

Jules Ferry

SPEECH BEFORE THE FRENCH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Jules Ferry (1832–1893) was a French politician who twice served as premier during the Third Republic, the name of the French government from 1871 until 1940. Ferry was an enthusiastic imperialist, and during his premierships France annexed Tunisia and parts of Indochina and began exploring Africa's Congo River region. In debates in the French National Assembly he frequently defended his policies against both socialist and conservative critics who, for different reasons, opposed French imperialism. The following selection from his speech on July 28, 1883, summarizes Ferry's reasons for supporting French expansionism and also sheds light on his opponents' views.

Questions for Analysis

1. What economic forces, according to Ferry, make imperialism a necessity for France? What economic benefits will result?
2. What other arguments does Ferry present in favor of imperialism?
3. What are the antiimperialist arguments of his opponents? How does he counter them?

NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL
MAY BE PROTECTED BY
COPYRIGHT LAW
(TITLE 17, U.S. CODE).

M. Jules Ferry. Gentlemen, it embarrasses me to make such a prolonged demand upon the gracious attention of the Chamber, but I believe that the duty I am fulfilling upon this platform is not a useless one: It is as strenuous for me as for you, but I believe that there is some benefit in summarizing and condensing, in the form of arguments, the principles, the motives, and the various interests by which a policy of colonial expansion may be justified; it goes without saying that I will try to remain reasonable, moderate, and never lose sight of the major conti-

mental interests which are the primary concern of this country. What I wish to say, to support this proposition, is that in fact, just as in word, the policy of colonial expansion is a political and economic system; I wish to say that one can relate this system to three orders of ideas: economic ideas, ideas of civilization in its highest sense, and ideas of politics and patriotism.

In the area of economics, I will allow myself to place before you, with the support of some figures, the considerations which justify a policy of colonial expan-

sion from the point of view of that need, felt more and more strongly by the industrial populations of Europe and particularly those of our own rich and hard working country: the need for export markets. Is this some kind of chimera? Is this a view of the future or is it not rather a pressing need, and, we could say, the cry of our industrial population? I will formulate only in a general way what each of you, in the different parts of France, is in a position to confirm. Yes, what is lacking for our great industry, drawn irrevocably on to the path of exportation by the (free trade) treaties of 1860,¹ what it lacks more and more is export markets. Why? Because next door to us Germany is surrounded by barriers, because beyond the ocean, the United States of America has become protectionist, protectionist in the most extreme sense, because not only have these great markets, I will not say closed but shrunk, and thus become more difficult of access for our industrial products, but also these great states are beginning to pour products not seen heretofore onto our own markets. . . . It is not necessary to pursue this demonstration any farther. . . .

. . . Gentlemen, there is a second point, a second order of ideas to which I have to give equal attention, but as quickly as possible, believe me; it is the humanitarian and civilizing side of the question. On this point the honorable M. Camille Pelletan² has jeered in his own refined and clever manner; he jeers, he condemns, and he says "What is this civilization which you impose with cannon-balls? What is it but another form of barbarism? Don't these

populations, these inferior races, have the same rights as you? Aren't they masters of their own houses? Have they called upon you? You come to them against their will, you offer them violence, but not civilization." There, gentlemen, is the thesis; I do not hesitate to say that this is not politics, nor is it history: it is political metaphysics. ("Ah, Ah" on far left.)³

. . . Gentlemen, I must speak from a higher and more truthful plane. It must be stated openly that, in effect, superior races have rights over inferior races. (*Movement on many benches on the far left.*)

M. Jules Maigne. Oh! You dare to say this in the country which has proclaimed the rights of man!

M. de Guilloutet. This is a justification of slavery and the slave trade!

M. Jules Ferry. If M. Maigne is right, if the declaration of the rights of man was written for the blacks of equatorial Africa, then by what right do you impose regular commerce upon them? They have not called upon you.

M. Raoul Duval. We do not want to impose anything upon them. It is you who wish to do so!

M. Jules Maigne. To propose and to impose are two different things!

M. Georges Perin.⁴ In any case, you cannot bring about commerce by force.

M. Jules Ferry. I repeat that superior races have a right, because they have a duty. They have the duty to civilize inferior races. . . . (*Approbation from the left. New interruptions from the extreme left and from the right.*) . . .

1. The reference is to a trade treaty between Great Britain and France that lowered tariffs between the two nations.

2. Pelletan (1846–1815) was a patriotic, radical republican politician.

3. Adhering to a tradition begun in the legislative assemblies of the French Revolution,

democrats and republicans sat on the far left, moderates in the center, and conservatives on the right. By the 1880s, the "left" also included socialists.

4. Maigne, Guilloutet, Duval, and Perin were all members of the National Assembly.

That is what I have to answer M. Pelletan in regard to the second point upon which he touched.

He then touched upon a third, more delicate, more serious, and upon which I ask your permission to express myself quite frankly. It is the political side of the question. The honorable M. Pelletan, who is a distinguished writer, always comes up with remarkably precise formulations. I will borrow from him the one which he applied the other day to this aspect of colonial policy.

"It is a system," he says, "which consists of seeking out compensations in the Orient with a circumspect and peaceful seclusion which is actually imposed upon us in Europe."

I would like to explain myself in regard to this. I do not like this word "compensation," and, in effect, not here but elsewhere it has often been used in a treacherous way. If what is being said or insinuated is that a republican minister could possibly believe that there are in any part of the world compensations for the disasters which we have experienced,⁵ an injury is being inflicted . . . and an injury undeserved by that government. (*Applause at the center and left.*) I will ward off this injury with all the force of my patriotism! (*New applause and bravos from the same benches.*)

Gentlemen, there are certain considerations which merit the attention of all patriots. The conditions of naval warfare have been profoundly altered. ("Very true! Very true!")

At this time, as you know, a warship cannot carry more than fourteen days' worth of coal, no matter how perfectly it is organized, and a ship which is out of coal is a derelict on the surface of the sea,

abandoned to the first person who comes along. Thence the necessity of having on the oceans provision stations, shelters, ports for defense and revictualling. (*Applause at the center and left. Various interruptions.*) And it is for this that we needed Tunisia, for this that we needed Saigon and the Mekong Delta, for this that we need Madagascar, that we are at Diégo-Suarez and Vohemar⁶ and will never leave them! (*Applause from a great number of benches.*) Gentlemen, in Europe as it is today, in this competition of so many rivals which we see growing around us, some by perfecting their military or maritime forces, others by the prodigious development of an ever growing population; in a Europe, or rather in a universe of this sort, a policy of peaceful seclusion or abstention is simply the highway to decadence! Nations are great in our times only by means of the activities which they develop; it is not simply "by the peaceful shining forth of institutions" (*Interruptions on the extreme left and right*) that they are great at this hour. . . .

As for me, I am astounded to find the monarchist parties becoming indignant over the fact that the Republic of France is following a policy which does not confine itself to that ideal of modesty, of reserve, and, if you will allow me the expression, of bread and butter (*Interruptions and laughter on the left*) which the representatives of fallen monarchies wish to impose upon France. (*Applause at the center.*) . . .

(The Republican Party) has shown that it is quite aware that one cannot impose upon France a political ideal conforming to that of nations like independent Belgium and the Swiss Republic; that something else is needed for France: that she cannot be merely a free country, that she

5. The reference is to France's defeat by Prussia and the German states in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871.

6. Madagascar port cities.

must also be a great country, exercising all of her rightful influence over the destiny of Europe, that she ought to propagate this influence throughout the world and

carry everywhere that she can her language, her customs, her flag, her arms, and her genius. (*Applause at center and left.*)

■ ■ ■