leaders: The Political Fate of Caillaux, Jouvenel, and Tardieu*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Bonnefous, Edouard. *Histoire politique de la Troisième République*. 7 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1956-67.

Brogan, Denis W. *The Development of Modern France, 1870-1939*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Cambon, Paul. *Correspondance, 1870-1924*. 3 vols. Paris: Editions Bernard Grasset, 1940.

Duroselle, Jean-Baptiste. *Clemenceau*. Paris: Fayard, 1988.

Goguel, François. *La politique des parties sous la IIIe République*. Paris: Editions du

- Seuil, 1958.
- Haig, Robert Murray. *The Public Finances of Post-War France*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.
- Huddleston, Sisley. *Poincaré: A Biographical Portrait*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1924.
- Jackson, Julian. *France: The Dark Years*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Jolly, Jean ed. *Dictionnaire des Parlementaires Français: Notices biographiques sur les ministres, députés et sénateurs français de 1889 à 1940*. 8 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960.
- Junot, Michel. *André Tardieu: Le Mirobolant*. Paris: Editions Denoël, 1996.
- Kemp, Tom. *The French Economy 1913-39: The History of a Decline*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972.
- Misoffé, Michel. *La Vie volontaire d'André Tardieu*. Paris: Editions des Portiques, 1930.
- Mordacq, Jean Jules Henri. *Clemenceau au soir de sa vie, 1920-1929*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1933.
- Moreau, Emile. *The Golden Franc: Memoirs of the Governor of the Bank of France*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1991.
- Ogburn, William and William Jaffé. *The Economic Development of Post-War France: A Survey of Production*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.
- Parker, R.A.C. *Europe 1919-45*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1967.
- Reynaud, Paul. *Mémoires*. Paris: Flammarion, 1960.
- Sauvy, Alfred. *Histoire économique de la France entre les deux guerres*. 2 vols. Paris: Fayard, 1965-1975.
- Sherwood, John M. *Georges Mandel and the Third Republic*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- Shuker, Stephen A. *The End of French Predominance in Europe*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1976.
- Siegfried, André. *France: A Study in Nationality*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930.

Tardieu, André. *Le mystère d'Agadir*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1912.

----- . *La Révolution à refaire*. 2 vols., Paris: Flammarion, 1936.

----- . *Notes sur les Etats-Unis*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1908.

Tint, Herbert. *France since 1918*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Weber, Eugen. *The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994.

Werth, Alexander. *The Twilight of France, 1933-1940*. New York: Howard Fertig, 1966.

II. Articles

Suarez, Georges, "L'outillage national et les parties," *Revue de Paris*, 1 Feb. 1932, 562.

Clague, Monique, "Vision and Myopia in the New Politics of André Tardieu," *French Historical Studies* 8 (Spring 1973), 98.

VITA

Tim K. Fuchs was born in Crailsheim, Germany. In December of 1998 he received his bachelor of arts degree in history from Georgia Southern University in Statesboro, Georgia. He enrolled in the graduate program at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana in 1999. Here he started working on his thesis under the direction of Benjamin Martin. Mr. Fuchs will receive his degree of master of arts at the May 2002 commencement.