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1. Introduction

Chronologically the first consequence of Europe’s abolitionism in Africa was to legitimize imperial conquest. A self-given anti-slavery mandate sanctioned France’s rule over its West African colonies. Yet in the first years following occupation French abolitionist ideas remained a dead letter: although slavery and the slave trade were abolished in a series of legal acts culminating in the comprehensive decree of 12 December 1905, laws were rarely enforced. Then in the 1920s pressures by newly founded international governmental organizations forced colonial empires to implement their own abolitionist agenda. Abolitionism became an internationally imposed standard against which the legitimacy of colonial rule was measured and scrutinized in the international arena. The French Administration, in response, passed a comprehensive decree of 12 December 1905, which included a broad definition of slavery: “Whoever, in the territory of French West Africa: this meant that masters could not use French courts to reclaim fugitive slaves. The main law abolishing slavery in French West Africa was the law of 12 December 1905. Its first article declares that "Whoever, in the territory of French West Africa and French Congo, concluded an agreement (aura conclu une convention) aimed at alienating, with or without compensation, the freedom of a third party, will be punished with imprisonment of two to five years and a fine of 500 to 5000 Francs. The attempt will be punished like the crime. The money, goods, or other objects of valuables received in fulfillment of the said agreement or as deposit for a forthcoming exchange, will be confiscated". Article four specifies that these dispositions did not affect in any way the rights pertaining to the marital or tutelary authority of the husband/father on his wives or children, as long as he did not impose a temporary or permanent servitude upon them. Decisions made by French courts would prevail in cases subject to the authority of both native and French courts. The text of the 1905 law was published in Journal Officiel du Sénégal, 18 janvier 1906, pp. 51-52, BNF microfilm M-5530; Governor General Ernest Roume commented on this law in his opening speech at the Session of the Government Council of French West Africa; the full text of the speech was published in Journal Officiel du Sénégal, 14 décembre 1905, pp. 641-643, BNF microfilm M-5530. The first two articles of this law were amended on 8 August 1920: “French Congo” was changed to “French Equatorial Africa,” and the Ministry of Colonies and Ministry of Justice were made responsible for the execution of the law. For a discussion of slavery’s legal abolition in French West Africa, see F. Renault, “L’abolition de l’esclavage au Sénégal. L’attitude de l’administration française, 1849-1905”, Revue Française d’Histoire d’Outre-Mer, 56 (1971), 5-81. The abolition of 1905 was prepared through a series of studies and reports that have been published in: Paul Lovejoy and Alexander Kanya-Forstner, Slavery and Its Abolition in French West Africa. The Official Reports of G. Poulet, E. Roume, and G. Deherme (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994). I consulted the original files of these reports in Dakar at the Archives Nationales du Sénégal (ANS), Série K Esclavage et Captivité 1807-1915, see particularly K15 to K29. Martin Klein examines the ambivalence of the French administration with regards to slavery’s abolition in the early 1900s in Slavery and Colonial Rule in French West Africa (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 131-140.

2 Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin, eds., Internationalisms: A Twentieth Century History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); see also Roland Burke, Decolonization and the Evolution of International Human Rights (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2010); Barbara H. M. Metzger, “Towards an International Human Rights Regime during the Inter-War Years: The League of Nations’ Combat of Traffic in
administration was well aware of this: “More and more the great colonial questions escape the strictly national domain; whether we like it or not, international organizations have become increasingly involved, this is a state of fact that no one would presently dream to challenge.” International surveillance eased the transition from de iure to de facto abolitionism. But change happened gradually and partially.

When international institutions started monitoring slavery and abolition worldwide, there were no substantial changes in administrative arrangements. But, as Susan Pedersen observed, “the work of legitimation moved to Geneva.” Surveillance by the League of Nations (LN) and International Labor Organisation (ILO) compelled member governments to enforce their anti-slavery legislation.\(^5\) Now laws were enforced, but only when and where their infraction was discovered. Immense desert zones and elusive border regions remained partly autonomous from colonial control.\(^6\) In these areas, the hope that colonial law could actually be enforced was and remained chimeric until the end of the colonial regime. As late as 1951, an official note commenting on the failure to implement French legal provisions in the Nomad Subdivision of the Cercle de Tahoua stated laconically: “French justice is powerless (la Justice Française est impuissante).”\(^7\)

This is how this story ends: in these regions colonial law was applied only partially and was scarcely internalized by local societies. Here legal abolition did not end slavery. What, then, if anything, did it do? In the first two decades following colonial conquest, the laws that abolished slavery were largely ineffective, as administrators in this region lacked both the will and the power to enforce them.\(^8\) But in the 1920s and 1930s the consequences of the internationalization of legal abolition under the aegis of the League of Nations were twofold: first, the representatives of the colonial state were monitored closely and came under pressure to prosecute slavers when cases of slavery or slave trade were brought to their attention; and second, enslaved persons and persons vulnerable to enslavement realized that their accusations could no longer be ignored with impunity, and that resistance against slave-holding elites was no longer futile. Although these were the main trends, nothing was easy.

French administrators posted in desert regions faced a conundrum: how to demonstrate success in eradicating slavery while operating in a society where slavery was ubiquitous and normal. Such was the magnitude of the problem that its eradication was simply impossible, given the limited means at their disposal. Unable to address the problem at its actual scale, the administration reduced its *appearance* by redefining as “actual slavery” only a small part of the forms of unfreedom that existed locally, some of which were the direct result of colonial recruitment practices. When the law could no longer be ignored, it became clear that Europe’s abolitionist project was doomed to failure: not only were its targets unachievable given the

---


3 Gouverneur de l’AOF aux Gouverneurs des Colonies, 11 October 1929, ANS K60 (19).


5 On 10 September 1919 the co-signatories of the treaty of Saint Germain en Laye revised the General Act of Berlin of 26 February 1885 and the General Act of Brussels of 1890. They signed a protocol stating that “[t]he Signatory Powers exercising sovereign rights or authority in African territories will continue to see to the preservation of the native populations and the improvement of their moral and material conditions. They will, in particular, endeavor to secure the complete suppression of slavery in all its forms and of the black slave trade by land and sea.” Article 11, Convention of Saint Germain en Laye, 10 September 1919. The full text of the convention is accessible online at: [http://www.loc.gov/law/help/us-treaties/bevans/m-ust00002-0261.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/law/help/us-treaties/bevans/m-ust00002-0261.pdf).


7 Note sur Mohamed el Moumi, Tahoua 5 Janvier 1951, ANN 381.

means available, but slavery’s complete eradication was not what colonial powers really wanted. The solution to this impasse was rhetorical: local practices were redefined to suit the law. Officers anxious to avoid being accused of tolerating slavery talked of “voluntary servitude” and “tacit work contracts” in reports destined for broad circulation. These distinctions were primarily linguistic, but definitions had practical consequences.9

Forms of unfreedom supported by African slave traders who procured slaves to African slave-owners were named “slavery”; as such, they were condemned as intolerable and outlawed. On the other hand, forms of unfreedom that served the interests of the colonial economy directly or by supporting collaborating elites were maintained. Unwilling to commit metropolitan funds to the building and maintenance of infrastructure in its African colonies, France needed to mobilize native labor for free. It did so primarily through the intermediation of African elites who used their authority to extract unpaid work from subordinates, mainly ex-slaves. This type of unfree labor, with its peculiar procurement and disciplining technologies, was tolerated and legal. Forced labor on colonial worksites was justified as “training” for workers unaccustomed to free labor conditions. Persons of slave descent who remained subordinate to their (ex-) owners were dubbed “voluntary servants” when supporting native slave owners promoted political stability.

Double standards were embedded in legal practice.10 The Code de l’Indigénat backed the action of the French administration, which decided when and how to punish native slavery or recruit forced labor for colonial purposes.11 Colonial administrators did not see these arrangements as problematic because they were commensurate with the racialized political thinking of the time. By contrast, those who might have been inclined to denounce these arrangements as unjust – in primis African unfree workers – were denigrated by the same racial stereotypes that underpinned Europe’s civilized mission. Their views were unsolicited and disregarded. French officers portrayed themselves as liberators, but doubted whether in practice African slaves could be trusted to handle freedom. In 1931 the comments of the District Officer commanding the Cercle of Tahoua were not uncommon: “Thieves, liars, looters – one would say that the guardianship of a master is [the slaves’] only claim to wisdom. […] If slavery amongst the nomads is an evil, it is a necessary evil nonetheless!”12 People were not considered equal. The universality of abolitionist ideals clashed with the hierarchies of race and status that informed colonial views of African society. This generated ambiguities in the interpretation and implementation of the law.

10 In his study of English capitalist industries Marc Steinberg has shown that particular labor regimes are “embedded in legal institutions that bound both the ways in which the labor relationship can be perceived and the strategies by which the subordination of labor can be pursued.” Marc Steinberg, “Capitalist Development, the Labor Process, and the Law,” American Journal of Sociology 109/2 (2003): 445-495, here p. 484. See also Marc Steinberg, The Great English Transformation: Law, Labor, and the Industrial Revolution (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2016). In this article I follow Christopher Tomlins’s understanding of the law as not external to the social phenomena that it regulates, but itself a particular manifestation of the moral axioms of its time: the law should be seen as “one of society’s authorizing discourses”. Unlike other discourses, however, “law’s moral existence is founded […] upon a claim to transcend all other authorising discourses.” Christopher Tomlins, “Subordination, Authority, Law: Subjects in Labor History,” International Labor and Working-Class History 47 (1995): 56-90, here p. 67.
12 Capitaine Commandant le Cercle de Tahoua à Monsieur le Gouverneur du Niger, 29 Juin 1931, ANN 381.1
The colonial administration’s ambiguous enforcement of its own anti-slavery laws has received abundant attention. Studies ask whether European colonialists practiced what they preached; they often did not. But “European colonialists” is an internally diverse category: ministers of colonies and colonial governors were not subject to the same pressures as district officers (commandants de cercle). Pressures by the LN set off a chain of requests for information at the imperial, regional, colonial, and district levels. Ministers of Colonies and General Governors had to demonstrate to international institutions and the European public opinion that slavery was being eradicated everywhere under their flag. In the 1920s this became a fundamental international standard against which the legitimacy of colonial rule was evaluated. Claims had to be backed with evidence provided by the men on the ground. District Officers were asked to write reports that would enable their superiors to showcase success in fighting the abolitionist cause. But District Officers also had to negotiate with African commoners and chiefs, slaves and slave owners.

In the Tahoua region of the Colony of Niger in the first half of the twentieth century, slavery had been a deep-seated institution for centuries. Abolitionism was alien to Tahoua’s society. Slavery was inextricably embedded in, and constitutive of, authority and hierarchy. Until the eve of occupation it had been regulated by Islamic norms, which continued to shape people’s sense of identity and justice. Elites followed local interpretations of Islamic law as they participated in the slave trade and formed relations with slaves up until the eve of colonial occupation. Subordinate groups who had been integrated in local hierarchies for generations did not mobilize collectively and object to slavery as an institution. Although their normative views were rarely recorded, the sources we have show that they did not see slavery in itself as a moral aberration. But when resistance became an option, they struggled to protect their safety and dignity. Although slave descendants were not abolitionists, in the 1920s they realized that the commandant could not turn a blind eye toward slavery and the slave trade as before. When threatened with a deterioration of their conditions, they took advantage of the changed circumstances. They resisted exploitation when they thought it safe to do so. They denounced owners and traffickers who caused pain to them and their loved ones. They engaged with colonial laws in the practical settings of tribunals as accusers and

13 See, for example, Suzanne Miers and Richard Roberts, eds, The End of Slavery in Africa (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 19-25 and 42-47; Fall, Le travail forcé; Cooper, Decolonization and African Society, in particular 23-56; Klein, Slavery and Colonial Rule, 35-36. See also Camille Lefebvre’s article, in this issue [third paragraph before last paragraph of the article].

14 A close analysis of the debates and activities of these institutions can be found in Suzanne Miers, Slavery in the Twentieth Century: The Evolution of a Global Problem (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2003), see particularly pp. 58-366. See also Joel Quirk, The Anti-Slavery Project: From the Slave Trade to Human Trafficking (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 2011).


16 Following Tomlin’s definition, anti-slavery was not part of ”society’s authorising discourses” in this Sahelian region, Tomlins, “Subordination, Authority, Law,” 67.

witnesses. Interviewed by colonial officers, they gave unambiguous answers that indicted slave owners and traders.

This article explores the strategies of colonial administrators, slave owners, slave traders, slaves, and slave descendants in the Nigerien Sahel in the 1920s-1930s. It shows that passing laws is not enough: for change to happen, laws have to be activated. In the 1920s the internationalization of abolitionism resulted in the activation of anti-slavery laws. On the whole, change was determined less by anyone’s will to end slavery in the Sahel than by the establishment of international surveillance mechanisms with the power to (de-)legitimize colonial rule. The internationalization of anti-slavery turned out to facilitate slave resistance. This article reconstructs the social history of the alleged “end of slavery.” It first looks at the broader legal and institutional context, and then turns to everyday social relations in Tahoua. Its primary aim is to shed light on the least understood consequences of abolitionism, namely, how it influenced the experience and agency of (ex-)slaves. Institutional change mattered, but individuals made real choices. If in general anti-slavery laws were enforced only when France risked being exposed internationally, some French officers pursued slave traders and traffickers relentlessly. Their exceptional persistence persuaded some slaves to denounce their owners. Unlike those who chose to endure continued subservience, slaves who resisted risked everything: their safety, their lives, and the lives of their children. Their resistance, too, was exceptional. Prosecuted slave owners experienced their predicament as unjust. Disposed to think of slavery as a sacrosanct institution, they harbored steadily hostile feelings toward Europeans. Exceptional actions marked people’s imagination and triggered reflections about the legitimacy of slavery or, alternatively, of European abolition. These reflections informed people’s choices and shaped a history that in the Central Sahel has not yet ended.

2. “Slaves are in a state of semi-slavery, but entirely of their own will”

At the Third General Assembly of the LN the attention of member states was summoned to “the problem of slavery and the recrudescence in Africa of this deplorable institution.” Sir Arthur Steel Maitland, the New Zealand delegate, expressed concern over the intensification of cases of slavery in Abyssinia. His intervention reignited debate on this issue. In September 1922 the League agreed that it was necessary to make a general enquiry on slavery, not only in Abyssinia, but in all of Africa. Gabriel Hanotaux, delegate of France, urged the LN not to collect information based on generic rumors, but to carry out a detailed enquiry based on the collection of “precise facts.” It was agreed that member states would provide information on this issue to the League’s Council.

The French Minister of Coloniess wrote to all Governor Generals asking them to provide reports that would reveal: (1) the results of France’s fight against slavery in their respective territories; (2) the administrative measures taken by the local colonial offices to repress

---


19 Ministre des Colonies à Monsieur le Gouverneur General de l’Afrique Occidentale Française, 27 Octobre 1922, ANN 381.1.

20 Ministre des Colonies à Monsieur le Gouverneur General de l’Afrique Occidentale Française, 27 Octobre 1922, ANN 381.1.
slavery, including a list of the prosecutions relative to slavery cases; (3) the presence of clandestine slave trafficking in boundary areas between their regions and neighboring countries; and (4) whether slavery persisted in their territories and what was the situation of domestic slaves.21

The idea that these enquiries would generate, in Hanotaux’s words, “precise facts” collected by “experts” entrenched colonial power by emphasizing objectivity and impartiality.22 But this language disguised the intrinsic circularity of the work of the Committee of Experts on Slavery. Its enquiries were not independent from the abolitionist policies whose effectiveness it had been tasked to assess. The experts overseeing the enquiries were high-ranking colonial officials. The “precise facts” they chose to present at the meetings of international organizations highlighted problems that called invariably for more colonial “civilizing” interventions. Unsurprisingly these enquiries endorsed and entrenched colonial rule even when they revealed its shortcomings.23

In a circular dated 8 December 1922, the Governor General of French West Africa (FWA) passed on the Minister’s request to the Lieutenant Governors of each territory under his command.24 In turn, on 12 February 1923 Jules Brévié, Lieutenant Governor of Niger then residing in Zinder, instructed District Officers (Commandants de Cercle) to conduct an enquiry on the four questions listed above in their respective Districts.25 Commandant Paul Marty, senior colonial administrator and author of several studies on Islam in West Africa, was then the acting District Officer in Tahoua. In his three-page report in response to Brévié’s Circular, Marty left little doubt as to the resilience of slavery in his district.26 He suggested that such resilience was explained by its not being actual slavery, but a milder dependency that should be tolerated in the interest of those slaves who benefited from benign masters, while at the same time manumission would be granted to all those who asked for it:

“In the Cercle of Tahoua slavery continues to exist both among the settled groups (Hausa and Aderawa) and among the nomads who used to be the tyrannical masters of the country. But just as before our occupation, the situation of slavery is harsher amongst nomads than amongst sedentary peoples. This is due to the nomads’ profound dislike for the black race, as well as to their rigid feudal regime […]

But it would be a mistake to think that [domestic slaves] are all forced to remain subject to their masters. Many were born in the masters’ camps or were acquired at a very young age, and are devoted to the masters somewhat like those old servants that one still finds in the French countryside and whom the masters consider almost like relatives. Others, well fed and well treated by benign masters who give them usufruct rights over part of their belongings, are loyal and grateful to the masters. Some ex-masters granted manumission freely, or in exchange for a symbolic payment, to their ex-slaves, who continue to serve them willingly. Often the master took as his concubine the daughter of his captive.

[…]

21 Gouverneur General de l’AOF à Messieurs les Lieutenants Gouverneurs des Colonies et au Commissaire du Gouvernement General au Niger, Circulaire no. 158, 8 Décembre 1922, ANN 381.5.
23 See the special issue edited by Emmanuelle Sibeud, Blais Hélène Blais, and Claire Fredj, on “Sociétés coloniales : enquêtes et expertises,” Monde(s) 2 (2013), no. 4.
25 Lieutenant-Gouverneur du Niger à Messieurs les Commandants de Cercles, Circulaire no. 24 BP, 12 Février 1923, ANN 381.1.
Captives declaring that they want to be liberated present themselves constantly at the Subdivision headquarters. Freedom is always granted to them, and their families are protected from possible retaliations on the part of their masters.”

This reasoning conjured the image of devout and willing old servants serving benign masters and of safe, straightforward liberation for those who opted for independence. Were it not for its adamant claim that “slavery” continued to exist everywhere, it made the whole enquiry appear almost pointless. This form of reasoning led to an apparent paradox, for it seemed to imply that “slavery” was not a problem and that, if/where it was, it could be fixed easily.

“The magic of words”

The appropriateness of the terminology was often questioned. For example, the report from the Cercle of Agadez asked whether “it is really possible to argue that domestic slaves (captifs de case) are actual slaves (esclaves). They should rather be seen as voluntary servants who choose freely to serve their masters.” Some reports emphasized the alleged psychological consequences of past enslavement on the consciousness of ex-slaves and their consequent inability to leave their masters. The report from the Cercle of N’Guigmi noted that “enslavement marked so profoundly the spirit of the ex-slaves that they are unable to act on their own initiative. Used to obeying without discussion or reflection the orders given to them, they continue to obey orders, and remain passive when they don’t receive any.”

Theories of natural slavery – the view that slaves need a master by nature and cannot lead a normal life without one – have been the strongest arguments for the tolerance of slavery at least since Aristotle’s Politics. That enslavement had made slaves incapable of self-governance was an adaptation of the “natural slavery” argument. This idea exonerated an administration unable or unwilling to fulfill the abolitionist agenda and allowed slavery, glossed as nominal or voluntary, to continue. No one asked why former slaves sometimes chose to keep working for ex-masters; no one asked what alternative forms of employment, possibly to be sponsored by the colonial state, were available to them.

Another recurrent topos was the comparison between French and British antislavery policies. The British were denounced repeatedly as being less committed to the emancipation of slaves than their French counterparts. Ending slavery had been the banner under which European powers had occupied Africa. The alleged effectiveness of abolitionism in the colonies was used as a standard of success in a race to outperform rival colonial empires. But periodic reports from the Cercles show that in actual practice the ambivalence attributed to British officers in Northern Nigeria was the norm, too, in the French administration. Political necessity was adduced to justify French slowness.

---

27 Capitaine Francois Commandant le Cercle d’Agadez à Lieutenant-Gouverneur du Niger, 8 Mars 1923, ANN 381.1.
28 Capitaine Garnier Commandant le Cercle de N’Guigmi à Lieutenant-Gouverneur du Niger, 28 Février 1923, ANN 381.1.
29 See, for example, the report from Tessaoua, which denounces the British administration’s alleged inability to bring about immediate emancipation, in contrast to the French policies and “active propaganda aimed at freeing the slaves, and our efforts to make servants and vassals understand that they [are] free and should stop working for their masters or making customary payments to them.” Administrateur du Cercle de Tessaoua à Lieutenant-Gouverneur du Niger, 20 Mars 1923, ANN 381.1.
30 See, for example, the arguments of the Lieutenant Gouvernor of Niger to the clarification requests from Bilma: “The high slave/free population ratio prevents us from encouraging emancipation all at once because, as you remark, an immediate reorganisation [of society] might harm the economic development of your Cercle [of Bilma] and upset the tranquillity of the region. Hence for the current year you should limit yourself to facilitating the liberation of captives enslaved after our occupation and of youths and children born after this date. The strict application of these measure will force slave-owners, still too numerous, to reflect on our determination to end slavery once and for all. You will then proceed to the completion of your work progressively...” Lieutenant-Gouverneur p.i. du Niger à Monsieur le Commandant de Cercle de Bilma, 7 Juin 1923, ANN 381.1.
The 1923 report of the Governor of Niger drew on district-level reports. It distinguished between the abolition of the slave trade and the abolition of slavery. While the former had been immediate, the latter had to be delayed to avoid open revolt and economic crisis:

“It is obvious that the masters, whom we would have deprived of a highly valuable capital without notice, would have risen against us and might have demanded a financial compensation for the expropriation [of their slaves] (indeed France compensated the slave-owners of the French Antilles). Moreover, [the masters] were not used to manual labor, and did not know how to carry out work that required physical qualities that they lacked […] Finally the slaves, left to their own devices (as seen elsewhere) and improvident as they are, would have stopped working altogether; and furthermore if left alone suddenly, how would slaves have bought tools and seeds, how would they have survived waiting for the harvest?”

In 1926, the passing of the League of Nations’ Slavery Convention, signed by the French Government on 11 December 1926 and ratified on 28 March 1931, marked a new threshold. The Secretary General nominated a Committee of Experts on Slavery charged with conducting a study of slavery and analogous institutions. A new list of questions was passed down the administrative ranks. It asked whether slavery, the slave trade, or other practices susceptible to limiting individual freedoms existed in the colonial territories. So-called “analogous practices” included serfdom, traditional forms of unpaid involuntary service imposed by landlords on the workforce, debt-bondage, pawnship, child exploitation under guise of adoption, the purchase of wives and widow inheritance “implying the subjection of a woman to a man she has not [freely] chosen”; and forms of prostitution of women and children implying the exercise of property rights upon them. Respondents were required to provide a detailed description of relevant institutions and customs; to explain what measures had been adopted since 1926; and what had been the results of the application of such measures.

This inquiry gave rise to another set of reports written by the Commandants de Cercle. These reports represented ex-slaves as lacking dignity, work ethics, and the ability to act autonomously. In 1931 the officer commanding the Cercle of Tahoua did not hesitate to declare that slavery “continues to exist more or less everywhere, especially in the districts at the edge of the Sahara, peopled by nomads of Berber or Arab origins. There is nothing exceptional in this situation: a law cannot from one day to the next, from one year to the next, modify an ancestral mentality, an institution that so-called civilized peoples took centuries to reject.” The Commandant de Cercle reiterated the theme of voluntary servitude linked, as it

---

31 Lieutenant-Gouverneur par interim. du Niger à Monsieur le Gouverneur General de l’AOF, 1 Juin 1923, ANN 381.1.
32 Ibid.
33 The text of the convention can be found online in the website of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights: [http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/SlaveryConvention.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/SlaveryConvention.aspx)
35 The reports were solicited by telegram no. 1735 of 11 May 1931, ANN 381.1.
36 For example, the report from Bilma argues that when the master (le patron) travels, the slave (le captif) "takes advantage [of his absence] to steal shamelessly, and this is how certain slaves have been able to make considerable profits. […] The District Officer often receives the complaints of the masters regarding the [dis-]honesty of the captives or former captives, but no complaints or actions are ever received concerning possible attempts to alienate the freedom of ex-slaves or dealings concerning ex-slaves. The current situation of ex-slaves is that of a worker who would not receive a salary, but is fed and clothed, in exchange for which he owes his work [to his master]. Upon the death of the master he can stay with his master’s descendants or leave them as he wishes. In fact these are captives only by name only [il ne reste de captive que le nom] and those who are still called ‘captif’ are in the same situation as emancipated slaves who remain with their former owners voluntarily."Capitaine Lafitte Commandant le Cercle de Bilma à Monsieur le Gouverneur du Niger, 3 Aout 1931, ANN 381.1.
37 Capitaine Commandant le Cercle de Tahoua à Monsieur le Gouverneur du Niger, 29 Juin 1931, ANN 381.1.
often was, to the view that “slaves” were only slaves by name, due to “the magic of words,” words which lingered on even after the phenomena they referred to had disappeared:

“slaves are in a state of semi-slavery, but entirely of their own will. Servants accept readily the destiny that custom attributes to them, all the more so since – were it not for the magic of words – such destiny has hardly anything in common with the slavery of the past.”

The text continues with a long description of all the ways in which the living conditions of slaves had changed, including reference to the willingness of ex-slaves to denounce their masters if they dared to impose on them conditions they found unacceptable. This, however, is described as the state of affairs amongst sedentary groups only. By contrast, slavery in nomad societies is seen as resilient and unchanged: “the slave trade still exists. The nomads of the north (Hoggar and Iforas) come to acquire slaves in our regions, and the trade happens without us finding out, with the tacit or overt complicity of the whole population.”

Rather than asking why “the entire population” apparently did not share the colonial abolitionist ethos, slavery’s resilience amongst nomads was attributed to the slaves’ baseness:

“The slave (bellah amongst the Tuareg, hartani amongst the Moors and Arab) is an integral part of the society of the nomad. […] They have taken the language of their masters, but of their masters’ mentality they took the defects only. Thieves, liars, looters – one would say that the guardianship of a master is their only claim to wisdom. If they are freed, left to their own devices, when they do not decide of their own volition to become the servants of a new master, they become chronic visitors of our tribunals and constitute the prisoner workforce (la main d’ouvre pénale) of our administration. To end slavery in the nomad region would be tantamount to destroying the Arab or Tuareg societies. […] If slavery amongst the nomads is an evil, it is a necessary evil nonetheless!”

In October 1931 Gérard Esperet completed a general study “on the Situation of Servile Labor in French West Africa.” This report resembles others in its logic: a portrait of a generic and undifferentiated “past” is contrasted with changes following the action of the French administration in the aftermath of occupation. Then challenges are mentioned. A marked distinction is drawn between nomadic and settled populations with respect to the resilience of practices similar to slavery that are seen as enduring among the former more than among the latter. The terminology is problematized: the administrative and native habit to refer to persons of slave descent as “captives” is denounced as confusing, because this category often covers a large proportion of people who are “captives” only nominally and who work as voluntary servants.

Marking an important change from previous discussions of this matter, Esperet’s report compares vestiges of “traditional” servility and forms of “obligatory public works” that include colonial prestations. A section entitled “Where does free labor begin?” includes an assessment of the widespread practice of carrying out farming work for a former master in exchange for being housed, fed, clothed, looked after, and often given a part of the harvest. This type of labor relation is seen as comparable to salaried labor, allegedly a concept alien to African societies. The coercive elements of colonial recruitment are then justified as being necessary to familiarize Africans with salaried labor. Obligatory public works in the form of prestatory labor and labor mobilized in the form of the “second military contingent” constituted “training” that would gradually
“accustom our subjects to the concept of free labor as we understand it: remunerated obligatory work is the necessary step between serfdom and free labor. It is the additional professional education (école de perfectionnement) indispensable for the development of non-productive territories and the education and improvement of the conditions of indigenous masses.”

Forms of colonial labor management that were becoming increasingly unviable under the scrutiny of the LN and ILO were presented as a necessary step that would accustom indigenous workers to free labor.

**“Voluntary servants” and “tacit contracts”**

The League of Nations’ Committee of Experts on Slavery drew on the wisdom of seven senior colonial officials, most of whom had occupied the highest ranks in Europe’s colonial empires. The Committee regularly asked colonial governors for updated information, and Governors forwarded these requests to the district officers. In January 1935 new regional reports were requested. Emphasis was placed on the presence or absence of “contracts.”

In the mid-1930s, faced with pressures from the ILO, which investigated forms of forced labor, the French administration developed a two-tiered argument that, on the one hand, insisted on the existence of a “tacit contract” that regulated local labor relations; and, on the other, attempted to enforce the application of new contracts regulating the provision of services (especially herding work) by ex-slaves.

In his reply to the Minister of Colonies, the Lieutenant General of FWA provided the example of the Commandant of the Cercle of Dori, who “explained [to Tuareg elites] the mechanism of the work contract that should be established between masters and servants, and which defines the rights and duties of both.” Efforts were made to demonstrate that only a very small percentage of those designated as “captives” or “slaves” were actually enslaved. “Nominal captivity” and “tacit contracts” were closely connected:

> “The voluntary servants are tied to their employers by a work contract which lacks a fixed salary (unusual formula for this region), but provides food, clothing, and an allowance that usually includes a certain percentage of new-born animals from the herd guarded by the servant.

---

44 ibid., p. 33. The French official position on compulsory labor is described in the preface to the Law of 21 August 1930 (Décret portant réglementation du travail public obligatoire aux colonies), cited in Fall, Le travail forcé, pp. 321–5.


46 The experts were allegedly persons with experience of African, Asian, and Arabian slavery and were appointed at the request of their governments. In 1931 a committee of seven was selected. It included a woman delegate to respond to a request of the Council for the Representation of Women in the League of Nations. The experts were the Italian Tullio Zedda, secretary to the Government of Eritrea, who was later replaced by Ercole Vellani, head of the Office of Studies and Propaganda in the Ministry of the Colonies; the Belgian Albrecht Gohr, Director General of the Belgian Ministry of the Colonies and formerly official of the Congo Free State; the Dutch Neytzell de Wilde, former president of the Legislative Assembly of the Dutch East Indies and an official of the Ministry of Colonies; the Spanish Julio Lopez-Ólivan, minister plenipotentiary at the Foreign Ministry, and formerly director general of the Protectorate of Morocco and the colonies; the Portuguese Virgínia de Castro e Almeida, delegate to the League of Nations International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation (the only woman in the Committee); the British Lord Lugard, formerly military administrator of Uganda, Governor of Hong Kong, and Governor of Nigeria. Lugard had served on the Temporary Slavery Commission and on the International Labor Organization’s Committee of Experts on Native Labor from 1925 to 1941. The French member was Gabriel Angoulvant, former governor of the Ivory Coast and governor general of FWA, a man known as an “authoritarian technocrat” who “advocated concessionary companies, compulsory crop growing, and forced labor for the large-scale development projects,” Slavery in the Twentieth Century, 199.

47 Ministre des Colonies a Monsieur le Gouverneur General de l’AOF, 10 Janvier 1935, ANN 381.1.

48 On the idea of contract in French emancipation policy, see Klein, Slavery and Colonial Rule, 178-179; see also Cooper, Decolonization, 51.

49 Lieutenant Gouverneur du Niger a Monsieur le Gouverneur General de l’AOF, 22 February 1935, ANN 381.1
These servants have the freedom to break the contract that ties them tacitly to their employers at any moment, and to complain, if they wish to, with the representatives of the administrative authority. This freedom that they have to dispose of themselves prevents us from calling them ‘slaves’ even if they were enslaved in the past or they were born from enslaved parents.”

Allegedly, the existence of French laws that terminated the former masters’ right to force their slaves to work for them meant ipso facto that those who continued working for their masters without contract or salary did so voluntarily. This was presented as evidence for the existence of a “tacit contract” that regulated labor relations otherwise indistinguishable from the “slavery” of the past. French bureaucrats marveled at the “magic of words” that alone explained why such relations could possibly still be termed “slavery”… but one cannot but marvel at the magic of colonial discourse, that conjured the appearance of contracts where none existed. The claim that these relations were regulated by some kind of invisible contract turned – as if by magic – thousands of relations that suspiciously resembled slavery into examples of free labor.

Having reduced the existence of slavery to a question of definition, the administration emphasized definitional rigor. The Governor of Niger wrote to the Cercles, demanding that the administrators’ reports distinguish between “voluntary servants” and “victims of the slave trade.” This limited the potential repercussions of reports: although it was impossible to establish the degree of consent under which unpaid dependants continued serving old and new masters, this rhetorical distinction concealed the connections between these two categories and circumvented the prevalence of the problem.

The political consequences of distinguishing between “voluntary servants” and “victims of the slave trade” were formidable. Although “voluntary servants” and “victims of the slave trade” faced different circumstances, the former (mostly persons of slave descent still connected to the families of their masters) were particularly likely to be sold by former masters, or have their children sold and turned into “victims of the slave trade,” as demonstrated by the court cases of Tahoua discussed below. On the other hand “victims of the slave trade,” especially when they had been kidnapped very young and had no recollection of their original families, were likely to accept their destiny eventually and turn into the category that French reports defined as “voluntary servants.” Keeping these two categories separate made the slavery problem appear significantly smaller than it was.

3. The World of Slaves and Slave-Owners in Tahoua

In the official discourse abolitionism itself attested to Europe’s moral superiority, which, in turn, legitimized European government in the colonies. But how far, if at all, was this rationale shared by African slaves and slave-owners? What did they think and do in relation to slavery and the slave trade? How did they relate to European administrators? And how did European administrators interact with African slaves and traffickers? Did their behavior differ, in practice, from what they wrote in reports to their superiors?

50 Circular No. 29 CM, a tous Cercles et Divisions, 29 Janvier 1936. My underlining.
51 Gouverneur Niger to Commandants de Cercles, Circular No. 29 of 28 January 1936, ANN 381.5. The Advisory Committee of Experts on Slavery was a permanent structure, unlike its antecedent the Committee of Experts on Slavery, but met only every two years “if necessary”. Members were still selected by their governments, and included three from the old Committee of Experts on Slavery (the Dutch de Wilde, the Italian Zedda, and the Belgian Gohr). Theodore Marchand, former governor of Cameroon, replaced the former French member, Angoulvant, who had died; Portugal’s Jose d’Almada, Colonial Advisor to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, replaced de Castro e Almeida, whose involvement had been limited; the British replaced the aging Lugard with George Maxwell, a barrister who had served in Malaysia; and the Spanish member was Isabel Oyarzabel de Palencia, delegate to the ILO and to the League’s Assembly. See Miers, *Slavery in the Twentieth Century*, 217-218.
Ader is a mixed Hausa and Tuareg region that lies at the boundary between the desert to the north and the savannah to the south. Court cases that took place in the 1920s and 1930s illustrate the resistance of Tahoua’s slaves, who did not hesitate to denounce masters and traders. They attest to reconfigurations of relations between parties who belonged to the same local hierarchies. Many of the slaves who appear in these cases did not live together with their owners: they lived in separate locations, but were recognized collectively as dependent upon specific elite families. In colonial reports, the vast majority of these people were designated as “voluntary servants”: they were not forcibly tied to their masters and were apparently free to break off relations at any time. But many of them continued working for their masters, primarily looking after their herds.

Slave owners felt entitled to be hosted by these subordinates at any time: they saw these communities and the resources they exploited as their own; male masters thought they had sexual access to women and could take children away to sell them or give them as presents. Those who lived in close physical proximity to members of the masters’ families carried out manual and domestic labor for the masters; women of slave descent were the carers and wet-nurses of elite children. In return, they received some food, clothes, protection in moments of crisis (for example, they may have had access to food during famines), and occasional gifts. They appeared to be tied to the elites by a “tacit contract,” entered voluntarily and hypothetically freely repudiated. But the ambiguity of their status – Were they slaves? Ex-slaves? Slave descendants? – made them vulnerable: they could be sold, turned into gifts, or used for sexual entertainment, leading lives subordinated to the lives of others.

The cases below shed light on the actual nature of the relations that figured as “tacit contracts” and “voluntary servitude” in French reports. They reveal, too, the matter-of-fact nature of slavery in Tahoua: owners were not ashamed to own slaves and talked of slavery as an integral part of their economic activities. The slaves who chose to denounce their masters revolted against particular actions that they found unacceptable. They were trying to improve their circumstances and those of people they cared for – not to eradicate slavery.

“*Their word does not carry the same weight as mine*” (22 September 1920)

On 14 September 1920 Tougai, a “Bellah” woman of about thirty-five years of age, denounced the actions of her master Abdelkader to the colonial administration of Tahoua. About ten days earlier, Abdelkader had taken Rhali, Tougai’s ten-year-old son, and given the child to his “uncle” Ahmed ag Mohamed in exchange for 12,000 measures of millet. Tougai claimed that Abdelkader had intended to sell her son to Ahmed. Agodek, a “bellah” man from the village of Labanda, testified as eyewitness to this transaction: he had seen Abdelkader reach Ahmed ag Mohamed’s dwelling with the child Rhali, and leave alone with the millet. Agodek believed that the millet was the payment for the child. Abdelkader and Ahmed denied the whole affair. They claimed that the millet had been given to Abdelkader on credit, and that Abdelkader would have paid for it at a later date. “The witnesses lie,” stated Abdelkader “I only lent the boy to my uncle who needed a shepherd.” The District Officer told Abdelkader that he had no right to “lend” a child who was not his own, and that the two witnesses had given conclusive evidence. Abdelkader replied: “These are bellah, captives, 

---


53 In French West Africa the term “bellah” loosely designates slaves and slave descendants within Tuareg societies. “Bellah” is a term used by Songhay speakers in the French Sudan (today’s Mali). In Hausaphone contexts Tuareg slaves and ex-slaves are referred to as “buzu”, “buzuaye”, or “bugadje”. The colonial sources cited in this article use the terms “bellah” and “buzu” interchangeably.
their word does not carry the same weight as mine.” The Commandant noted that Tougaï, who was Abdelkader’s servant (domestique), would not have complained unless she knew that her son had been sold to Ahmed. Abdelkader once again discounted the reliability of Tougaï’s statement: “this woman does not know what she is talking about.”

The Commandant asked for the opinion of the two assessors, “Mohamed el Momi”, Chief of the Second Nomadic Group (Kel Eghlel), of Muslim status, and Abderhaman, Chief of the Euddes, a Muslim nomad. It was decided that Rhali had been exchanged for millet and therefore that this was a case of slave trade. However, the gravity of the case was extenuated by the fact that Rhali had not been removed from his region of residence; that the accused had no criminal records; and that Islamic law did not foresee any punishment for this crime. The punishment was reduced to six months of prison and the payment of 150 Francs for Abdelkader and Ahmed, respectively.

“We had to sell Seima and her daughter to buy some cattle” (25 May 1921)

On May 5th 1921 the Commandant de Cercle of Tahoua, received a letter from his counterpart in the District of Gao in the French Sudan. The letter informed him that he should expect the arrival of some slaves of Tahoua who had been sold by Almoussakaeres Arabs to nomads of Gao. And in fact Seima, a woman aged about 40, and her nine-year-old daughter Alguimat reached Tahoua’s administrative headquarters a few days after the letter arrived. Seima declared that she had been sold around 1913 by her masters Youssouf Ould Belahi and her brother Mohamed Ould Belahi. She and her daughter had been bought by a nomad from Gao who had been summoned by the Gao District administration. In Seima’s words:

“About eight years ago my masters Youssouf and Mohamed sold me to Mohamed Ould M’barek of the Daoussak of Gao. My daughter was about one year old at the time. I was staying with my new master when one day he was summoned to Gao’s administration… someone must have told the District Officer of Gao that Mohamed Ould M’barek had bought me and my daughter, because he was arrested and brought to trial.”

The sellers, Youssouf and Mohamed, were summoned to appear in Tahoua. Youssouf had died, but Mohamed was arrested on May 19th. He confessed that he and his brother had sold Seima and her daughter. He tried to justify himself by blaming his youthfulness at the time of the affair: “I had wanted to oppose this sale, but my brother was the elder and he told me that we had to sell Seima and her daughter to get some cattle in their place. I was young and I did not want to contradict Youssouf’s decision.” Tahoua’s tribunal condemned Mohamed to two years in prison. But a handwritten note at the bottom of the dossier indicates that a

54 Jugement no. 4 Affaire Abdelkader et Mohamed ag Mohamed, ANN 381.1.
55 Shaykh Muhammad al-Mumin was the leader of the Kel Eghlé of Abalagh. He and his younger relative Muhammad Ibrahim were influential religious scholars, respected by the colonial administration who relied on their advice and called upon their services in the Tahoua region. They also shared their knowledge (and their important manuscript collection) with some of the main scholars of Tuareg societies in Niger, including H.T. Norris, Edmond Bernus, Johannes Nicolaensen, and Ghubayd Agg-Alawjéli (Ghoubeld Alojaly), all of whom refer to these two shaykhs of Abalagh in their works. I had conversations with Shaykh Muhammad Ibrahim in Abalagh on 9 and 10 October 2005.
56 Transactions between Tahoua and Gao were not random. These two regions were linked by long-term ethnic, political, and trade relations. Tahoua-Tamaske and Gao-Menaka hosted, respectively, the Iwellemmeden Kel Denne (or eastern Iwellemmeden) and the Iwellemmeden Kel Ataram (or western Iwellemmeden). These two divisions of the Iwellemmeden were tied by trade and intermarriage. Some of their chiefs collaborated during the revolt of 1916-1917. Business between them was eased by a sense of common origins and frequent contacts, sometimes hostile, but characterized by the mobilization of segmentary principles. Slaves, like wives and objects of trade, travelled across the segments of Iwellemmeden groups and sub-groups, and could eventually be transferred to completely distinct groups, like the Ahaggar in Algeria or the Tuareg of the Adrar des Iforas in Mali.
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chamber of the Court of Appeals (chambre d’homologation) reversed this judgment on 18 August 1921. Mohamed was eventually acquitted.

“It’s the fault of God who ill-inspired me” (6 July 1921)

In September 1917 Oumar Ag Ibrahim sold his slave Seidi, a ten-year-old girl of the eastern Igdalen, to Sahalla of the Daoussak of the District of Gao. In May 1921 the District Officer of Gao discovered that Seidi had been bought by Sahalla, and had the latter arrested and brought to the administration’s office. Sahalla gave away the identity of the seller, and the District Officer of Gao sent Seidi to Tahoua and informed his counterpart in Tahoua about the facts. Oumar was found and arrested on 29 June. Confronted with Seidi he recognized her immediately, and initially tried to deny the accusation and shift the blame onto a certain Attaher. However Seidi provided extensive details, forcing him to confess. Seidi was fourteen years old when she provided the following testimony:

“In September 1917 I was in the service of the accused [Oumar ag Ibrahim]. He brought me to the east and sold me to Sahalla of the Daoussak in exchange for three heads of cattle and one donkey. Recently some guards (goumiers) from Menaka came to our camp and arrested Sahalla who was brought to the District Tribunal. I was taken away, too, and after Sahalla was condemned the District Officer sent me to Tahoua.”

Oumar Ag Ibrahim was then asked whether he admitted that he had sold Seidi, his servant, to Sahalla.

“Yes, I confirm that what Seidi said is the truth. She was not of great use to me. After the revolt of the nomads and the affairs of Agadez I needed to restock my herd, so I decided to exchange my maid for three oxen and a donkey. It’s the fault of God who ill-inspired me (c’est la faute de Dieu qui m’a mal inspiré).”

Oumar ag Ibrahim was condemned to five years of prison, but we do not know if the sentence was finally carried out.

“I needed the money” (6 April 1922)

On 15 February 1921 Absata, a “bellah” woman of the Iragamaten, was sold with her son and daughter by her master Sibilla ag Shibebe of the Igdalen to a man of the Hoggar region whose name and ethnicity she did not know. A few days later, their new owner sold Absata’s daughter to a man of the Adrar des Iforas and retained Absata and her son. While they were travelling northwards, Absata and her son escaped and reached Tahoua, where they filed a claim with Tahoua’s Commandant. After over two months of search, Sibilla was arrested and brought to Tahoua. Concurrently, a woman called Elgeme arrived in Tahoua with her two young children and a note from the District Officer of Gao stating that she had been sold by a nomad from Tahoua to a certain Salimou, nomad from Gao, who had been condemned for having purchased her.

Sibilla arrived in the administrative station on March 31. While he was being interrogated by the District Officer, Elgeme reached the colonial administration’s headquarters and recognized him, her former master, who had sold her, and Absata, her old companion. Absata and Elgeme accused Sibilla of having sold not only them and their children, but many other women and children, to nomads of the Hoggar and Adrar des Iforas regions. In her accusation, Absata said: “Sibilla surely sold other women and children, because on several

58 Jugement n° 9 Affaire Oumar ag Ibrahim, ANN381.1.
59 Oumar ag Ibrahim is referring to the 1916-17 anti-colonial “revolts” of the Tuareg groups of Tahoua (Niger) and Menaka-Gao (French Sudan).
60 Ibid.
occasions I saw him arrive at the camp with people that he gave to other nomads in exchange for livestock and cloth. I do not know what happened to my daughter.”

Elgeme, too, was asked to testify:

“She sold me with my two young children to Salimu of Gao for 30 heads of livestock and one donkey. Since my new master treated me harshly, I complained to the colonial administration of Gao. The District Officer of Gao sent me back to Tahoua with a letter for Tahoua’s District Officer. When I reached the administration’s building I was surprised to find there my old master, who was being interrogated by the District Officer, to whom I gave the letter. Sibilla recognized me. He had sold several other of his servants, primarily women and children.”

Sibilla admitted that he had sold Absata and Elgeme, but denied having sold anyone else. The District Officer asked him whether he knew that French law had forbidden the slave trade and asked him why he engaged in this traffic. Sibilla replied: “I needed the money and I was dissatisfied with the work of these servants.” Sibilla was condemned to five years in prison.

The resistance of enslaved women and mothers

What is the nature of the relations described in the cases above? In the first case, Tougai defended her son Rhali when her master Abdoulkader tried to give, or sell, him to his “uncle” Ahmed. She convinced a man of slave descent called Agodek to act as her witness in court. In the second case, Seima and her nine-year-old daughter Alguimat had been sold by Seima’s master eight years earlier to a nomad from the district of Gao. They spent approximately eight years at the service of this man in Gao, until the sale was discovered and they were sent back to Tahoua. We do not know whether Seima (or Alguimat) had denounced their new owners, or whether their case had been discovered accidentally.

In the third case, Seidi was ten years old when she was sold by her master to a nomad of the District of Gao. When the District Officer of Gao discovered her circumstances, he sent her back to Tahoua. Again, we do not know if Seidi in Gao had informed the administration of her status, or if other happenings had brought to light her enslavement. These discoveries happened either at the initiative of enslaved persons themselves, who contacted the colonial administration in the hope of receiving support; or at the initiative of administrators conducting investigations required to complete their reports on the situation of slavery and the slave trade in the districts under their command. Be that as it may, when fourteen-year-old Seidi was interviewed in Tahoua, confronted with her former owner who had sold her, she did not hesitate to accuse him. His answer reveals that he found the transaction completely normal: as a servant Seidi was not of great use to him, and he needed to restock his herd, which had suffered severe losses after the conflicts of 1916-17. His motivation was similar to that of the owners of Seima and her daughter, who stated that they had sold their slaves because they wanted to purchase cattle.

In the fourth case, Absata and Elgeme were sold, each with their respective two children, by their master Sibilla to Tuareg of other groups (Hoggar and Adrar des Iforas). Following the re-sale of her daughter to yet another man, Absata escaped with her son, reached the administration, and denounced her master. Meanwhile Elgeme, still with her two children, reached Tahoua from Gao where she had been “liberated,” though we do not know the circumstances in which her enslavement had been discovered. The two women, Absata and Elgeme, incriminated their former master, accusing him of having sold many other persons. His explanation was curt and plain: he needed money and was displeased with their service.

---
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These cases, all from the early 1920s, suggest that women of slave descent were particularly vulnerable. We do not know how Tougai, Seima, Seidi, Absata, and Elgeme had originally been enslaved. They may have been purchased as infants and grown up in a Tuareg camp or slave settlement with many other children who shared a similar destiny. Or they may have been born to a slave mother owned by someone who automatically owned them, too (this was the case for Idi in the next section, who stated that he had been born to a woman enslaved to his owner). They probably led a relatively autonomous life and may have had only occasional contacts with their masters. Then a day came when their master decided that he needed money, or cattle, or that he owed something to someone close to him, someone he could not disappoint. And he disposed of them, whom he considered his possessions, to fulfill his needs. These transactions had been legitimate until only two decades earlier. Their criminalization by French occupiers, who had undermined substantially the power of former Tuareg elites in these areas, was a novelty. Slave owners did not feel guilt for actions that were justifiable in their own cultural and normative universe – actions banned recently by colonial agents whom they considered infidels, enemies, and usurpers.

A large number of slaves were tied to their nomadic masters by loose ties of dependence: all that was asked of them was, perhaps, to host the masters and their parties during their visits; to carry out some domestic work, look after part of the masters’ herds, and fetch water and wood. They owed masters some customary gifts and prestations, but received some, too. In sum, for many of these persons slavery was bearable and they may have been able to benefit from the protection of a master. But the most marginal amongst them lived under the threat that their master would decide to sell them and/or their children. Sale implied a deterioration of their circumstances: it involved abandoning familiar places and friends and facing the alienation of the newly enslaved, forcibly relegated to the lowest rung of another social hierarchy with a status that gave few, if any, entitlements. Slave mothers feared that their children would be sold. They feared losing them to a life harsher than their own, far away where they could not protect them and look after them. In the 1920s, some slaves faced with a deterioration of their circumstances chose to resist.

Most slaves had reasons to resent their masters: they may have experienced enslavement and the eradication of all links to their original families. Even if they had been born into dependence, their lives were harder than those of freeborn persons. Their workloads were heavier, they could be physically chastised, and slave girls were sexually accessible to elite men. This article examines a limited number of cases that are not statistically representative and do not allow generalizations. But the prominence of enslaved women corroborates the findings of other studies that in this period women and children formed the majority of slaves because they were more easily coercible than men of slave descent. The experience of exploitation was highly gendered: these women had to endure the allegedly legitimate abduction of their own children and violation of their own bodies. At abolition, men of slave descent turned into labor migrants and accessed opportunities unattainable to many enslaved women in this region. When in the 1920s colonial administrators were required to actively pursue slave owners and traders in their districts, it seems that enslaved women in particular took advantage of these circumstances.

63 For an analysis of the migration of male slaves in Tahoua and generally in the West African context, see Benedetta Rossi, “Migration and Emancipation in West Africa’s Labor History: The Missing Links,” Slavery and Abolition 35 (2014): 23-46. For a study of other contexts where women of slave descent were able to migrate in substantial numbers, see Marie Rodet, Les migrantes ignorées du Haut-Sénégal, 1900-1946 (Paris : Karthala, 2009).
4. Tadoutchi’s courage

This case is more complex than the previous ones. The actors involved in the sale of Tadoutchi and Idi did not belong only to Tuareg nomadic sections. Unlike the cases discussed above that involved the sale of slaves across closely connected Tuareg networks, Tadoutchi’s odyssey cut across status, ethnicity, religion, gender, and age. Tadoutchi was from Sabon Gari Kaora, a small hamlet near the village of Agouloum, north-east of Tamaske. Villages in the Bagey-Tamaske-Agouloum area were, and are, inhabited by a mix of Hausaphone Asna groups, different Tuareg groups (some nomadic, others settled), and small groups of slave descendants some of which were manumitted and acquired the status of liberti: Ighawalen in Tamasheq or Gawalley in Hausa. Notions of identity and hierarchy could not be more complex than in this small region of Ader, where Tuareg and Hausa/Asna ideas and institutions mix, and members of the same family may not speak the same language. In this area “slaves” could imagine occupying different positions in Ader’s multiple hierarchies – they could perceive themselves, and be perceived, as manumitted slaves or poor Hausa peasants. Unlike a Tuareg slave who grew up in the camp of his/her master, “slaves” like Tadoutchi, Mayaki, and Idi were embedded in a multiplicity of hierarchies based on wealth, descent, rank, and spiritual criteria. Their names show that they were partially Hausaized.

In this world of interlaced hierarchies, one day Barao, a powerful man connected to the Canton Chief of Tamaske and active in Ader’s multi-ethnic trade networks, sold a young boy called Idi. Tadoutchi denounced Barao for selling Idi, whom she qualified as her brother. Tadoutchi believed in herself, and possibly saw herself as endowed with magical powers. Nevertheless the consequences of her denunciation were terrible: Barao sold her and her child into the trans-Saharan trade. She was already deep into the desert, when her destiny suddenly turned: the same forces that had led her into the Sahara pulled her back home.

Under normal circumstances, Barao’s revenge against Tadoutchi would have been easy to accomplish. But this time other interests were at stake: the colonial administration, under pressure from the LN, had to pursue cases of slavery beyond what might have been considered reasonable earlier in the twentieth century. The Commandant de Cercle Adelard de Loppinot was a man of relentless determination, as he had shown on several other occasions. And Tamaske’s Canton Chief (Hausa: Sarki) Tuba dan Aga had private scores to settle with Barao. Under pressure by de Loppinot and determined to harm Barao, Sarkin Tuba became involved in this case. Tuba’s men reached out to the Tuareg intermediaries who had sold and re-sold Tadoutchi and Idi further and further into the desert. Retrieved from these trafficking networks, Tadoutchi and Idi testified against Barao. They identified him as the man who had sold them and, facing him at the trial, denounced his lies.

---

64 I described this type of ethnic identities and relations, and specifically the settings of Sabon Gari Kaora and Agouloum, in “Being and Becoming Hausa in Ader,” in Being and Becoming Hausa: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, ed. Anne Haour and Benedetta Rossi (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 113-139. For a discussion of the relations between Hausaphone (including Asna, Asna or Asena) and Tamasheqophone groups in the Tamaske area, see Francis Nicolas, Tamesna: Les Ioullemeden de l’Est ou Tuareg Kel Denneg (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1950), 48-59.

65 See examples of this type of relations in Rossi, “Without History?” 547-548.

66 The name, or nickname, “Tadoutchi” indicates an association between this woman and the plateau, hill, or mountain (“ta doute” the one of the rocks, the one of the mountains). In the Bagey – Tamaske – Agouloum culture area such nicknames are often given to individuals believed to hold supernatural powers. For example, I collected testimonies describing the supernatural powers of a woman known as “ta karfi,” or “the one of the jar”, believed to have powers over the rain which she transmitted to her son Ibrahima Mai Ruwa (Ibrahim chief of the rain), see fieldnotes, Kongo, 13 September 2005; Sabon Gari Kaora 19 September; Agouloum, 20 September 2005; Agouloum, 21 September 2005; Kongo, 18 October 2005.

67 Rossi, From Slavery to Aid, pp. 175-192.
"You went to see the whites. Now you can do anything you want, you shall never see them again" (April-November 1930)

In June 1930 Tadoutchi, a woman of about 23 years of age from the village of Sabon Gari Kaora, filed a complaint with Tahoua’s administration in which she accused her master Barao of having sold her fourteen-year-old brother Idi as well as another young “servant” called Idrissa. She was given a convocation paper to bring to Tamaské Sabon Gari, where her master Barao lived. Barao was seen leaving for Tahoua together with Tadoutchi: they left Tamaské and walked together up the dusty lateritic plateau that stands just after Tamaské where the road branches off to Tahoua. But Barao came down the plateau alone. There was no trace of Tadoutchi. In Tahoua’s administrative headquarters Barao was asked to explain what had happened to Tadoutchi, and he said that she spent the night in Bagey, and would reach them on the following day.

The days passed, and Tadoutchi did not reappear. Barao was imprisoned and searches were arranged to find the missing Tadoutchi. The enquiry was dwindling for lack of evidence, when Tuba dan Aga, the Canton Chief of Tamaské, came to see the District Officer Adelard de Loppinot with two testimonies, and declared spontaneously that Barao had told him in person that he had sold Idrissa. Barao was informed that he had the right to select a defense attorney amongst his relatives or the local notables, but he argued that he would defend himself and did not need anyone else. Asked to make his deposition, Tuba stated:

“One day I was going to the District Administration, and Barao too had been convoked there following the accusations of his servant Tadoutchi who claimed that he had sold her brother Idi. I told Barao “Tell me the truth, I am your father in law, did you sell your servant?” He replied: “It is not Idi I sold, but Idrissa”. This happened along the way [to Tahoua], near Kolloma, and Rahimoun and Moussa were present. [Barao] added that he had sold [his servant] to Aggour of the Hoggar for four camels. He sold one of the camels to cover the expenses of his recent marriage; the second camel he exchanged for livestock that he exported for sale in Nigeria. He must have hidden the other two, I don’t know where: he had offered to give me a female camel to buy my silence and support in this affair.”

De Loppinot asked Tuba whether he knew anything about Idi’s sale; he replied that he had heard about this but he did not know for sure. He was asked, too, if he had any suspicion about Tadoutchi’s disappearance. He replied that he found her disappearance troubling: following orders from the administration he had dispatched all the District Guards and had hundreds of people searching the plateau and its surroundings but “no bones had been found.” Rahimoun and Moussa, the two witnesses who were with Tuba, confirmed his deposition. Rahimoun added that Barao offered Tuba one female camel, one plaid, and 250 Francs in exchange for his collaboration.

Barao, asked to comment on these accusations against him, replied:

“All I know is that this is a conspiracy against me by my father in law who is upset with me because I married the sister of the Canton Chief of Tahoua. He invented my statements and convinced two friends of mine to depose against me in order to damage me. I am a successful trader and I earn money through trade: it is with this money that I was able to get married. My two servants Idi and Idrissa saved themselves [“se sont sauvés”, meaning they escaped], my

68 Sarkin Tuba was renown for his magical power, partly related to the potency of Arnei, his Chief of Bori (Sarkin Bori), a “Buzu” from a specialist well-digging group. He had close ties with the old village of Agouloum, which is the main settlement near Sabon Gari Kaora, where Tadoutchi is from; fieldnotes 19 February 2005 (including interview with Alio Aga, brother of Tuba), 2 March 2005, 21 September 2005, 2 December 2008.
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servant Tadoutchi [ran away] too, I could do nothing about this, all slaves run away, they are probably in Nigeria.”

This started a discussion between De Loppinot and Barao about individual statements of the latter that had been shown to be false in successive enquiries. De Loppinot accused Barao of lying: “these successive lies attest to how little trust we should place in your claims.” The three witnesses swore on the Qur’an that their statements were true and stated that they had nothing to add. Barao, asked if he wished to add anything, said: “nothing, only that they are lying in order to destroy me.” Barao was condemned to five years in prison and the confiscation of a rifle and the four camels, or the livestock acquired through the sale of such camels. Then unexpectedly some weeks later, on 21 August, Tadoutchi and Idi appeared suddenly in the Administration of Tahoua. Tadoutchi made the following deposition:

“The three witnesses swore on the Qur’an that their statements were true and stated that they had nothing to add. Barao, asked if he wished to add anything, said: “nothing, only that they are lying in order to destroy me.” Barao was condemned to five years in prison and the confiscation of a rifle and the four camels, or the livestock acquired through the sale of such camels. Then unexpectedly some weeks later, on 21 August, Tadoutchi and Idi appeared suddenly in the Administration of Tahoua. Tadoutchi made the following deposition:

“About two months ago I came to Tahoua to file a complaint against my master Barao who had sold my two younger brothers Mayaki and Idi. The District Officer gave me a paper for Tuba, the Canton Chief of Tamaske. When I brought the paper to the Chief, he was absent, so I gave it to his nephew Maidoubou, who read it, gave it back to me, and asked me to wait for Tuba’s return. On that same day my master Barao came to see me and told me: ‘you went to tell lies to the District Officer. I am coming from Tahoua: the District Officer told me to bring you back to Tahoua immediately. Bakary, the colonial interpreter, lent me his camel so that I could travel faster.’ He asked me to give him the paper of the District Officer; then he went off to Tamaske Sabon Gida, came back, and told me to follow him. So this is what I did. He rode his camel and I walked behind him with my child on my back. When we reached the plateau of Tamaske he took me on the camel and we travelled like this until we reached the Valley of Barmu in the evening. Barao stopped only when he saw three nomads waiting for him. Then he told me: ‘You went to see the whites, now you can do anything you want, you shall never see them again’.

The nomads gave him a rifle and a large woolen plaid from Hoggar, then they parted. Barao went back the way he had come, and the nomads, who were already in possession of my brother Idi, left with [Idi], myself, and my child that I was carrying on my back. On the second day of our trip one of the nomads parted from us, heading eastwards. We travelled by camel for about nine days, travelling overnight, from sunset until about midday every day. On the ninth day we reached the nomads’ camp. We spent one week there, then we travelled five days westwards and reached a valley where there were the camps of some Arabs with their tents and their camels. The nomads who had brought us there sold us to these Arabs: I for six camels, and my younger brother for five. The nomad who had given the rifle and plaid to Barao kept my child (who had been weaned) in his camp with him. I stayed at the camp of the Arabs where we had been sold, but my brother [Idi] was taken away by the Arab who had bought him, to another camp located south of the first camp. A few days later, the nomads who had sold us came to look for us at the Arabs’ camp and brought us to their chief called Moussa, who was camped at about one day of march by camel, westwards of the Arabs’ camp.

Moussa told us that he had received a paper that stated that Barao had been imprisoned and that a search had been launched for me. He asked us whether we would be able to return to Tamaske or Tahoua [on our own], we said we could, and he let us go without giving us any food or water. After a two-day march we reached the camp of Mohamed El Mumi [near Abalagh], where we were fed and given water to drink. Then we continued our trip and reached Tahoua. It took us twenty days in total to come from Moussa’s camp to here. During almost the entire road we ate leaves and drank water from the ponds scattered along the way.”

The account of Idi, who at the time was about fourteen years old, complemented the one of Tadoutchi by adding details from his own story:

---

70 See footnote 57.
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“My mother was a slave (captive) of Barao. I was born in his home and I always lived there. As soon as I was old enough to work, I did all kinds of jobs. I looked after the animals of my master; cultivated his garden; carried out tasks he assigned to me; and tried to be helpful on all occasions. One day, at the beginning of the rainy season this year, Barao’s father beat me without reason and threatened to throw me in a well. I ran away in panic and sought refuge with Ikali, also known as Abubakar, of Tchinkaki. Barao found me here one month later, when he came to look for me to bring me to a certain Duadie. I spent one week in Tahoua with Barao, then we left and went to Bagey where we stayed three days. When we were leaving Bagey, Barao told me ‘now we are going to Tamaske.’ He took the road to Tamaske, but before reaching Tamaske he made a detour and stopped just after the village of Zangarata. We stopped in the bush. At sunset Barao started walking with me toward Tamaske, but instead of entering the village he stopped about two Km south of Tamaske, he stopped on a dune where we met a group of about ten nomads, all of whom had their faces veiled and long hair [i.e. they were Tuareg elites or imajeghen]. We spent the night on this dune with the nomads. Just before sunrise Barao woke me up and I had to leave with him and three nomads in the direction of Bagey. When Bagey was in sight, Barao said that he had forgotten the shackles of his horse and returned to Tamaske after telling me to continue the trip with the nomads. We followed them until we reached the valley of Barmu. We camped here for three days, and it is here that I overheard the names of the nomads: Almina, Aguele, and a third who must have been a cleric (maraboutique) was called Aliafare. On the evening of the fourth day Barao arrived with my sister Tadoutchi carrying her child of about two years old on her back. My sister told you already what happened afterwards.”

On the following day, Barao, Tadoutchi, and Idi were interrogated together at the tribunal of Tahoua. This confrontation was chaired by Edouard Nafyn, deputy (adjoint) of the District Officer Adelard de Loppinot. Barao was reminded of his earlier statement, in which he had argued that he had gone with Tadoutchi to the Plateau of Tamaske, and that then he had continued on the road to Tahoua alone while Tadoutchi had stayed overnight in Bagey with a certain Azzahara, and that after this he had never seen Tadoutchi again. He was asked if he would reconfirm this version of facts, which he did. Barao was then informed that Tadoutchi and her brother Idi had been found and were accusing him of having sold her, her son, and Idi to three nomads called Almina, Agueli, and Aliafare. He was asked if this was true.

Barao: “If this is true, you should contact these people [the nomads] and they will tell you what price I asked them [to pay].”

Nafyn: “Your accomplices will soon be arrested and they will betray you. It is in your interest to tell the whole truth from now.”

Barao: “The plaid which they say I received with the rifle as payment for the child of Tadoutchi...”

Nafyn: “Who told you about the plaid and the price of Tadoutchi’s son?”

Barao: “I overheard people talking about this when I was carrying water yesterday.”

Nafyn: “What did you hear?”

Barao: “I do not know, I heard this yesterday, there were some men who were talking between them.”

Nafyn: “Which men? You do not see that many men in prison...?”

Barao: “I don’t know, I do not know them...”
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Nafyn: “Continue.”

Barao started a complicated story about Aliafare, the cleric mentioned by Idi, explaining that Aliafare owed him 850 Francs for some trade exchanges that had occurred between them. Since this story departed from the focus of the court case, Nafyn asked him to explain how Tadoutchi and Idi had been given to the nomads.

Barao: “I am not lying. I do not know how they have been taken by the nomads. I assure you that I have never sold anyone. You may bring the nomads here and interrogate them, and you will see that I am not involved in this affair. Aliafare is a family friend. Each time he comes down to the sedentary region, he stays with me.”

Nafyn: “Who asked you to talk about the nature of your relations with Aliafare?”

Barao: “No one, it is just to let you know.”

Nafyn: “Do you insist on denying that you sold Tadoutchi, her son, and her brother Idi?”

Barao: “I never sold anyone.”

Nafyn (to Tadoutchi): “Is this the man who sold you?”

Tadoutchi: “It is him.”

Nafyn (to Idi): “Do you recognize this man, is he the man who sold you?”

Idi: “Yes, it is he, he says nothing but lies.”

On 15 November 1930 one more witness in this case gave his testimony at the Cercle of Tahoua to the Deputy District Officer Paul Guillaud. Bibi, a 38-year-old nomad from the group of the Arab chief Moussa with their main camp in Tamaia at the border between the Districts of Tahoua and Tamanrasset gave the following statement:

“Moussa, my chief, found out that some individuals of the Taitoff fraction had bought two slaves, a man and a woman. He ordered me to go to look for this man and this woman among the Taitoff and to bring them back to him. I left for the Taitoff [camp] with some companions. […] We found the Taitoff in Tegidda, in the District of Agadez north-west of In Gall, at four days of march from this old station [In Gall]. I found the boy Idi at the place of Mamma and Tadoutchi at Mohamed’s place. Moussa had recommended that we act cautiously among the Taitoff, pretending to want to buy back these slaves, nothing else. This is what we did, and once we had acquired the two slaves we brought them back to Moussa together with the Taitoff Mamma and Mohamed.”

On 10 December 1931 this case was adjudicated at the chambre d’homologation of Niamey. At Tahoua’s tribunal of second degree the case had been adjudicated as a case of slave trade, and Barao, Agueli, Almina, and Aliafare had each been condemned to five years in prison and fines of 500 Francs. Moreover, it was decided that the goods transacted in exchange for the slaves (four camels, 2000 Francs, a rifle, and one plaid) would all be confiscated. The chambre d’homologation decreed that the judgment against Barao and Aliafare – who “had been the main instigators of the crime” would stand, but Agueli and Almina’s punishment

---
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was reduced from five to three years. The punishment against the Hoggar nomads was reduced because their culpability was seen as mitigated by the fact that they had “done nothing to provoke this sale” and that “they had not opposed any resistance to set free the captives they had acquired when they received the order to do so by the Chief of the nomadic tribe Moussa ag Aklissou.” The transcript of the chambre’s decision goes on to explain the logic that had resulted in the tribunal’s final decision:

“the rules of humanity that must guide our decisions sometimes oblige us to suspend our personality and consider that things that are contrary to our feelings are sometimes seen as normal by these natives, whose mentality is somewhat primitive, and on whose spirits our civilising influence has been acting only very slowly.”

Colonial law, ethnicity, status, and gender in the Saharan trade

Barao had already sold Tadoutchi’s younger brother Mayaki when he took Idi away and sold him to Aliafare, a man of the Hoggar with whom he had close relations. Barao was a wealthy Hausaphone merchant—he bought livestock from the north and sold it in the south, probably Northern Nigeria: a lucrative form of trade for the businessmen of Tamaske who acted as intermediaries between Tuareg nomads of the north and the busy Hausa city-states to the south of Ader. He was involved in many axes of trade, and occasionally must have sold persons whom he considered his slaves.

When Idi was sold, Tadoutchi denounced Barao. Barao was a powerful man and her denunciation was a long shot and a potentially hazardous one. But Tuba dan Aga, the Canton Chief of Tamaske, decided to intervene in her favour. As Barao stated, Tuba must have had his own motives for getting involved. Surely Tuba had decided to harm Barao, perhaps due to jealousy. Barao had married the daughter of a powerful chief in the region, and Tuba himself was trying to marry-up with women from old chiefly families in order to ennoble his own lineage. Tuba, canton chief of a rich farming canton bordering dry semi-desert regions, was a homo novus: he was the son of a rich farmer, Aga, who had become the first canton chief of Tamaske by making colonial occupation work for him, but who did not have chiefly credentials by descent. Aga, it is said, had been the chief of farming (sarkin noma) of the Lissawan before becoming the first Canton Chief of Tamaske at the direction of French colonialists. Aga and Tuba were perceived as legitimate chiefs by the local population, who resented Tuareg power. Thus in the 1920s French abolitionism became a weapon in the hands of Tadoutchi, who resisted the sale of her two “brothers” (subordinate young boys close to her who may or may not have been her biological brothers); and in the hands of Sarki Tuba, who got rid of an adversary and strengthened his position by appearing to lend support to the abolitionist cause.

This case sheds light on the internal workings of the trans-Saharan slave trade: Barao, settled in a village at the boundary between desert and savannah, was the Hausaphone business partner of Aliafare, a nomad of the “Hoggar” (Ahaggaren). He sometimes provided slaves to Aliafare, and the latter sold them off to men from other Arabo-Tuareg nomadic groups, such as the “Taitoff” (Taytoq). But in this case Moussa, the chief of Aliafare’s Hoggar nomadic

76 Officier du Ministère Public près le Tribunal d’Homologation du Niger a Monsieur le Président dudit Tribunal a Niamey, annulation du jugement no. 12, Niamey 10 décembre 1931, ANN381.1.
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79 This is based on my research in Ader, see in particular 2005 fieldnotes and interviews with Allo Aga (son of Aga) and Cheffou Tuba (son of Tuba) conducted in Tamaske on 19 February 2005; fieldnotes 2 March 2005 (in Agulum Tudu); fieldnotes 9 September 2005 (in Keita).
group, interfered with Aliafare’s business, perhaps because of the intervention of Tamaske’s Canton Chief Tuba. Informed – probably by Tuba’s emissaries – that the French had started a search for Tadoutchi and Idi, Moussa had his men find out the identities of the men in his own group who had bought slaves from Aliafare, and sent his men to buy these slaves back. Barao and Aliafare’s transaction was nullified by the intervention of their respective two chiefs, Tuba and Moussa, who on this occasion chose to collaborate with the French administration. Tadoutchi and Idi were vindicated. But in this story Tadoutchi lost the unnamed child whom she was carrying on her back. This child was kept by someone in Moussa’s camp and perhaps never returned to her.

None of the slaves who testified at the Tribunal of Tahoua were strangers to their masters. Some had been born to one of the masters’ female slaves and were, therefore, second- or third-generation slaves in these highly stratified societies. But from their master’s perspectives they were disposable. Their status and racialized identities made them persons who could be transacted. Masters who knew that their slaves would oppose resistance to these transactions lied to slaves they had decided to sell to conceal their real intentions: Barao told Idi that he had forgotten the shackles of his horse and had to go back to collect them when he left him in the hands of those to whom he had sold him.

Idi did not want to leave, but this was not because of any emotional attachment to Barao, from whom he had already escaped once when Barao’s father had threatened to throw him in a well. The ties he felt were to his other enslaved relatives and friends, like Ikali who hid him when he ran away, or like Tadoutchi who did not hesitate to denounce her master to the French to rescue Idi, an act of defiance that would provoke her own sale and the loss of her child. Indeed, were it not for the intervention of Tuba, Tadoutchi could have lost everything: her marginal liberty, her relatives and friends, and her recently weaned child. Fortune favored her courage, to some extent.

5. Tchimmou’s Return: Emancipation Remembered

We do not know how the slaves of Tahoua lived the rest of their lives, or how the experience of enslavement and emancipation affected their aspirations and perceptions of hierarchy. Following the trials, how did they relate to slave owners and enslaved persons? Did they try to own slaves? Did they become abolitionists? The historiography of slavery in Africa is only beginning to ask these questions. Yet, this is such a recent history that persons with memories of enslavement, and persons who have relations with their own or their parents’ owners are not undiscoverable in today’s Tahoua (as in other regions of West Africa). In 2005 I interviewed an elderly lady called Tchimmou who lived in a village inhabited mainly by slave descendants located in the rural hinterland of the Region of Tahoua. As a young girl, Tchimmou had been kidnapped and sold at the market of Bilma, then brought to the French Sudan (Mali) by her new masters. She remained there until one day she obtained the help of French colonial officers, who liberated her and sent her back to her village. Tchimmou’s experience was analogous to the experiences of the slaves discussed earlier in this article. Her reminiscences reveal how she had come to think of these episodes of her youth.

Tchimmou was a fragile elderly lady, blind in one eye and bowed by old age. I had known her for many years and she had hinted at her story many times. Then one day she decided to give me a detailed account of what had happened to her in her youth. Tchimmou chose to start her account with the death of her mother. In a summarized version of her story that she provided

80 A similar subterfuge is described by Susan Rasmussen in an article on slavery amongst the Kel Ewey of Aïr: the master of Atakor (a pseudonym) lied to Atakor, still a child at the time, when he tried to sell him. Atakor found out that his master was lying and was able to avert a sale that would have brought him to Hausaland, see Susan Rasmussen, “The Slave Narrative in Life History and Myth and Problems of Ethnographic Representation of the Tuareg Cultural Predicament,” *Ethnohistory* 46 (1999): 67-108. 
81 Fieldnotes 4 May 2005.
first, Tchimmou summed up her experience in few sentences that were translated into Hausa from Tamasaghlalt by her “nephew”\textsuperscript{82}: “When she was a little girl she lived with her mother. When her mother died, the jajaye kidnapped her (sun kama ita) and brought her to Tabotaki.” Tchimmou did not refer to a father figure: she probably never met her biological father. When her mother died, Tchimmou became an orphan. This made her more vulnerable than other children and was the first memory that she chose to recall. I asked her whether she could explain her story in greater detail. So she restarted her account from the death of her mother.

When she was a little girl she lived with her mother. When her mother died, the jajaye took her and brought her to Tabotaki. Then she was brought to Azawagh, where she was sold, and then brought to Timbuktu. Where in Azawagh? I asked. The Kel Eghlel Emnigger came and brought her away. They took her to Tabotaki where they gave her to the Igdalen. They told the Igdalen: “Sell her for us” (sunka ce musu “a saida ta muna”). The Igdalen replied “You won’t sell this young girl!” The Kel Eghlel answered: “We are used to selling men with long beards, why wouldn’t we sell this one?”

The Kel Eghlel and the Kel Gress owned and captured slaves, but did not sell them. The Igdalen were like professional dealers (dillalai) of slaves at markets. She remained four months with the Igdalen. She wore the slave bracelets at both arms and they shaved her head, and brought her to the market of Bilma. She was sold for six male camels and one female camel. Usually they would have to pay six camels and a large sakala carpet in bands of cloth sewn together.

In Timbuktu, she looked after the herd of her new masters (tana kiwo). One day she was in the bush with the animals, when she saw a group of colonialists mounted on camels: about thirty African soldiers (goumiers, gummair) and two white officers (kufar). When this group moved close to her, she ran to them and they started asking her questions – she said she was a foreigner here. They asked her where her people were; she did not know, she told them she had been sold by jajaye and was herding livestock for them. One officer wrote down the information she had provided and took her with them. It was sunset when they reached the place where they would stay for the night. They slept there. In the morning they sent someone to fetch the man who had bought her.

When Tchimmou’s owner reached them and saw her with the colonial officers, he asked her: “Where do you think you are going?” The white man then asked the [Tuareg man]: “How can you sell and buy people?” He kicked him. They tied him and made him lie on the floor. One white officer walked upon him in this position and left him tied on the floor overnight. In the morning they called another white and told him to come and see the one who sells slaves. When he arrived, they asked what should be done to him. They killed him with one shot.

In the days that followed Tchimmou was well fed and reassured that she would never be a slave again. She told the whites that she had been sold with two others: one woman from Arzerori and one from Tabotaki. They promised her they would look for them. Meanwhile, the white man who saved her, who was called “Gitna,” travelled with her by car to Gao (Gao), Timbuktu, Kidal and Imorafan. Everywhere she received help in the military camps where they stopped (bariki). They reached Kidal. Women here gave her new clothes, and applied henna on her hands, gave her perfume and braided her hair. Some men wanted to marry her, but she did not want to, she wished to go back home. Gitna told them she would not marry anyone, he said that she was travelling and they should leave her in peace. Tchimmou took off her new clothes, so no one would look at her again. Finally, her uncle

\textsuperscript{82} Tamasaghlalt is a variant of Tamasheq spoken by some groups in the Tahoua and Abalagh regions. See Jeannine Drouin, ”Nouveaux éléments de sociolinguistique touarègue. Un parler méridional nigérien, la tamasaghlalt,” Actes du Groupe Linguistique d’Études Chamito-Sémitiques (G. L. E. C. S.) 24-28 (1979-1985): 507-520.
found her in Kidal, and they gave her to him. Together, they travelled back to Niamey, because her uncle was afraid to stay with the soldiers. Tchimmou was not afraid, but he was. However, her uncle died in Niamey. Sarkin Niamey “Sauri” and his wife looked after Tchimmou and her uncle until her uncle died. They had funerary rites performed for him, and had a ram butchered, cooked, and distributed to people on the third day after his death.

The colonialists had initially planned to bring her to many places in Niger to show that slaves were still being sold. But then they thought this would have been too much travelling and changed their minds. Finally they brought her back to Tahoua by car, and then to Keita. The canton chief (sarki) was Rabo then. Rabo was unwell, so Alkassoum, his aide, was charged with bringing her back to her village. When she arrived, all the men and women gave Alkassoum gifts to thank him for bringing her back. The whole village offered gifts to Alkassoum (sugar, tea, salt, dates). Even her relatives from another village – in particular her brother Amud, with whom she had grown up – sent gifts. They lived like nomads and moved around all the time, but they still sent gifts. She was the only one in her village to have been sold at a market. This is the end of Tchimmou’s story as she herself narrated it to me.

Memories of slavery often have a specific function in the autobiographies of speakers: they may provide a justification for poverty or lack of success in life, or else signal initial powerlessness in a trajectory of self-realization. A speaker’s age influences his/her testimony. The persons of slave descent to whom I talked described erstwhile enslavement in the light of the life they had lived. Events they may have experienced as terrifying when they occurred were reinterpreted as turning points in autobiographical narratives of emancipation. What might have induced uncontrollable fear, or helpless hesitation before the many possible turns that a situation might take in a future yet unlived, was muted into the certainty of what had happened in the past.

The retrospective interpretation of an event in the narrator’s life transformed its original experience. For example, Tchimmou’s account of her decision to seek the help of colonial officers after her sale and enslavement retains little – if anything – of the fear of being let down by colonial officers or found out by her owners, a fear that must have been only too real when these events took place. Her confrontation with her owners retains only some of the defiance that we found recorded in the verbatim quotes of enslaved women speaking at the colonial trials discussed in the two preceding sections of this article. I cannot state with any degree of certainty whether Tchimmou actually sought out colonial officers to denounce her enslavement and seek help, or whether the events that followed occurred exactly as she narrated them to me. But her testimony constitutes evidence of her assessment of the roles played by the different persons who, respectively, owned her, sold her, freed her, or welcomed her back in her village. Her representations reveal interpretative choices. What, asks the colonial officer in Tchimmou’s story, should be done to someone who “sells and buys people”? And his questions seem to find an answer in the actions that follow in Tchimmou’s narration. You should step on him. You should kill him. Tchimmou tells her story and conveys her moral assessment of slavery.

6. Conclusion

Narrating the lives of enslaved persons raises a number of methodological difficulties. As shown in this article and in other studies, the “history of those who would rather forget” can be evinced from a variety of sources, all of which are biased and problematic. How

---

representative are the French transcripts of testimonies given during colonial trials of the experiences of enslaved persons and slave owners outside the trials’ context? As stated in the introduction, only exceptional cases of slave trade and slave resistance would have reached the colonial administration. The majority of slave–master relations were renegotiated without European intervention. Furthermore, some problems are intrinsic to the nature of each type of source. In the case of legal proceedings, the original testimony in Hausa or Tamashq, as the case may be, is forever lost; what we have is a translation, possibly inaccurate or worded so as to minimize ambiguities. It is not inconceivable that interpreters or District Officers erased inconsistencies and nuances to provide a simplified record that would justify the final verdict. But it would be over-simplistic to imagine that the original statements, whatever they were, captured a hypothetical “truth” of slave–master relations. Statements made at trials reveal a mix of genuine conviction and strategic dissimulation, as accusers and defendants strive to prove their own innocence, or their enemy’s guilt. The context presented here was tense and competitive. Sources reveal a struggle between the different perspectives and interests of slaves and slave owners. The testimonies may or may not convey what actually happened, but they relate events that stakeholders found realistic. Those speaking at trials could not have provided unimaginable accounts, for doing so would have exposed them as unreliable witnesses or outright liars. All witnesses were under pressure to provide convincing accounts, accounts that judges, advisors, and other listeners would have believed. In this sense, these sources, though not always verifiable and certainly not statistically representative, constitute reliable evidence on the world of slaves and slave owners.

Tchimmou’s autobiographical testimony raises still other questions. People’s perceptions of a situation change as they age and rethink their past experiences in the light of the lives they lived. I had not yet found the colonial sources cited in this article when I collected Tchimmou’s testimony and I doubted its factuality. But the more I researched these phenomena, the more Tchimmou’s story appeared realistic – not in its specific details, which however I have no reason to doubt, but in the general plausibility of the circumstances it describes. The story that Tchimmou chose to tell about herself, an old lady looking back at her own life, provides a glimpse into Tchimmou’s reflections on slavery and sense of self in 2005. It attests to transformations in the consciousness of slave descendants and ex-slaves who, in their youth, had experiences analogous to those of Tougai, Alguimat, Seima, Absata, Elgeme, and Tadoutchi. Although many of its details are not verifiable, Tchimmou’s testimony is so similar to those of trafficked slaves described in the colonial records that I see these independent sources as mutually corroborating. Undoubtedly emotion and moral judgment color these sources. The emotional and moral dispositions of the speakers compromise the objectivity of their accounts and offer glimpses into moral – as well as social – transformations. Because history does not exist outside the minds of people, Tchimmou’s narrative has historical value. It attests to a turning point in the consciousness of a slave descendant; it attests to the beginning of the social death of the masters’ class.

The slaves of Tahoua struggled to free themselves and their relatives from the violence and exploitation directed against them. Caught between two interpretations of slavery – the


colonial one and the local one – they opted for the one that benefited them most. Some of them took advantage of French abolitionism to resist an intensification of their exploitation. Reflection on these historical experiences led progressively to the development of abolitionist ideologies and activism in the Republic of Niger. It is likely that Nigerien abolitionism will continue to grow. Concurrently, resentment against European abolitionism and colonization has been contributing to the rise of extremist Islamic movements that reject all forms of western-inspired education and advocate the legitimacy of slavery.

Colonial antislavery discourse – like the rationale of intergovernmental institutions – saw abolitionism as a universally superior moral position and an inevitable normative evolution. Today this vision is questioned by the resurgence of pro-slavery ideologies amongst movements like Boko Haram active in the region immediately to the south of Tahoua. At the same time, Tahoua has continued to produce iconic examples of resistance on the part of enslaved women, as exemplified by the recent case of Hadijatou Mani. Hadijatou benefited from the assistance of Timidria, a national abolitionist NGO embedded in international antislavery networks, which puts pressure on governments to enforce global abolitionism. Since the 1920s, the internationalization of anti-slavery struggles has been providing legal and logistical support to enslaved persons and activists seeking to end slavery and its enduring legacies in the Sahel and beyond.

