Introduction

On 8 December 2014, the French state signed a contract with the American government to pay sixty million dollars to victims of the Holocaust in the United States. The money was to be distributed to the non-French Jews deported from France between 1942 and 1944 and who had not yet received reparations from the French state. The French would pay this lump sum which would subsequently be divided up by Washington and distributed to the recipients, ‘hundreds of survivors, spouses, children and heirs’. Each survivor would receive approximately 100,000 dollars.1

This highly mediatised agreement between the French and American governments was the result of many years of debate around the role of the French National Railway Company, the Société Nationale des Chemins de fer Français (SNCF), in the Holocaust. Since the late 1990s, the SNCF had been repeatedly accused by American lawyers and plaintiffs for its role in the deportation of 76,000 Jews from France. This was not an isolated phenomenon, however, since similar procedures were being carried out in France itself: Kurt Werner Schaechter and the Lipietz family had brought claims against the SNCF in the late 1990s and mid-2000s. But the repeated attempts to bring the SNCF to trial in America had escalated over the past decade, and by 2014 the SNCF was facing serious economic sanctions as well as legal pursuits. Indeed, when Americans decided to build new high-speed railway trains in certain states in the late 2000s, the SNCF saw itself actively excluded from all potential economic activity. Legislators in California, Florida, Maryland and New York were vocally criticising the SNCF, claiming that it was ‘an affront’ to Holocaust survivors for this company ‘to bid on projects funded by tax revenues from some of the very victims it

deported. Guillaume Pepy, the Chairman of the SNCF, tried to appease these tensions in 2010 and 2011 by issuing formal regrets in both America and France in regards to the SNCF’s actions during the war. However, the pressure from American lawyers, legislators and victims continued. In 2013, a bill – the Holocaust Rail Justice Act – was submitted to the United States Congress to make it legally possible to sue the SNCF in American courts for its actions during the Second World War. Until then, all legal claims against the SNCF had been rebuffed in American courts due to issues of national sovereignty. Although this bill did not pass, it added to the on-going tensions between Americans, the French and the SNCF over Holocaust reparations.

By paying sixty million dollars in reparations, the French government was putting an end to over fifteen years of relentless attacks against the SNCF for its role in the Holocaust. Indeed, part of the agreement behind this payment was that all attempts to either bring the SNCF to trial in America or to prevent the SNCF from bidding for high-speed rail contracts – which could potentially amount to billions of dollars for the French company – would cease. Yet this settlement also acknowledged an important fact which for years had been disputed by the American lawyers, legislators and victims involved in the affair: that the SNCF was not responsible for the deportations of Jews from France, that it had been a company acting on behalf of the French government at the time. The fact that it was the French government who paid the sixty million dollars, and not the SNCF, thus confirmed that the responsibility for the deportations lay not with the railway company itself, but with the French state.

This recent agreement fits into a longer story of what I will now refer to as the SNCF affair. The affair goes beyond these American disputes and resonates strongly with France’s own memory problems. After the Liberation of France in 1944, the history of the cheminots (French railway workers) was discussed through the lens of postwar myths and ideological struggles. In René Clément’s film La Bataille du Rail (1945), the story of French railway workers sabotaging German railroads was framed in a broader discourse of French resistance and martyrdom. This threw the cheminots at the heart of the Resistance myth, and they were often

---

5 The affair will be discussed in greater detail in the Epilogue of this book.
mentioned in passing as great saboteurs in accounts of this period. The brilliant historians Rod Kedward, Jean-Louis Crémieux-Brilhac and M. R. D. Foot all commented on the cheminots' usefulness in the fight against the Germans, but a lack of in-depth analysis only further upheld this heroic image. Only two works, both authored by ex-cheminot resisters, Paul Durand (1968) and Maurice Choury (1970), examined the 1939–45 period specifically. But while Durand and Choury made valuable points, their sweeping statements about the heroic and patriotic nature of cheminot identity and activity was seriously tainted by postwar Resistance myths. Durand, a Gaullist corporatist, argued that the SNCF as a whole had resisted the Germans, whilst Choury, a fervent communist who had authored other works on communist resistance under Vichy, argued that only the communists had actually resisted within the SNCF.

By the late-twentieth century, however, the heroic image of the cheminot resister was being actively challenged. In the early 1980s, a few scholars began to ask some uncomfortable questions over the role of French railway workers in the Jewish deportations: if cheminots had been so involved in sabotaging German transports, why had they never sabotaged the Jewish deportation trains? The question was never really picked up beyond the works of Michael Marrus, Robert Paxton and Annie Kriegel, although two little-known films released in 1984 and 1998 told the story of a cheminot suffering from an internal, moral crisis as he remembered his involvement in the Jewish deportations. The pivotal moment came in the 1990s when the SNCF was charged for crimes against humanity first in France and then in the United States. Since then, the SNCF has seen a wave of criticism and accusation, not least in non-academic studies often written by journalists which have reinforced Manichean interpretations of its role in the Holocaust.
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The SNCF and the Association pour l’Histoire des Chemins de Fer Français (AHICF) soon realised the urgent need for a historical re-evaluation of its role in 1940–44, and Christian Bachelier, a discreet and thorough Vichy historian from the Institut d’Histoire du Temps Présent, was commissioned to write a new history of the SNCF during the Second World War. Bachelier spent four years sifting through the historical documents, and in 1996 he released the Bachelier Report, which is almost one thousand pages long, and is available on the internet. Despite being an invaluable source, the report is extremely difficult to read: it is less of a coherent narrative, and more of a collection of notes separated into neatly divided topics and sub-topics. The online version of the report also has a clunky format which is not at all user-friendly.

The railway community has responded to this new line of enquiry that casts a dark shadow over their previously glowing historical image. Following Guillaume Pepy’s regrets (for the SNCF’s involvement in the Holocaust) at the Bobigny memorial in France on 25 January 2011, cheminot trade unions were especially quick to recall the widespread cheminot resistance during the Occupation. The cheminot branch of the Confédération Générale du Travail (CGT), France’s biggest trade union, declared that it was necessary to ‘understand the difference between the level of German presence within the SNCF, the collaboration of certain cheminots and the fact that a large part of the company resisted’. The railway section of the Union nationales des syndicats autonomes (UNSA-cheminots), which is the other big trade union presence within the railway milieu, stated that ‘the necessary historical inquiry unto the company’s role in the war must not lead us to forget the cheminots’ courageous involvement in the fight against the Nazis’.11

Only a year earlier, when I was invited to give a talk at the Musée de la Résistance et de la Déportation de Picardie in Tergnier in 2010 to discuss the history of resistance and deportation in the SNCF, I was greeted by a mixture of applause and criticism. Tergnier was an old railway town, and many cheminots and/or their children were present in the audience of about one hundred people. Whilst some were grateful that I was opening up such a sensitive topic, others were less impressed. Recalling the experiences of their fathers and/or grandfathers, they accused me of ignoring the obvious fact that cheminots had been resisters of the first

hour. The letter I received a few days later – signed by several members of the community – further confirmed their reluctance to hear anything aside from a glowing review of cheminot resistance.\(^{12}\)

An important, if small, literature has emerged around the cheminots, readjusting to some extent the Manichean approaches to cheminot history in the Second World War. Articles by several French historians – including Georges Ribeill and Christian Chevandier, leading experts on French railway history – have concentrated on cheminots’ resistance experiences, giving new insights into their methods of protest and disobedience.\(^{13}\) Another area of focus has been cheminots’ involvement in the Forced Labour Service, the Service du Travail Obligatoire (STO),\(^{14}\) whilst the AHICF has been particularly active in tracing railway history between 1939 and 1945. It has published a series of journals on cheminots during the Second World War, as well as conducting a series of interviews with ex-cheminots.\(^{15}\) In 2000 it organised an international colloquium on the SNCF in 1939–45, presided by Henry Rousso. From the perspective of the deportations, Holocaust historians have also added to existing literature and presented new approaches to cheminot history.\(^{16}\)
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\(^{12}\) I discussed this event in a conference paper in Chicago. Accepted for publication, Ludivine Broch, ‘The SNCF Affair: Trains, the Holocaust and Divided Memories of Vichy France’, in Lessons and Legacies XII (Northwestern Univerity Press, expected Nov. 2016).


\(^{15}\) A full list of the publications by the Association pour l’Histoire des Chemins de fer Français is available on their website: www.ahicf.com/les-publications-de-l-ahicf.html.

When the research for this book began in 2006, it aimed to better understand these divided memories over cheminot history which seemed to mirror France’s own ‘Vichy syndrome’ in the late-twentieth century. Why had the SNCF’s role in the Holocaust been silenced for so long? How had cheminot sabotage been mythologised over the years, and how much truth lay behind this myth? What archives were now available to allow us to understand the role of railways and railway workers in the deportation of 76,000 Jews? As Marrus and Paxton asked in 1981: why had cheminots not sabotaged the Jewish convoys? Whilst doing research in archives, however, I became aware of a growing need to look beyond these commemorative barriers and really understand the community of railway workers itself. A new set of questions thus emerged: What kind of pressures had the SNCF come under during the Occupation? What did everyday life look like for the cheminots? To what extent was their experience during this period tied to class struggle? This book, the final product of years of research and writing, is a combination of both approaches. Indeed, one cannot do away completely with the familiar categories of collaboration, resistance and deportation which had initially shaped my enquiry – these are far too entwined in the history of the cheminots/Vichy France to be completely discarded, and they remain useful tools of analysis. Rather, these categories need to be revisited and expanded. In doing so, one uncovers a more textured history of the Occupation that has to do not only with resistance and deportation, but also with theft, class struggle and wartime economic pressures.

The railway and working-class archives were particularly rich in material. First, there were the SNCF archives in Le Mans, where a very large quantity of railway archives had been centralised over the years. Held in one of the warehouses near the Le Mans railway centre, it contains vast amounts of boxes detailing the history of the Central and Regional Services, as well as SNCF Personnel. The archives there mostly offer a top-down perspective, allowing us to understand the personnel and material concerns of the Direction. Yet some collections – the reports on cheminots’ impressions of working in Germany, the South-West disciplinary records, the collection of anti-national tracts – offer valuable insight into the everyday lives of the cheminots. Moreover, the archives in Le Mans contain every issue of Notre Métier and Renseignements Hebdomadaires, the SNCF’s official paper before and during the Occupation. The SNCF archives in Béziers hold individual personnel files, and these are particularly useful when looking for specific names. The pension reports filed in these dossiers are often very revealing. Aside from containing a fantastic library of works on the French railways, the AHICF in Paris has a unique collection of cheminot memoirs and interviews.
Meanwhile, the *Archives nationales du monde du travail* (ANMT) in Roubaix contain a wealth of material on working-class communities in France, not least on railways before 1939 and the creation of working-class and railway cities – the *cités ouvrières* and *cités cheminotes*. There was also some fascinating files relating to the pre-1938 disciplinary cases in the era of private railway companies, but also to the strikes and purges in the postwar period.

A lot of the research for this book also took place in Paris itself. The Second World War collection in the National Archives (AN) is well known, and it contains a plethora of materials on railways and railway workers during this period. Some of the most interesting include Paul Durand’s collection of over one hundred cheminot postwar testimonies which were all examined thoroughly for this research. There is also an abundance of material on resistance networks and sabotage during this period, not least on *Résistance-Fer*, the controversial railway resistance ‘network’. The AN also had an almost complete collection of the monthly meetings between the Ministry of Transports and the SNCF for much of the period of the Occupation, as well as valuable sources on the deportation and transfer of Jews and non-Jews during the Occupation. The *Bibliothèque Nationale de France* (BNF) contains a collection of a cheminot right-winged review from the 1930s which certainly merits further exploration. In order to gain better insight into the deportations, the *Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine* (CDJC) contains many documents in German about the organisation of transports from the Occupied Zone to the camps, and is a necessary source when attempting to trace the Jewish personnel in the SNCF. The *Fondation pour la Mémoire de la Déportation* (FMD) also contains dozens of unpublished memoirs of non-Jewish but also some Jewish deportees who recorded their experiences, almost all of which mention their experience during the railway deportations themselves, even if briefly, giving great insight into the diversity of experiences.

Going to departmental and municipal archives helped to supplement a lot of the material I had already gathered at this stage. The archives in Aix-en-Provence, Marseille, Toulouse and Foix allowed me to collect some very diverse material, not least on local attitudes and behaviour, sometimes beyond the railway community. Local incidents including strikes, shortages and non-Jewish deportation trains showed the diversity of life under the Occupation. Looking at the archives of the internment camps in South-West France did not, however, really reveal anything new about the role of the SNCF in the transfer and deportation of Jews. Finally, carrying out a dozen interviews myself with ex-cheminots all across France allowed me to hear the voices of these men. This was
fundamental for two reasons: first, I needed to become better acquainted with this community, and seeing them in their homes, first hand, allowed me to truly appreciate the uniqueness of the railway milieu. Second, their memories and their stories help to distinguish the individual from the collective in this study. The personnel at the Musée de la Résistance et de la Déportation en Picardie in Tergnier was especially helpful in helping me locate and interview ex-cheminots.

Based on these sources, Ordinary Workers busts the myths of cheminot resistance and collaboration in the Holocaust. This is not to say that cheminots did not resist, nor that they were not facilitators in the Final Solution. However, their history is more complicated than that. And in the dawn of the twenty-first century, as the heated and passionate debates around Vichy memory are beginning to die down, it is becoming possible to revisit the history of this period without getting completely entangled into the politics of the past. This book thus tells the story of the cheminots during the German Occupation of France between 1940 and 1944 in eight chapters and one epilogue. It takes an overarching chronological approach, starting with a history of the cheminots pre-1939 and ending with an epilogue which explores the rise (and fall) of cheminot memory. The seven chapters in between are slightly more thematic, exploring topics of accommodation, resistance and deportation as well as everyday life, cheminot professionalism and class struggle.

This book is based on three major arguments that aim to contribute not only to existing scholarship, but also to a more public discussion of the role of cheminots in the Second World War. First, cheminots were not all resisters. Railway historians Chevandier and Ribeill have given a more nuanced picture of cheminot resistance since the late 1990s, showing that it was more scattered, circumstantial and individual than it was organised or violent. However, by intertwining national and corporate archives with oral histories and memoirs, and by looking back at nineteenth-century professional traditions and identities, my research fully re-writes the history of cheminot resistance. It explains that Résistance-Fer, still considered the official cheminot resistance organisation under Vichy, was only created after the war in 1945, and that there was never a real, uniform cheminot resistance organisation. As for sabotage, cheminots had refused to partake in industrial sabotage since the late-nineteenth century because it destroyed their beloved railway machines and risked the lives of colleagues and travellers alike. These feelings were still very much alive under the Occupation, and few cheminots engaged in sabotage as a result

of this. Finally, as I explore hitherto unknown archives about employee theft and re-examine cheminot clandestine press, my book argues that cheminot resistance was not just about fighting the Germans, Vichy or the fascist authorities: it was also about fighting the SNCF. Cheminot resistance cannot, therefore, be explained by politics, corporatism or patriotism alone: cheminots’ professional frustration was central to all forms of defiance and protest. This points to a much longer class struggle between workers and bosses, and to a shift in mentalities in the early 1940s. These new approaches fit into a rich literature on resistance by French and English-speaking historians alike. Their works are a strong reminder that there is no longer a need to either embrace or reject a Resistance myth – rather, it is possible to approach the topic of resistance from a historical and more nuanced lens. Resistance studies are far from dead, and can in fact offer new and exciting revelations about this period.

Second, the book argues that cheminots accommodated and collaborated with Vichy. Until now, discussions of collaboration had focused on the SNCF management. Yet sources in departmental, national and company archives actually show that many blue-collar cheminots were quick to accommodate to – and even eager to collaborate with – the Germans and Vichy. This is largely because cheminots are far more conservative than is often assumed. Under Vichy, ex-trade union leaders joined the Vichy regime; small groups of right-wing cheminots hailed the rise of Pétain; cheminots bonded with the German railwaymen over their common professional interests. The list of purged cheminots from all hierarchical levels further exemplifies their hitherto unknown ‘collaboration’. German historians had previously shown how German workers cooperated with the Nazi party and ideology; in France, it is only in the past few years that studies have examined working-class conservatism and collaboration in the 1930s and 1940s. This study of the cheminots is thus part of a new field of investigation.

Finally, *Ordinary Workers* highlights that the relationship between Jews and cheminots, between the SNCF and the Final Solution, is far from straightforward, and it argues that the SNCF was not only a cog in the wheel of the Final Solution, but also that cheminots and SNCF directors were not indifferent to the fate of the Jews. This book engages with Holocaust history in three different ways. First, it outlines the SNCF’s role in the Final Solution. Aside from the archival documents, it relied on major works by railway as well as Holocaust historians.21 In doing so, it clearly explains how the deportation convoys were organised and financed in both the Free and Occupied Zones. This book also steps away from the deportations to examine the question of the Jews who worked for the SNCF. Indeed, recent studies have shown the value of looking beyond camps and deportation, not least those by Claire Zalc and Nicolas Marcot, which examines Jews in Lens, and by Jean-Marc Dreyfus and Sarah Gensburger, which examines Jewish work camps in Paris.22 By going through the SNCF’s personnel archives, I thus uncovered a fascinating story of networks of survival, of Jewish accommodation with the Vichy regime, and of the possibilities but especially limitations of bureaucratic ‘rescue’ and assistance. This approach offers a different view of Jewish experiences under Vichy, inspired not least by Daniel Lee’s recent work on Jewish youth which re-evaluates Jewish life (and accommodation) under Vichy.23 Finally, the issue of Holocaust memory looms large over this book. The memory of Vichy France is also still a sensitive – if not burning – topic, and beyond Henry Rousso’s *Vichy Syndrome* the recent works by Sarah Gensburger and Marc Olivier Baruch show the fascinating tensions between history, memory and politics in contemporary French society.24 Michael Marrus has in fact


carried out a rare study of the French trials against the SNCF, and the
epilogue contributes to a further understanding of these memory stud-
ies. Moreover, if studies have previously shown the transnational
effects of Vichy memory on society, politics and culture, the recent
demonisation of the SNCF in France and America reveals the economic
repercussions of Holocaust memory, placing France at the centre of a
global memory culture.

Yet this book also contributes to a new literature on working-class
communities. There have been studies exploring the significance of the
backgrounds of workers in Vichy France, reminding us how individuals
are affected by socio-professional communities and identities. Histor-
ians have recently examined the men and women involved in French
industry – from workers to bureaucrats – in the Vichy period, whilst
others have given insight into French industry and production before and
after the ‘dark years’. The study of daily life in Vichy France has also
changed the way we understand the Occupation, and offers nuanced
accounts of life in wartime Europe. These works tell a different story
of the Second World War, one that cannot be reduced to victims or
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perpetrators, but instead places workers and industry at the centre of this conflict. This book aims to do just that – and ultimately, if cheminots were in many ways a ‘distinct’ community of workers throughout modern history, their experiences under Vichy remind us that, like most French men and women, their attitudes and behaviour were those of ordinary workers looking to survive the war and the Occupation.

Indeed, beyond the three major arguments outlined here, the study of the cheminots under Vichy makes a significant contribution to working-class history. Traditional working-class histories examined political structures and organisations. However, the data I located and analysed on employee theft between 1939 and 1942 shows the importance of studying subaltern activities and everyday forms of defiance. Moreover, the topic of class struggle is intertwined all throughout the book, from the emergence of class-consciousness in the nineteenth century to the post-war strikes of 1947. Cheminots were major actors in these postwar strikes, but this actually contrasts sharply with their absence from the general strikes in 1936, and their historic attitude towards political activism. Did Vichy change cheminots’ attitudes towards political protest? This question requires much careful consideration, not least in regards to how political protest overlapped with resistance activities. After exploring the many facets of this question throughout the book, I come to conclude that Vichy was a turning point in cheminots’ political but also sociocultural identity, although the continuity of attitudes and behaviour should not be dismissed completely.

Of course, in a study of this kind – which focuses on a group of almost half a million men – there is an on-going tension between the individual and the collective. Is it possible to write a history of the cheminots? Does the term ‘cheminots’ not obliterate the significance of individual experiences, and thereby prevent any real understanding of the years of Occupation? Does it not reduce the individual to his/her collective identity? In many ways it does, and this is an almost inevitable outcome of writing the social history of a community. However, this book repeatedly relies on individual experiences and memories to show the complexity of attitudes, behaviour and experiences during the German Occupation. The cheminots are far from being a single uniform body, and if their community values and identity set them apart from other social groups in France, their diversity within their own community is nonetheless visible throughout their history.