

# HENRI PROST

## and The Moroccan Colonial Experience

Hélène Vacher

The purpose of this paper is to examine the proposition that the experiences in colonial town planning played an important role in the constitution of French urban planning doctrines before World War II. The approach adopted to address this question consists in bringing together conceptions of urban history and of planning history and inquiries arising out of French attempts to consolidate its colonial Empire in the first half of the twentieth century.

This paper especially tries to illuminate the career of the architect and urban planner Henri Prost before the Second World War. For all his achievements, H. Prost (1874–1959), has somehow remained elusive.<sup>1</sup> No sustained research analysis of his influence in both the professionalisation and the institutions of town planning in France has yet been effectuated. In assessing the significance of Prost's role in the building up of French town-

Hélène Vacher defended her licentiate thesis *Projection coloniale et ville rationalisée. Le rôle de l'espace colonial dans la constitution de l'urbanisme en France-1900-1931* last spring at the University of Aalborg, Denmark. With this text she is developing, from that colonial background, some important aspects of the specific career of architect Henri Prost and particularly his vast importance to the preformation of the ideology and practice of modern urbanism in France itself.

planning apparatus, I will also examine some questions emerging specifically from the context of colonisation.

By exploring this formative period of French urbanism, it is shown that the intertwined threads of relationships between colonisation and modernisation have not yet received the attention they apparently deserve.

The role of “colonial urbanism” in relation to the development of the town-planning movement in France has been noticed long ago by Bardet (1945) and more recently by Massiah & Tribillion (1988) and Tribillion (1991). However no comprehensive study has provided a complete idea of its scope during the formative years of the discipline. In my earlier work<sup>2</sup> I have concentrated on showing the founding role played by the practice of town planning in the colonial field. Advancing the hypothesis that urbanism had a “logistical” function as an aid, I have investigated how this discipline was acknowledged as a powerful auxiliary force next to the public works in order to enforce colonial domination and for reorienting economic and social developments according to the logics of the metropolis. In this context two distinct propositions of A. D. King have proved fertile:

*Colonial planning affords an example of a comprehensive and positive planning theory put into practice by government many decades before this became feasible in the metropolitan society*

and

*despite mounting evidence on the role of colonial urbanism and urbanisation in the formation of a world urban system (...) the most significant gap in our knowledge is of the impact of colonialism on urbanism and urbanisation in the metropolises themselves*<sup>3</sup>.

In this paper I shall focus on the impact of colonial urbanism on the planning apparatus at a moment when the discipline had already been crystallised.

For methodological reasons I refer to the term *urbanism* first and foremost as a professional discipline and an institution. That is to say I consider urbanism as a set of techniques, of professional practices and ideologies related to implementing institutions. Some components of that body are derived from technical sciences ranging from geology to public works engineering all of which contribute by way of giving scientific validation to planning. Another category is affiliated to social engineering with a strong reformist and hygienist trend and to economic survey analysis. A third root involves legal expertise and law procedures making feasible the implementations of the plans. In France urban arts have significantly contributed to crystallise the planning apparatus, through academic institutions such as Beaux-Arts and the Prix de Rome.

### The professional profile of Henri Prost

The exemplary career of H. Prost displays many of the characteristics common to the early promoters of modern urbanism. However some peculiar features can explain his ascendancy over the emerging profession Prost did not leave any treaty or theoretical writings, but only his plans and attached programmes<sup>4</sup>. It is thus only through his personal archives, articles and achievements that his contribution to the discipline can be assessed. Prost belongs to the post-haussmannian generation of architects who were looking for a way out of a one century long post-Boulléean crisis of architecture. He enjoyed the privilege of having been accepted by both the academic and the rationalist-modernist milieu, for belonging to the Ecole Spéciale d'Architecture (ESA) and to the prestigious "Prix de Rome" tradition.

The ESA was established by Émile Trélat (1821–1907) during the Second Empire to bridge the growing gap between architecture and civil engineering. Among the personalities belonging to Trélat's school was Viollet le Duc, the rationalist theoretician and restorer who was ostracised in 1863 from the Beaux-Arts for its "pro-gothic" view despite the strong backing of the court of Napoleon III. Merely three decades later when H. Prost entered the Villa Medici in Rome as the first and single laureate with an ESA cum Beaux-Arts background, the "gothic quarrel" was long over and Academism had made numerous concessions to eclecticism. With the teaching of Julien Guadet (1834–1908), the Beaux-Arts School underwent a

much deeper evolution opening on to the rationalist and pre-functional trend. As Prost recalls in a note, changes were also perceptible in the Villa Medici through a plunge into the Greek and Roman town-planning of Antiquity<sup>5</sup>. He himself carried out between 1905 and 1907 an extensive survey of St Sophia of Constantinople, including the palatial complex and the surroundings. This passion for investigations in structural architecture and antiquity town-planning was not to be converted into a renewed form of historicism. Like several of his colleagues Prost looked for a direct involvement in town-planning schemes, an approach that met with great success in the Antwerp "Golden Ring" project's winning award in 1910.

Prost's extension plan for Antwerp represented a new clear cut orientation, including but a few guiding principles drawn upon the previous German and Austrian "Stadterweiterung" experiments. Prost opted for the preservation of some of the military buildings. The fortification ring was buttressing a large green belt articulating inwards arterial roads with outward radials, opening to new districts and generating "garden-cities" from place to place. As some of the Villa Médici co-pensioners like Léon Jaussely (1875–1933) and the famous Tony Garnier (1869–1948), Prost paid also special attention to the new scale infrastructural network integration. One innovative aspect of his proposal was the most remarkable suggestion for a huge concrete platform he called "Belvédère". This artificial floor supported by a row of eight concrete columns was designed to enable the direct connection of the city centre

through intervening landscaped ramps and monumental avenues directly out to docks and harbour areas.

At that stage Prost's career, combining some of the brightest aspects of the academic and rationalist tradition, was to take a decisive turn as Prost was associated with the Musée Social in June 1911. Together with other members of the Urban and Rural Hygienic Section (SHUR) of the foundation he seconded the ailing Eugène Hénard (1849–1923) in charge since 1908, in the analysis of the eventual replacement of Paris city edge fortification constructions<sup>6</sup>. The same year, 1911, he participated with some of his colleagues from the SHUR in the act of founding the Société Française des Architectes-Urbanistes, soon to be known as the Société Française des Urbanistes (SFU).

In my previous work I have described the over representation of the colonial lobby ("le Parti Colonial") within the M. S. since its inception in 1894 and the central role the foundation played to foster town-planning before 1914. In the context of Prost's career I shall further on try to present the full scope of the M. S. in articulating the ideology of metropolitan and colonial urbanism.

In January 1913 Georges Risler, then Vice-President of the SHUR, revealed to the section's members the decision taken by General Lyautey to establish "a lay out and extension plan" for the main cities of Morocco.<sup>7</sup> He suggested that Prost should be chosen for assisting the Resident in his "huge endeavour". A month later Gaston Delure, the all powerful director of Public Works of Lyautey's Protectorate, came to give a lecture on the preliminary phase of town planning operations for

Casablanca and Rabat<sup>8</sup>. It is noteworthy that another member of the SHUR, JCN Forestier (1861–1930) was invited in 1913 by the Residence in Morocco. By the turn of the century this polytechnician had become one of the first advocates for "green urbanism" in France. In December 1913 he provided the Protectorate authorities with a preliminary report on "free spaces" and immediate protective measures to be taken<sup>9</sup>.

Prost himself underlined the tight relationship between the leadership of the M. S., the Colonial Party and the government. He wrote that as early as by March 1912, G. Risler after a meeting with General Lyautey referred to him as an "extraordinary man" who "was going to be chosen soon" as the head of the Protectorate<sup>10</sup>. The decision was effective on April 27th 1912. The new French prolectorate and Lyautey's leaning for city planning converged with the M. S. desires for putting into practice some of the ideas developed by the foundation since 1908, at a time when the legislative battle and Hénard's plan were failing to achieve any significant advances within metropolitan French territory.

### Designing the colonial platform

Prost had been "arm, head and soul" of the so-called Service d'Architecture and Service des Plans de Ville which was formally set out in 1920. But already in 1914, when he set up his agency in Casablanca, Prost was joining forces with the Resident Lyautey and the Direction of Public Works for the plan of Casablanca. Before he moved his agency to Rabat late in 1916 in order to be on the site for designing the

whole complex of the new Residence, he was working on the plans for Rabat, Fes, Meknes and Casablanca. In fact the structure in which choices, orientations and decisions were actually taken was within an unofficial committee headed by Lyautey, something which Prost later characterised as a "political and technical council"<sup>11</sup>.

The layout and the implementation phase went on throughout the whole period of the First World War. From 1919 Prost often left Morocco and went for research missions related to town-planning issues, especially for comparative analysis of legislation. Thus Prost represented the Protectorate to the London Town Planning Conference in 1920. As the Moroccan program slowed down he was eventually looking for new creative assignments. While considering a proposition to work on behalf of the Turkish government, on a plan for Smyrne, Prost was in 1922 offered to design a regional scheme by the Prefect of Var in the south of France.

As a result from my former research into the theory and practice of town-planning in a colonial context, and especially from the specific case of Prost, I would like to propose the following set of important issues and characteristics derived from this material, deserving to be further discussed, as they try to identify the impact on the formation of metropolitan urbanism.

Primarily, in the colonies town-planning processes are not engulfed in the much wider and often intractable problematic linked to the parliamentary elaboration process. Consequently all planning activities and prescriptions can be considered by the all powerful "colonial state" as a set of primarily

functional relationships which were often compared to a machine or to a system, to quote from some of the founding fathers of French urbanism (Jausse & Risler). Accordingly colonial urbanism displays some specific aspects:

–The extraction-oriented polarisation of the infrastructural network coupled with strategic imperatives.

–The spatial dominance of the command-control aspects in military city-camps.

–The dual city with its “ethnic” and cultural boundaries.

We have defined the cities that were deployed in the geographical space of Morocco since 1912 as the “nerve centres” of a widespread infrastructural network. This constituted a new spatial structure – an “over-hanging territorial organisation” superimposing itself upon the, then, traditional Morocco. We have designated this as a colonial platform. The interconnection of new, “modern”, cities monopolising by adding modern institutions, buildings and goods and new communication networks, generated such a platform, which in turn has produced a highly differentiated spatial organisation. Lyautey repeated tirelessly that he had to bring the “newest into the oldest” that is to say an industrial, technological colonisation with electricity, motor vehicles, telephones and planes. He actually considered the Public Works department as an extended *military tool* making up for the weakness of military forces unable to hold on their very own what he called the “useful territory” of Morocco.

The policy of alliance with the indigenous elite, in the context of the international situation which prevailed

at that time, made for instance the Algerian policy of “dismantling” old urban structures surprisingly and absolutely obsolete. The strategic tasks given to town-planners was three folded:

– to rapidly display a complex territorial network and appropriate buildings enhancing the durability of the colonial occupation. The hierarchy of public thoroughfares was established especially in order to develop regional connections with the coastline.

– to make effective the spatial distancing through separation at every possible scale of the built forms to reinforce the dominance and the control. The implementation of zoning was particularly instrumental in this respect.

– the mechanisms of adaptation/adjustment was essential to secure the connection between the modern colonial platform and what the colonist called the mixture of contempt and romantic nostalgia around “Old Morocco”. A careful policy of conservation, sitology and “green urbanism” were efficiently applied to reinforce the “deep rooting” effect of the colonial occupation.

In short, urbanism was there to regulate the flow between differentiated socio-cultural entities who could also be analysed in terms of co-existing temporalities with corresponding speed flow. A model based on spatial and visual separation was systematised. For the first time within a “french territory” we observe a global procedure put into force to orientate, in a semiotically unified and economically coherent way, the urban macroform. The enforcement of a zoning regulation opened a wide field to manipulate architectural criterias and density ratios. In the end, the colonial

model was characterised by a space extensive energyintensive circulatory system, that became a model and a symbol of modernity after the Second World War. During those years, Prost working tightly with the Public Works department, was supposed to realise a symbiotic fusion between the political constraint of the colonial society and the techniques of modern town-planning. Urbanism was used as a “logistic” tool to dynamise the colonial platform, opening it up to world exchange.

Prost was eager to justify why architects should remain at the centre of the planning process. Their professional training had developed their abilities to articulate the different scales of the project and to integrate the socio-cultural dimensions. In the absence of architects, modern planning would fall back into an expended haussmannian circulatory obsession. Architects had a full monopoly over an expertise able to bring aesthetical cohesiveness, compensating for the crude reality of spatial separation.

#### Pivotal organisations and “glorious laboratory”<sup>12</sup>

By the turn of the thirties, planning doctrines, institutional bodies, and also the legal framework of urban planning reached a stage of maturity. This period was also marked by an increasing interaction between metropolitan and colonial urbanism. The SHUR and the SFU had reinforced their pivotal role in articulating town-planning activities between the metropolis and the dominated territories and the selected professional elite had confirmed its hold on the major bodies of the planning apparatus in the metropolis. This was

made possible because of strong and prolonged links between the colonial lobby and the M. S.

Until recently, little research have been undertaken on this multi-purpose “think-tank”, which we believe played a central role in the strategic elaboration of social reform undertaken by the Third Republic<sup>13</sup>. None have pointed out the tight relationship existing between the members of this politico-social elite and the colonial lobby<sup>14</sup>.

As an example here, during the pre-1914 period, let us just consider that Jules Siegfried (1837–1922), one of the founding members and President of the Musée Social until his demise, pioneer of the French town-planning legislation since 1886, never appears in the mentioned studies as a central figure of the Colonial Party, despite having been a President of the Colonial group in the Senate, a vice-president and a founding member of the same group in the parliament, plus a prominent member of numerous organisations, actively involved in the politics of colonial expansion of the Third Republic. We have shown in our previous study that this janus faced aspect of the M. S. President was not unique. Many personalities belonging to the various bodies of this foundation were also closely linked to the Colonial Party.

By the twenties, with the Protectorates imposed on Syria and Lebanon as well as Togo and Cameroon the French Empire had reached its zenith, and, from expansion, the attention of the Colonial Party shifted to economic development labelled “mise en valeur”, a process of revalorisation.

The strong presence of the Colonial Party at that time was also reflected by

the increase of colonial topics in the program of conferences arranged by this institution<sup>15</sup>. Within the specific professional context of the SHUR we have identified seventeen sessions dedicated to the study of colonial projects between 1913 and 1936. Twenty one sessions were dedicated to the study of metropolitan projects and fourteen to projects abroad. The bulk of the “colonial session” appears in the beginning of the thirties with in particular the presentation of the work of the Dangers consulting office in the Middle East. René Danger, a land surveyor and one of the leading urbanists of the SFU, had previously worked in Morocco with Prost and carried with him an extensive town-planning survey on the major cities of the Middle East placed under French Protectorate between the two wars.

Another important conference was held by Jean Royer who was also associated with H. Prost in Morocco and took over from him the direction of ESA. Royer insists on the complexity specific to colonial planning. For this very reason he finds this discipline especially attractive for students or young urbanists. H. Prost spoke twice to the Section. First together with the Public Works engineer E. Joyant in 1922. They together gave an extensive account of Moroccan town-planning achievements. Ten years later Prost made a critical assessment of the work undertaken in Casablanca.

We shall also mention an extensive conference given in 1929 by Robert de Souza, a founding member of the SHUR and a prolific writer on urbanism<sup>16</sup>. Placed under the patronage of Lyautey (who became by 1923 a mem-

ber of the Great Council of the M. S.) this conference can be interpreted as a SHUR manifesto, a first synthesis of the work carried on by the section since 1908. In his foreword Lyautey underlines the political advantage of the colonial context for urbanism. Town-planning regulation in this setting can be implemented without the many tedious interferences and annoying delays attached to the parliamentary, democratic process.

#### Paris:

##### Towards a mature apparatus

The decisive reinforcing period of the town-planning apparatus and of the attached regulation can be observed in France between 1928–1935. Prost was to play a central role in this process. The Var-project was from 1922 the first prolongation in the metropolis of his colonial career<sup>17</sup>. We believe that Prost was chosen for two essential reasons:

– First, among innovative aspects of the Moroccan urbanism was the systematic inclusion of tourist schemes. The importance of the tourist dimension with its economic as well as cultural dimensions had been repeatedly underlined by Lyautey who recommended Prost to the Var Prefect. In Morocco this aim was mainly pursued through ambitious multidimensional conservation programs involving not only monuments but also the global fabric of the indigenous city as such. In order to attract upper class tourism and business the indigenous city had not only to be domesticated and disciplined but also to remain visually essentially different in order to be spectacularised. In compliance with the official wishes of the prefect one of the main aims of the Var-

project was to install a framework preparing the tourist redevelopment of the Mediterranean coastline. Prost was to apply a detailed program of landscaped infrastructural network in which he excelled. By-pass roads were designed to protect small cities, coastal fronts and natural sites were identified and selected for protection. For the first time a global and integrated development and conservation plan was undertaken at a scale covering about 250 Km of coastline.

– Second, besides reaching the level of an experienced practitioner, Prost was also confronted with a problematic reversing the traditional town-planning approach where normally planners look from the city centre towards the expanding periphery. Studying the interaction between the architects of the Service des Plans de Villes and the engineers of the Public Works Department trying to create what we have called “a colonial platform” we have shown how a global territorial approach was from the very start one of the characteristics of the town-planning process in Morocco. Hence both services fully collaborated in paying a strong attention to the location and treatment of the connecting points of the new infrastructure. Consequently the methodology of urbanism was freeing itself from the persistent obsession with urban morphology *per se*.

Finally, in Var, the Prost’s project was quite successful in promoting redevelopment through housing estates – the prefect labelled Prost’s work “housing geography” – integrated within large conservation schemes. By 1927 Prost considered the achievements positively<sup>18</sup> despite the fact that the 1919 law was too weak to allow an

effective enforcement of the inter-communal regrouping scheme.

It can be said that the impetus for regional planning had penetrated the metropolis by 1924. Then, the ground was prepared for the master piece: the suburban redevelopment of Paris.

With a highly state-centred society and geographically polarised nation, town-planning initiatives in France were characterised by their strong relationship with the models set in the capital. The haussmannian model was created for Paris and then adapted to the provincial towns. During the pre-war period the debate over the destiny of the fortification ring mobilised the energies of the nascent urbanist milieu. Therefore the institutional set-up of urbanism in France must be analysed in relation to the Paris situation.

A short lived commission had been formed in 1911 under the Prefect of the Seine department, M. Delanney (who later became Vice-President of the SHUR). Its mission was to study “questions relating to the extension of Paris”. Two prominent professionals, an urban historian, and an architect, both connected with the SHUR issued a report discussing this project. M. Poète, founding member of the Institut d’Urbanisme de l’Université de Paris and the architect Louis Bonnier, insisted on the urgent widening of major highways linking Paris to the continental network and on the conservation and creation of green reserves.

Broader proposals were to come in the aftermath of the war. With the founding piece of French urbanism, that was the 14 March 1919 law, a general plan was made compulsory for cities of more than 10 000 inhabitants<sup>19</sup>. This

law also put in place a regulating organ the Commission Supérieure d’Aménagement, d’Embellissement et d’Extension des Villes (CSAEEV) directly placed under the interior ministry and in charge of controlling the plan making process. Its first President was H J P Cornudet, who had coined the law largely established after the 1912 Siegfried bill proposal. Authors of numerous parliamentarian reports, Cornudet was a moderate republican deputy, closely associated to the M. S. and the SHUR<sup>20</sup>.

The M. S.-SHUR-SFU-and the Social Alliance Hygiene (another offspring from the M. S.) were strongly represented<sup>21</sup> in the organs of the CSAEEV and among the four professional urbanists, three were well known members of the SHUR, with G. Risler, L. Jaussely and L. Bonnier. From 1924 six new urbanists were included with Henri Prost among them, the five others being either SHUR or SFU members. From 1927 onward, G. Risler took over the head of the Commission.

Within the framework created by the 1919 law a competition was launched for Paris redevelopment and extension plan. Léon Jaussely, one of the nine founding members of SFU, won (in collaboration with Expert and Sellier) the first section of the competition reserved to the issue of Paris future extension. For Jaussely, a planner of socialist leaning, like Tony Garnier, general welfare will be the end result from social and economical growth of the city. The task of the planner was thus to adapt and to transfer the technicity of industrial productivity methods into the spatial

organisation of urban land in order to optimise production. The project resumed the pioneer approach developed formerly by Jaussely in Barcelona<sup>22</sup> between 1903–1907 and insisted on a taylorisation of the infrastructural network and the use of space. This plan brought a lot of innovative ideas along, including zonal regulation, but it was poorly surveyed and met soon with failure. In any case the 1919 legislation, a “half victory” in the terms of the SHUR members, was far too weak to sustain its implementation.

The main contradictions and difficulties in the after-war period were concentrated in the Paris area. Since 1919 a global town-planning apparatus did already exist supplied with professionals, orientations, and modus operandi. But the practical application proved to be very difficult and too costly to the communes. The layout plans, were at best an incitement for the communes, because most of them did not have the finances to develop new districts. The expropriation law voted in 1918 limited the effective application of zonal redeployment by submitting the decision to the final approbation of the State Council, the latter having continuously maintained a conservative interpretation of the law. The inter-communal regroupings constituted under the prefectorial authorities had no sufficient powers to enforce regional plans and could not properly function for their lack of a tax equalisation mechanism, the basic territorial unit still being the commune.

The war had accelerated the industrial concentration in the suburbs and the consequent “spontaneous” development of building plots. By the end

of the twenties the growing and ill-equipped suburb threatened to become a major political problem for the Third Republic. Despite some set-backs in particular with the Paris extension plan the urbanist lobby managed to keep alive the pressure for an extension plan, now reconceptualized through regional planning. A planning office was created by the Prefect of the Seine department. This office was to be very active from the middle of the twenties in studying regional planning projects and in formalising communal plans but it failed in launching major pilot projects. The 1924 law, amended the 1919 text concerning plot building by making the submission of housing estate projects compulsory. By 1928, the question of the poor suburban dwellers (“sans logis”) remained urgent in the context of the economic crisis. When the lyauteyan circles decided to spark their “social action” strategy in the periphery with the intention to transform the “red belt” into a green one, the “Sarraut law” started an uplift program for “defectuous” housing plots realised before 1924<sup>23</sup>. This “soft” approach of urban sprawl was to be completed by a decisive reinforcement of the planning apparatus. In March 1928 the Minister of Interior A. Sarraut instituted the Comité Supérieur de l’Aménagement et de l’Organisation Générale de la Région Parisienne (CSAOGRP). Sarraut, former Governor of Indochina (1911–1914 & 1916–1919) and Minister of Colonies (1920–24), architect of an ambitious after war imperial public works scheme, was much alarmed by the suburban “proliferation of cancerous cells”. He gave to the new organ a triple mission

of “investigation and control”, “co-ordination” and “evaluation” declaring onto its members: “*You have to organise the Parisian region, to institute into this region, it must be said, an emergency power*”<sup>24</sup>. With the setting up of this Committee the term “extension” was dropped and the region emerged as the new decisive spatial entity in planning. But the region did not have specific legislative status as such. In fact the Committee placed directly under the Ministry of Interior represented the region. It included members of the elected assemblies and experts of various technical bodies. The exact composition and functioning of the Committee was later defined in 1932. Prost was working in the first section responsible for the centralisation of planning analysis. To be able to complete this mission, despite the poor informational network of the Committee, Prost had secured the presence of Raoul Dautry, a lyauteyan follower since his youth, who was later to be admitted in the inner political circle of the Maréchal. Dautry was a polytechnician and a passionate self proclaimed “urbanist”, member of the SHUR since 1922. He had by 1928 become the Directeur Général des Chemins de Fer de l’Etat after getting great fame for his technical cum social achievements as an engineer of the northern railways.<sup>25</sup> In July 1932 Prost was named chief urbanist of the Committee with J. Royer and P. Remaury as assistant urbanists. The SHUR was also heavily represented in the Committee with personalities like G. Monsarrat (a legal expert), A. Dervaux (architect-urbanist), L. Vaillat (writer and lyauteyan propagandist) and Cornudet. Finally

the law of 14 May 1932 defined the “Parisian region” with a radius of 35 Km from the centre encompassing 656 communes<sup>26</sup>. A general scheme as well as a program was to be established within two years and Prost delivered the Project by May 1934. The 1932 law assessed the principle of the pre-eminence of the regional scheme over municipal general plan and centralised all zonal transformations within the ministry interior. Those provisions were subsequently completed and reinforced through several decrees passed in July 1935. A technical committee was charged with co-ordinating missions to facilitate the project implementation. Another decree introduced the notion of land replotting within limited zones of interventions. The introduction of systematic replotting, first introduced in Morocco under Lyautey, had been constantly advocated since the war by the SHUR and the SFU.

Furthermore another decree, following the above mentioned pattern of French urbanism, by which Paris was to set the example, decided to generalise the making of regional plans at the national and colonial level. Regional committees could be formed under the proposal of the Ministry of Interior with consultative functions. A regular pattern was designed whereby the Regional project was concerned with the infrastructural network, the assignment of “free-space” and green reserves and zonal specifications. Regional easement regulations relating to zoning had to be included in the project to be used as guidelines when establishing sub-projects on communal basis.

The planning apparatus was therefore more or less in place by the middle

of the thirties. By that time urbanism had managed to impose a very large panoply of intervention tools (differential zoning, expropriation laws, land replotting etc.) even if their practical use was still of limited effect. Also after Prost started his Var project a conceptual step had to be acknowledged by the broadening of town-planning practice from the communal to the regional scale. The subsequent shifting of town-planners emphasis from physical shape to systemic interaction was then written into the law.

In 1934, with the Paris Regional Plan, Prost had reached a new step in the practice of planning. On the one hand the plan was supposed to bring to the Capital the latest achievements of “rational urbanism”<sup>27</sup>, on the other it was introducing territorial planning. Among the most innovative aspects present we shall retain the following:

- Besides a program aiming at restructuring the old infrastructural network, Prost projected an entirely new system of main arterial roads, “flying over” the existing suburbs who were blocking Paris outlet/inlet. Those motor ways would radiate from Paris in four cardinal directions, with a fifth “triumphal road” pushing toward the north-west historic axe Louvre-Etoile. In the suburb further highway developments would be preserved with the implementation of a strict system of easement regulation.

A ring road connecting this radial scheme was also provided with a special landscaping program “to hide the untidy districts”. This emphasis on highways, favouring individual vehicles was to become a long term characteristic of the Paris transport system.

- To stop encroachment on rural land the concept of an agglomeration perimeter was introduced to temper the development of speculative building plots. Consequently new clusters would have to find their way in the vicinity of existing agglomeration or on special development schemes on reserved land.

- Like in the Var project a general conservation scheme was designed to protect urban and rural sites, forests and parks. Meticulous studies were provided as examples.

- Zoning only marginally incorporated in the 1919 law appeared in a much more developed form with industrial, residential and “non-affected zones” where garden city projects and the like could be foreseen. The building heights were distributed in four classes depending on location. The principle of global replotting first tested in Morocco in 1917 and quoted by the M. S. members as one of the best examples of efficiency in the rationalisation of urban land was also introduced. Furthermore an easement regulation, on which Prost through experiences and comparative studies had become a top expert, was prepared.

The document submitted for public approval was accepted in June 1939 after much tussles and delay. The difficulties were partially linked to the communes’ growing reluctance to abandon their prerogatives in favour of what was perceived as a nascent technico-managerial elite operating now at the regional level. The land owners associations were also strongly resisting to zonal regulation and attached easement constraints. The decree declaring the principle of public utility was still full of



reserves. It took the technocratic lobby within the Vichy regime some time to confirm and extend this project ending with the August 1941 law<sup>28</sup>. This plan even if diluted succeeded in its formulated objective of “containment” of the built periphery. It was to remain a general guideline document until the sixties.

#### Urbanism as an art of strategy

G. Bardet, French urbanist theoretician, disciple of M. Poète and once President of the SFU on one occasion pointed out that urbanism was rather a “strategic art”, assembling activities, peoples and surfaces rather than constituting a town-builder game<sup>29</sup>. We can try to substantiate this judgement considering colonial urbanism in its highdays.

When Prost became the central figure of the French town-planning movement, while controlling the top of all major institutions in the metropolis, he appeared also as a first rank professional who represented French colonial urbanism during the largest colonial Exposition ever held. Lyautey had carefully prepared his own political comeback for this occasion. We cannot however develop here the place and role assumed by Lyautey and the Lyauteyen circles between the two wars. In our view this political trend has been largely underestimated in relation to its huge influence on the movement for “rationalisation”, and “social action”, within a neo-conservative christian ethos. Lyautey was not only closely linked to the Musée Social but also to the Redressement Français (RF), a movement founded by the electricity magnate Ernest Mercier aiming at regrouping the national elite. This organisation with anti-parliamentarian leaning was a

rallying point for numerous members of the political cum professional elite working for a global social and economic reform of French society<sup>30</sup>.

For Lyautey who was appointed in 1927 Commissar General of the Exhibition, the mission was two-folded:

- to display the strength and the achievements of the Empire.
- to suggest that the colonial territories could also be a vector of modernisation, through widespread rationalisation.

The “Congrès de l’Urbanisme aux Colonies et des Pays Tropicaux”, was held on the late days of the seven months colonial Exhibition (10–15 October 1931)<sup>31</sup>. The exemplarity of colonial urbanism was to be used by the town-planning profession until the Second World War in “Urbanisme”, the review of the SFU, founded in the wake of the 1931 Congress with Lyautey and G. Risler in the patronising committee, with H. Prost and J. Royer as director. The congress also gave birth to the International Institute of Colonial Urbanism<sup>32</sup>.

For the first time in a colonial congress, urbanism was clearly made distinct from the general question of Public-Works (“Outillage colonial”). The previous colonial Exhibition of Marseille in 1922 had been a turning point concerning town-planning when urbanism was officially named within the sixth section of the congress dedicated to Public Works and was publicised in a small exhibition designed by Prost. Thus, the “return” of the Moroccan urbanistic School can be dated from 1922 and on.

We have already put in evidence the founding stones of colonial urba-

nism. As early as 1914 J. A. Hardel, a Ponts et Chaussées engineer, wrote a handbook dedicated to public-works in which he exposed the broad lines of the methods of modern town-planning including the use of zoning within a colonial context<sup>33</sup>. In 1922 G. Rambert reviewed for *La Vie Urbaine* the Exhibition of Marseille and coined for the first time the term of colonial urbanism with a clear cut conceptual content<sup>34</sup>. Rambert was much impressed by the methodological cohesiveness of the displayed projects. He recorded with care the specificity of this new discipline which was encompassing: Global conservation and separation of the indigenous cities, “mathematical” application of zoning with detailed regulations, strength and unity of the legislative apparatus as the dominant features. He also noted the morphological peculiarity of colonial urbanism. In short the ground was free for great experiments and colonial planning was also able to bring tremendous improvements at the level of architectural setting and at physical planning levels. The next year Edmond Joyant, Ponts et Chaussées engineer, who had worked next to Prost in Morocco, published the *Traité d’Urbanisme* largely based on his Moroccan experience<sup>35</sup>. At this stage colonial urbanism had virtually “returned” to the metropolis. Both town planning movements were mutually reinforced partially through the SHUR and SFU complex but also through professional press and literature. By 1931 colonial urbanism was firmly established alongside the extensive Public Works congress which presented in July 1931 a comprehensive program of reconstruction

for the Empire. The urbanism congress was attempting to build a parallel strategy for town-planning. From the various general reports, including Prost's own one, we shall note some major new orientations.

### **Consolidate colonial implantation and favour urban concentration**

Sarraut had raised the danger of a "colonial undertow"<sup>36</sup> and the congress advised that colonial cities be instrumental in consolidating the roots of colonisation. Architects and engineers were then to deliver the best housing and infrastructures at the lowest cost to attract the colons with facilities non existing or limited to a very few in the metropolis. Vivier de Streel, one leader of the Colonial Party between the two Wars, insisted also on "*giving the maximum facilities to town dwellers of white race*"<sup>37</sup>

The congress' imperative advice was a strong degree of urban primacy. The strategy was aiming at concentrating investment in the hand of the colonial society and to optimise the productivity of the outlet/inlet nodal points directly interacting with the colonial territory.

### **Separate indigenous and colonial cities.**

This was the main innovation of the "Moroccan" School endorsed by the congress. This point has been very much discussed by many authors<sup>38</sup>. Some congress's delegates have opposed to the "racial segregative" system of Lyautey-Prost in Morocco and Lyautey himself "boiling and indignant" had to jump in the fray to clarify his position.

Accordingly separation did not mean to be segregative but was to design a global protection of the indigenous society encompassing people and built forms. J. A. Lughod (1980) has analysed present problems of "urban apartheid" in Rabat, tracing them back to Lyautey's days. She has developed a critical view of zoning regulation which generated qualitative spatial organisation differentiating collective units according to ethnic cleavages<sup>39</sup>. Lyautey had his point in assessing he never enforced a legally segregated city<sup>40</sup> and every individual could therefore live where they pleased. We have suggested in our earlier work to make a distinction between racialist and racist policies. The "Association" as the corner-stone of the Protectorate's policy was certainly patronising and authoritarian but not racist as such. Nevertheless the framework of the colonial apparatus was based on racialist premises with obvious consequences written on the ground.

### **Systematic global conservation and articulated modernism.**

Global conservation of urban forms promoted by the Moroccan planning model attracted the attention of the majority of town planners. This morphological question had developed in the context of the colonial separation of the "new" and "traditional" societies. At the same time the symbolism of association was magnified by the spectacularisation of the "old", when the medinas could be viewed from new ring roads.

The contextualisation of urban monuments was adopted as a principle long before it became a pattern for cities in the metropolis. A detailed framework had been incorporated into town-

planning to protect vernacular housing and natural sites, with consideration for economic dimensions. The attention paid to the development of tourism was totally new as a comprehensive scheme integrated into the Moroccan planning, even though colonial tourism was born long ago. The congress recommendations for conservation as integrated into planning objectives had other aspects. The impact of tendencies and currents of international scope under the banner of functionalism should not be ignored. In this context the SFU approach in supporting conservation can be interpreted as a mild counter move to the principles of the functionalist school. On the whole the SFU town planners had a pragmatic view on conservation, which might be accomplished alongside with the most "modern scientific town planning". The apparent duality of objectives, in the 1931 congress, rested on the following distinction: respect for historical core of the cities to be protected by a green belt and organisation of new urban functions and forms on the outskirts.

The congress strongly condemned historicist and exotic pastichios as well as any kind of official style for the new urban centres. Nevertheless it was advised to compensate eclecticism of the period with a "unity of style". But no definite pattern was to be given. As we have noted earlier in Morocco "adaptability" was the key to reach positive results. The prerequisites issued to architects and planners were great attention to be paid to climatology and site implantation, and that indigenous architecture should not be imitated but incorporated into a new form of

local idioms. In promoting variety as a key consideration for urban morphology the congress put emphasis on planning methods that acknowledged the interconnection of different spatial organisations in the colonial context.

### Innovative legislation

Town planning legislation was often at the core of the debate on colonial town planning and colonial legislation was rhetorically referred to by town-planners throughout the twenties and the thirties to display the backwardness of the metropolis. In this respect G. Monssarrat coined the differences between metropolitan and colonial legislation by saying that the “former was a resultant of legislation when the second was creative”. He stated during the congress that urbanism could probably only triumph in France through discretionary powers. Concerning the Empire the congress was opposed to the implementation of a standard legislation that would lead to the unification of built forms. In general the congressists favoured adaptations through exchanges between metropolitan and colonial urbanism. The comprehensive legislative system put into force in Morocco was largely considered a most inspiring innovative scheme and the extension of land replotting system with compulsory landowner associations was especially advised by the experts.

### Epilogue

Before concluding we wish to emphasise that the significance we have given to colonial urbanism in the process of formation and consolidation of the planning profession in France does not convey the idea that there were no other powerful forces to have influenced

French town-planning practice until the Second World War. Municipal activity since the end of the nineteenth century shall especially not be underestimated. It could also be argued that such a kind of “grand urbanism”, so spectacular and self-promoting, that we are concerned with, had little morphological effects on the ground<sup>41</sup>.

The new structure of the real estate market and the new criteria for interventions on the part of the public administration in town-planning after the First World War have to be appreciated in accordance with many factors such as the necessities for reconstruction and the overall rationalisation trend initiated by the war economy.

However, the insight into the trajectory of Prost’s career allows us to conclude these explanations of the evolution of town-planning theory and profession in France referring to the role played by colonial urbanism. Even though the planning apparatus’ subsequent schemes were of marginal importance in the metropolis, the complex that the SHUR-SFU organisation set up is to be situated in its rightful position. At a key moment in the process of French town planning formation the SHUR-SFU had selected and defined most of the criteria and rules that was later to be used by the professional elite, thus disseminating conceptions, ideas and patterns in French town-planning, or “urbanism”. Prost’s career is exemplary in respect of the dynamic process of interactions between colonial and metropolitan territories. One main characteristic of colonisation, in our view, is to operate the generation of differentiated space not only in the colonies but *also* at the

scale of the metropolis as well as in the peripheral colonies. The numerous possibilities of this kind, if I may use this image, is a chess game in three dimensions, made the strengthening of one particular type of town planning in France possible, which can be understood in the perspective of centuries old authoritarian and centralist rule of the French State. It is noteworthy here to recall that Lyautey had hoped “to continue Haussmann work” in Vincennes (East of Paris), around the site of 1931 colonial Exhibition.

The architect wrapped in the prestigious garb of late Beaux-Arts academism could also dream of playing a leading role in bringing to fruition a new systemic conceptualisation of the city. The colonial field has shown how urbanism could be used in integrating space and time differentiation into one new territorial cohesiveness. The urbanist was then an artistic strategist skilled in regulating friction between requirements for new infrastructures and built urban forms and between different social actors and communities. His expertise laid the ground for the optimisation of the spatio-temporal distribution of men, land and products.

*Hélène Vacher*

Ph. D., Aalborg University

*Text revised and reviewed from English original by Sten Gromark*

### Brief commentary by Sten Gromark:

This article is concerned with the colonial planning experience of French architect Henri Prost in Morocco. This case is conceived as an important preparatory phase in the formulation of a

metropolitan urbanism on French soil during the nineteen thirties. It is in turn regarded as a background, as a distant mirror, hidden in the far and forgotten colonial past, to the emergence of modernist ideologies of rationalisation in pre modernist western culture.

Hélène Vacher's somewhat astonishingly clarifying analysis – although in her thesis unfortunately blurred by the sheer mass of information, a bit disparately organised, partly presented in this summarising text and to be found in full fledged detail in her recent licentiate dissertation – of an important colonial pre-episode to the formation of a specific professional culture of urbanism on European soil, especially in France, has at least to me revealed the striking parallel of Le Corbusier and Haussmann with the more obscure personalities of Prost and Lyautey. Where the former two were obsessed with the idea of neutralising the imminent dangers of the subversive working classes by way of spatial and architectural means the latter two were occupied with the constantly rebellious indigenous population and the unpredictable colons. The latter two had at their hands the absolute power to implement their plans – available finance perhaps being the only limit. This was exactly what Le Corbusier deplored the state apparatus in France for not having. The same strategies of dominance; of rationalisation as a tool for control, of a systematic use of strategy, of ruse, of a refined military logic, of ethics and aesthetics of modernisation, of the modern project of order, can almost too easily be applied to both cases.

The military might, the freedom of immediate action that Prost and

Lyautey could enjoy in the colonial setting, formed, according to Vacher, a decisive urban experimental laboratory. Simply by force of the innovative and convincing example this showed the way ahead for a lethargic political milieu in metropolitan France and lead to a radically new conception of planning activity in the industrial society. This new conception, only gradually made headway in France, perhaps the last European country to adopt and to step by step implement these new principles in legislation, in planning practice and finally on the actual ground in architectural materialisations of structures and symbolics.

As Clausewitz declared, war is diplomacy by other means, we could say that architecture and planning is a war of cultures and of culture, by using far more refined and civilised means of course, but still – a kind of war. It could of course be argued that this kind of approach has been made rather trivial, even banal, during the seventies by several research attempts concerned with the interpretation of urban planning and architecture as material supports related to sociological issues of power and domination.

Has the colonial case thus simply too easily been adapted to this already firmly established frame of analysis? No, the empirical demonstration, at least on a discursive level, not so much on a substantial material level perhaps, the former being so extremely abundant in Vacher's research, denies this superficial and preliminary interpretation. Instead the overwhelming relevance of this perspective is once again reiterated but in quite a different context, where particularly the

intimate relation between the two worlds is underlined, with the binding human life material and extraordinary careers of the clever general politician Lyautey and the gifted planner architect Prost. The argument, I believe, is then once again and even more firmly supported by this empirically profoundly based contribution. It is made even more valid, developed to encompass an even wider cultural scope, integrating the forlorn colonial dimension. Of course, whether the urban strategy of soft colonisation employed by Lyautey, implemented by Prost, in Morocco, if it really worked, and exactly how it really worked is quite another question. For instance we learn that when Lyautey left Morocco a rebellion almost immediately broke out clearing the way for more conventional methods of blunt oppression. The fact that the progressive bourgeoisie elite firmly believed in these measures has however once again been clearly demonstrated and brought out in great, new and revealing detail by the events related by Vacher, founded mainly in extensive archive research. Her detailed account especially on the formation of Musée Social and Ecole Spéciale d'Architecture is extremely valid for the student of the origins of modernism and related planning ideologies.

The analysis of a specific professional culture advanced by Hélène Vacher is truly concerned with the conditions and social structures preparing for the invention of architecture and planning as tools for domination, of pacification, for domestication, a theme deeply embedded – but only rarely touched upon – in the deep rooted origins of the modernist ideology, displaying and

bringing to the light a kind of hidden, dark and subconscious colonial past at least in the French context. What we see here is a conception of urban planning and of architecture as a refined instrument of power, an intermediate tool used for cultural and social dominance, a perspective already well established in the writings of Michel Foucault and Henri Lefebvre.

This shows one side of the dubious role of architecture and planning, here to act as discrete means of control, "l'idéologie parée du nom de science", ideology presented as obvious, unquestionable scientific truth, instead of playing the complementary, more glorious and desirable role of being constitutive elements in acts of liberation and of empowerment, in creative projects bringing desires of new life world conceptions up to the conscious surface of our everyday reality.

Sten Gromark

## Notes

1. Little scholarly work has been undertaken until now about Henri Prost. The only book about Prost achievements is *L'oeuvre d'Henri Prost*, (Préface d'André Siegfried), Hautecoeur, Louis, Lacoste Henri, Marrast, Joseph, Paris: Académie d'Architecture, 1960, 241 p. Among few articles: Talamona, Maria Ida, "Henri Prost, du projet au zoning, 1902-1912" in *l'Usine et la Ville*, Paris, N° hors série, Paris: IFA, 1986, pp 51-55; Taylor, Brian, "Discontinuité planifiée, villes coloniales modernes au Maroc", *Cahier de la Recherche Architecturale*, N°, Janvier 82, pp 41-61. Toutcheff, Nicole, "Henri Prost 1874-1959, Anvers, Casablanca, Paris, in Dethier, Jean et Guiheux, Alain, *La ville, art et architecture en Europe, 1870-1993*, Paris: Edition du Centre Pompidou, 1994, 193 p, pp 172-173. Some
2. This article takes up some developments from my Ph. D. Thesis: *Projection coloniale et ville rationalisée - Le rôle de l'espace colonial dans la constitution de l'urbanisme en France-1900-1931-AUC*, 2 volumes, 350 p, 172 p.
3. The first proposition is to be found King, A. D., *Colonial Urban Development, culture, social power and environment*, Londres: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976, 313 p, p 24; the second in King, A. D., "Colonialism, Urbanism and the Capitalist World Economy" in *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research*, 1989, 13 (1): pp 1-18, p11.
4. Nevertheless Prost did write numerous articles for "Urbanisme" and some others professional magazines. An important publication is Prost, H., *L'Urbanisme au point de vue technique*, *Les Cahiers du redressement Français*, No16, Editions SAPE, Paris, 1927, pp 1-27
5. Archives Académie d'Architecture (A.A.A.), Fonds Prost, B2 74/19, "Paris 1900" Text dactyl, 3p, no date.
6. E. Hénard is generally considered as one influent French theorician together with Tony Garnier in the framing up of modern town-planning. He was a member of the international jury that awarded Prost the first price in Antwerp's competition.
7. *Annales du Musée Social*, 1913, p 114.
8. Idem, p 116.
9. Forestier, JCN, Rapport; Des réserves à constituer au dedans et aux abords des villes capitales du Maroc; Remarques sur les jardins arabes et de l'utilité qu'il y aurait à en conserver les principaux caractères; Rabat, Residence, 70 p.
10. A. A. A., Fonds Prost B2 74/97.
11. Prost, Henri, "Le développement de l'urbanisme dans le Protectorat du Maroc" in Royer, Jean, (ed), *L'Urbanisme aux Colonies et dans les pays tropicaux* (U.C.), T1, La charité sur Loire: Delavance Editeur, 1932, 400 p; TII, Paris: Edition Urbanisme, 1935, 130 p, TIII, p 63.
12. Du Vivier de Streel: "Les enseignements généraux de l'Exposition coloniale", Conférence, January 21, 1932 in *Musée Social-Revue Mensuelle*, 39e année, No3, March 1932, pp 77-103, p 78.
13. On the pre-World War I period, Osti, Giovanna, *Il Museo Social di Parigi e gli inizi dell' Urbanistica Francese- (1894-1914)*. Alcune note su di un progetto di riforma dell' habitat agli inizi del XX secolo, tesi di Laurea, Venezia, Dipartimento di Storia dell' Architettura, 1982-83, manuscript, 141 p, XXXIII p. Horne, Janet Regina, *Republican Social Reform in France, the Case of the Musée Social, 1894-1914*, Phd, New York University (1991), Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1992, 406 p. Till the World War II: Cormier, Anne, *Extension-Limites-Espaces Libres, Les travaux de la section d'hygiène urbaine et rurale du Musée Social*, Mémoire de DEA, Ecole d'Architecture de Paris-Villemin, 1987, 197 p. Naviaux, Jean Hubert, *Le Musée Social au lendemain de la première guerre mondiale et dans l'entre deux guerres: permanences et mutations*, mémoire de maîtrise, Université Paris X, Nanterre, UER Histoire, 1986, 119 p & annexes. See also : Gaudin, Jean Pierre, *L'Avenir en Plan, technique et politique dans la prevision urbaine, 1900-1930*, Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 1985, 215 p.
14. This missing element is linked to the poor state of the research concerning the role of the colonial lobby in France in relation to the global political process: Meyer, J., Tarrade, J.; Rey, Goldzeiguer, Annie; Thobie, J., *Histoire de la France Coloniale des origines à 1914*,

- Paris, A. Colin, 1991, 846 p, See Preface of Ch. Robert Ageron, p 7.
15. We have identify thirteen conference given by prominent colonial personalities as G. Hardy, E. du Vivier de Streel, Doumer etc. From inside or outside the M. S. recorded in the publications of the institution between 1918 and 1939. The last Conference given in 1939 by the director Lichtenberger, "Under the sign of Lyautey, the Moroccan lesson", *Le Musée Social, Revue Mensuelle*, Mars 1939, pp 59–81.
  16. Souza, Robert de, "L'Urbanisme en dix commandements", Conférence 27 Februar 1929, published in *Musée Social, Revue Mensuelle*, N°4, Avril 1929, pp 121–185.
  17. For a detail presentation of the project with attached documentation see Hodebert, Laurent, Henri Prost et la cote varoise, *Le Moniteur Architecture*, N° 61, mai 95, pp 60–65.
  18. In 1927 Prost noted that "the general lignes of the project were respected merely everywhere" Cf *A. A. A., Fonds Prost As 168–173*, Text dactyl, title "urbanisme, 2 mars 1927.
  19. For a good account of the maturation process of the law and of the debate about the fortification ring see Sutcliffe, Anthony, *Toward the planned city, Germany, Britain, the United States and France 1780–1914*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981, 230 p.
  20. We shall note that he was also an important member of the colonial lobby belonging to the Commission des affaires exterieures, des protectorats et colonies of which he later was to become later Vice-Président. Jolly, J. (ed), *Dictionnaire des parlementaires français-1889–1949*, Paris, PUF, 8 T, TIII, pp 1139–1141.
  21. For a complet list of the CSAEEV members see "Comité Supérieur d'Aménagement de la Région Parisienne" in *Urbanisme*, N° 4, juillet 1932, p 116.
  22. Manuel de Torres I Capell, *Barcelona: planning problems and practices in the Jausely era, 1900–1930*, in *Planning Perspective*, N° 2, April 1992, pp 211–233.
  23. The "Sarraut law" of 15 march 1928 was concerned with the bulk of the building plot created in the aftermath of the war, close to it the "Loucheur law" was voted to foster the development of popular housing.
  24. Quated in "L'oeuvre de Prost", *op.cit*, p 148.
  25. After the second world war he will become the first Minister of Urbanism and Reconstruction.
  26. For a full account of the law: Monsarrat, Gaston, *Le Code de l'Urbanisme, recueil annoté des lois, décrets, règlements, circulaires et instructions ministérielles concernant l'aménagement, l'embellissement et l'extension des villes*, Paris, Publication administratives et Bibliothèques municipales et rurales, 1933, 192 p, pp 173–177.
  27. This expression is used by Prost in its "Exposé Général" presenting the Regional Plan scheme of 14 May 1934, see *Centre d'Accueil et de Recherche des Archives Nationales-(CARAN) F2 4209*.
  28. The law of 28 august 1941, confirm the public approval of the project without any reserves, decide to include Paris city, and the extension to 732 new communes.
  29. See Bardet, Gaston, *L'urbanisme*, Paris, PUF, 1988 (1945 first edition), 127 p, p 54.
  30. See Kuisel, Richard F., *Ernest Mercier, French Technocrat*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1967, 184 p.
  31. The papers of the Congress were thereafter published under the supervision of Royer, Jean (ed.), U. C., *op.cit*. The 29 members of the Patronage Comité of the Congress included staunch colonial politicians as Paul Doumer and Albert Sarraut. Lyautey was Honorary President of this Congress with Henri Prost as President and Jean Royer as General Secretary. The director of Institut d'Urbanisme de l'Université de paris was present as well as G. Risler for the M.S. and A. Dervaux for the SFU. Architects having worked in Morocco and in Indochina were among the organisers.
  32. This Institut was located at the same adress that the review "urbanism" founded in 1932 in the aftermath of the International Colonial Exhibition.
  33. Hardel, J. A. Cours de Travaux-Publics aux Colonies. Livres 1. Generalités, Hygiène, Etudes et Levés. Organisation des Entreprises, Constructions Civiles, Construction des Villes, Paris, Ecole Spéciale de Travaux-Publics, 1914, 224 p
  34. Rambert, G., "l'Urbanisme à l'Exposition Coloniale de Marseille" in *La Vie Urbaine*, N° 17-quatrième année-15 décembre 1922, pp 419–437.
  35. Joyant, Edouard, *Traité d'Urbanisme*, Paris: Eyrolles, 1923, T1. 189 p; T2, 110 p.
  36. Sarraut, Albert, *Grandeur et servitude coloniales*, Paris: Editions du Sagittaire, 1931, 285 p.
  37. Du Vivier de Streel, E., "Introduction", in Royer, Jean, U. C., *op.cit*, T1, p 12.
  38. In particular by Rivet, Daniel: *Lyautey et l'institution du Protectorat français au Maroc 1912–1925*, 3 vol, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1988; 3 T, TIII, 357, p 157 concluded that separation was "a mild apartheid" asked for by the colonial power as well as by the indigenous elite.
  39. See Abu-Lughod, Janet-L., *Rabat, Urban apartheid in Morocco*, Princeton: P. U. P., 1980, 356p.
  40. The global polemic during the Congress and Lyautey position are presented in Ladreit de Lacharrière, Jean, "L'urbanisme colonial français et ses réalisations au Maroc", *Bulletin du Comité de L'Afrique Française*, 1932, pp 158–163, p 162. Also read during the Congress the interventions of Cohen Stuart, Hébrard, E., Durand, E. (Interventions de), "A propos de la separation des villes au Maroc et aux Indes Neerlandaises" in Royer, Jean, U. C., *op.cit*, T1, pp 276–277.
  41. In 1928 one leading legal expert of the SHUR-SFU deplored that less than 10% of the 1600 cities which could have abided by the 1919 law had established a lay-out extension plan. Cf "Seance de la SHURPS du 18 mai 1928" in *Musée Social, Revue mensuelle*, 1928, pp 292–294.