

Mutating racial and ethnic discourses and the post-colonial hangover in Côte D'Ivoire

Côte D'Ivoire is a country in West Africa, which neighbours Mali and Burkina Faso to the North, Ghana to the East and in Guinea and Liberia to the West. It is a country of a complex makeup, with five main ethnic groups, many states and chiefdoms and numerous languages and dialects. Until the colonial intervention by the French, this country existed relatively peacefully.

It was formerly a French colony, with the presence of French colonial powers dating back to the 1600s. The establishment of French rule came in 1893 when the nation was colonised. Through assimilation and association the French established pronounced superiority over the indigenous population (Lawler, 2015). The colonial, French governments that took power were founded on ideologies of eugenics and race science. The systemic inequalities and mistreatment that Ivorian's endured included: the institutionalisation of forced labour; plantations; child labour; bad working conditions; conflicts for working migrants and the creation of a friction between migrants and Ivorians. The state gained 'independent' status in 1960. Although, this paper will discuss that the French preserved a secure grip on political, economic and social occurrences. There has been a violent and unstable political atmosphere for almost two decades in the nation, which has resulted in serious Human Rights Violations, semi-bureaucratised-massacre and the displacement of many.

This case study will examine the state of racialisation and ethnicisation in the Côte D'Ivoire. This is because there are notable weaknesses of the coverage from official bodies considering these phenomena. Whilst there is much literature commentating the conflicts of ethnicity and human rights concerns, there is minimal literature on race, racism and racialisation in this nation. This has proved difficult in considering how racialisation is operationalized in this context. This case study will critically examine the problems of the post-colonial legacy and the French stranglehold, which are factors that impact on current political conflicts and the struggling economy. It will assess the manipulation of ethnicity by elites, to divide: for political power and control and how the repercussions of these conflicts have become a 'new' racism (HRW, 2001). It will identify evolving and mutating forms of a racial 'anti-white-French' discourse in Ivorian civil life, as a result of the colonial legacy. Furthermore, this paper will give critical insight into the somewhat methodologically narrow and reductionist coverage from reputable and commended international organisations such as the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Racism and literature from the Human Rights Watch. A semi-structured interview was conducted with a student at the University of Leeds, who is from the Côte D'Ivoire. This was to produce a primary source of data that will be used appropriately to support empirical investigation. The ethical considerations and a transcription of the interview are included in the appendices.

Goldberg's (2009) theory of 'relational racisms' is central to the analyses of this paper, as it will transpire that the manifestations of racial and ethnic conflicts are part of the Ivorian socio-historical matrix. Another integral theme to this paper is analysis from a post-colonialist perspective (Solomos and Back, 2000). As, in order to critique the current landscape of racialisation in Côte D'Ivoire it is essential to consider the ramifications of the colonial legacy.

The premise of this case study is to investigate the operationalisation of racialisation in a national context. However, it is important to highlight that the workings of ethnicisation and interethnic conflict will become paramount to this paper.

The French stranglehold: the crisis of the Ivorian post-colonial legacy

stranglehold

'strʌŋg(ə)lhəʊld/

noun

complete or *overwhelming control*.

(Oxford English Dictionary Online)

It is critical to consider the interrelation of racism and colonialism when understanding any phenomenon relevant to the Cote D'Ivoire. Moreover, the landscape of racialisation and ethnicisation is underpinned by pre-existing, structural factors. French colonialism and the Vichy regime were founded upon ideologies of biological essentialism, eugenics and the belief of 'scientific' race categories. These racialised discourses upheld the white supremacy of the French-colonialist regime, as they 'scientifically' detailed that non-white populations were biologically inferior: mentally and physically (Law, 2010).

Under French Colonial rule in 1893, the 'assimilation' concept was applied to Côte D'Ivoire (Lawler, 2015; Cashmore et al., 1996). The premise of assimilation was to extend the French way; by adopting French language, culture and institutions, colonised peoples could gain French citizenship. However, in practice only small numbers of Ivorians were ever granted citizenship in 1930. The French practiced this through inclusionary domination: "dismantling ethnic cultures, languages and attachments by facilitating acculturation to the nation" (Esman, 2004; Law, 2010: 83). The assimilationist state project was orchestrated at the macro level – imposing on the social, political, economic and employment structures. This is demonstrated by the implementation of a racialised and segregationist national constitution. There was law for the French and a separate law for indigenous Ivorians. Certainly, the colonialist state project silenced black voices in the political and policymaking sphere. These forms of direct discrimination rendered black Ivorian rights as inferior, undermining the agency of the majority population, on a racialised basis. This rendered the majority population of Ivorians as a 'subaltern' group, as they were outside the hegemonic power network of the imperialist-French elite (Cashmore et al., 1996: 356).

Latterly, colonial leaders used 'association' policy, as assimilation was failing. Arguably, association in practice was no different to assimilation. This policy change failed to move further from the existing racialised practices directed to Ivorians. This can be demonstrated by how, "racist legislation, economic discrimination against African planters, increased forced labour, and an [economic] depression" still existed, despite a supposed shift in ideology (McKenna, 2011: 111). The Democratic party of the Côte D'Ivoire (PDCI), sought to balance out these inequalities, under leadership of Houphouët-Boigny, from 1946 (Lawler, 2016). It could be suggested that this move towards an Ivorian Nationalist sentiment was to challenge the residual hangover of punitive colonial law (Nugent, 2004). They gained 'independence' from the French in 1960.

Notably, the governmental and societal structures that are in place, in the present day, have not moved far from their operation under French-colonial rule. It has been illustrated that these institutions are fundamentally racist in their structural and historical practice. Arguably, the inappropriate and ineffective post-colonial national structures in Côte D'Ivoire have contributed to the recent turbulent ethnic and political conflicts. As, the institutions are not made for democratic and ethical operation of the indigenous population. Therefore, the institutions of the Côte D'Ivoire have not yet become *post*-colonial. The shift has moved from

racialised discrimination by white-French to Black-Ivorians, to an ethnicised discrimination by Ivorians to Ivorians. This arguably demonstrates how discrimination is learned, and is *relational* to past workings of the state (Goldberg, 2009).

The economic landscape following ‘independence’ saw two decades of great success. It has been argued that this was due to the strong national structures that the French had ‘gifted’ to Ivorians. However, the strength of the national economy did not last. Arguably this happened as a result of the structures not being created for non-discriminatory practices, as they were built on systemic oppression and, essentially, enslavement of the subaltern group (through forced labour and plantations). Notably, with no subaltern group to govern, the economic and labour structures were fundamentally unworkable and deficient. Certainly, the decline in the economy was a catalyst for the acceleration of interethnic tensions. The blame for the problematic circumstances in the economic bust was echoed from both the North and the South. The pre-existing local narratives from both sides mirrored one another: that the North has benefitted from the educated Ivorians of the South and should be grateful; that the South were previously savages and had been given too much power by colonialists whilst the North had built chiefdoms and established systems of operation that worked for Ivorians (Chiro and McCauley, 2008).

In addition, despite ‘independence’, the French have been alarmingly present in the tensions of the last fifteen years. It has been claimed that the white-French played a role in the orchestration of military coups and consequential civil wars (Conroy, 2010). This can be demonstrated through the proliferation of local narratives and from national media: “the supporters of the government always think that in this war the white people, precisely the French men, help the rebels” (Pawson, 2004: NP). There are also local narratives that an aeroplane that was used in the guerrilla conflicts was manufactured and owned by France. This was demonstrated in the interview with Fred* (Appendix II). The French were seen to be involved in the rebellion from the North, in attacking the centralised Southern government regime. Notably, this presents Ivorians with a French stranglehold. In that, French officials are still involved in the basic workings of national civil life, despite ‘independent’ status. Therefore, Côte D’Ivoire is not free from the racialised relics of white-supremacist colonialism.

The notion of relational racisms can also be illustrated here. Multiple countries of Africa continue to experience similar residual post-colonial struggles of an internal divide, struggling economy and ethno-religious conflicts, for example: Nigeria, Republic of Congo, Gambia, to name a few (Nugent, 2004). Arguably, in moving forward from racialisation in these Nations it is not useful to use a comparative approach such as that suggested by Dikotter (2008). Rather it is imperative to identify the ways in which post-colonial atmospheres can be helped by strategies that have worked in other countries of similar historical and sociocultural compositions. This is supported by Goldberg’s (2009) relational racisms methodology. Whilst perhaps idealistic, by understanding the way in which the racialised colonial residue exists, a continental strategy to overcome this could be formatted.

Manipulating ethnicities to divide: by elites, for power and control

“The shocking brutality that permeated the election period was the fruit of a dangerous policy of manipulating ethnicity for political gain” (HRW, 2001: NP)

Côte D’Ivoire’s recent political history is violent. Whilst racialisation is not fundamental to this section of analysis, it is important to consider the mutating patterns of discrimination by elites and whether or not they are racialised. Notably, the contemporary political situations have been part of ‘ethnopolitical warfare’ (McCauley and Seligman, 2001). In that in the

quest for power, political elites have used ethnicity as a dividing tool, to mobilise, elevate and sustain positions. Arguably, Ivorian governments have manipulated ethnicities to divide the population, in order to gain power and control (HRW, 2001). This can be demonstrated by the activity surrounding the 2002 military 'coup d'état' and subsequent civil war. The rebel group from the North attempted to seize control of three major Southern cities. During this militant exercise they massacred and raped non-Muslims and non-supporters of the Northern agenda. The rebel group felt political injustice, as their leader Alassane Ouattara was not allowed to stand for election, due to discrepancies of his nationality. As, Ivorian constitutional law dictates only autochthonous citizens can run for presidency (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2016).

Furthermore, the government's rejection of Ouattara, despite proof he was legitimate, accelerated pre-existing anti-migrant discourses. The descent of Ivorians from the North can be connected (by family names and ethnic lineage) from neighbouring countries: Burkina Faso and Mali. Civilians in Côte D'Ivoire who were thought to be migrants were treated with hostility. The hostility arose due to beliefs that farming-land was unlawfully stolen from 'real' Ivorians by migrants. This propagates an anti-migrant discourse and maintains ethnic divides. This can be demonstrated by the complete national divide by regions, of the "rebel-held North and the government-controlled South" (Encyclopaedia Britannica Online, 2016:NP).

Additionally, the manipulation of ethnicity was violently engaged in the semi-bureaucratized-massacre at Ivorian national elections. In 2010, at the time of the awaited elections, "3,000 civilians were killed and 500,000 displaced" (BBC, 2013). Political elites again used their platforms to incite violence towards those in the North of the divide. The public promotion of ethnic divides, and, calls for violence, increased the levels of ethnic hostility and xenophobia. The ethnic groups that were segregated to Northern territory were predominantly Muslim. Certainly, there were systemic inequalities for Ivorians in the North, as in particular regions there were food shortages and no access for humanitarian aid intervention such as health care and medical supplies (Nugent, 2004).

The above demonstrates the re-emergence of *othering* in Côte D'Ivoire, which arguably "played a central role in colonial discourses" (Solomos and Back, 2000:13). This process can be suggested to have occurred through the broadcasting of those 'others', of Northerners to Southerners and the reverse, by governments, elites and 'rebels'. The North-South Divide displaced 500,000 Ivorians. This meant displaced peoples were separated from families, unable to work and access to basic health care, as travelling between the borders was highly restricted by officials. The Southern government failed to address the displacement, which arguably is systemic discrimination, as they had no interest in re-affiliating the displaced Ivorians of the North (Nugent, 2004). Arguably, this displays elements of segregationist practice from the Southern governing elites (Cashmore et al., 1996).

It can be suggested that the use of ethnicity as a socio-political resource in Côte D'Ivoire mirrors the imperialist use of race to construct hierarchies. Notably, the broadcasted importance of nationality, origin, religion and political affiliation has created a heightened ethnic consciousness in the Côte D'Ivoire. Arguably, this is why it has been a malleable tool for political elites in the quest for political power. The discriminatory practices of recent Ivorian governments arguably echo those of historical colonial rule. In that, both have sought to oppress populations seen as distinct and inferior. However, the pre-existing racialised structures of institutions in Côte D'Ivoire are a contributory factor. It is important to highlight the interplay of the "way in which colonialism and imperialism helped to construct images of the 'other'" and how Ivorians have transposed this (consciously or subconsciously) to the present day xenophobic practices (Back and Solomos, 2004: 13).

Moreover, scholars have argued that the explanations for the tensions between the North and the South reflect each other (Chirot and McCauley, 2006). The accounts both entail a

“mythicized history... full of resentment about various injustices, with a demeaning, essentialized description of whole ethnic, religious and regional groups who are deemed to be enemies” (Chivot and McCauley, 2006: 99). This further demonstrates the reductionist and essentialist, xenophobic narratives from both sides of the divide.

The UN Special Rapporteur suggests that these practices have resulted in an ideology of “ethnic isolationism” (Diene, 2004:2).

Evolving and mutating forms of a ‘racial’, anti white-French discourse

Certainly, the considerations of ‘mutating racisms’ in Côte D’Ivoire need to be acknowledged in the discussion of racialisation. Yet, as aforementioned, the more important concerns for the state are those of ethnicisation and inter-ethnic conflict and xenophobia. This section will examine a mutating racial discourse that targeted whites in the nation. Further, discussing the suggested ‘racism’ of black-Ivorians to other black individuals in the nation. Continually, the xenophobic narratives are present throughout this discussion.

The divisive and, often, violent rhetoric of those in positions of power in Côte D’Ivoire has arguably transmitted to local and national narratives surrounding race. Another integral element to this discourse is nationality and origin. The continued presence of the French caused contention, as they were the white faces that represented the residual colonial legacy. Many whites in the nation owned businesses, had a good level of education and employed Ivorians. These factors were perhaps too familiar of the imperialist past. Due to this, some Black-Ivorian elites vocalised a liberation narrative, calling for revolution against the ubiquitous French. It was unfair that the white-French were still held positions of higher social and economic status. This perceived injustice and inequality resulted in the articulation of an anti-French discourse. This was fed into Ivorian society by many spheres of public life. Principally, ‘hate media’ was utilised to spread this discourse. This can be demonstrated by the messages from Television Broadcastings and national radio (Pawson, 2004). This was then reinforced by the messages from political elites, who were role models for the Ivorian liberation movement: “since September 2002, anti-French sentiment has been whipped up. Obviously that impacts on other white people but it's been artificially manufactured” (Pawson, 2004: NP).

Moreover, the public discourse was arguably internalised by Ivorians. They saw the inequality of how the white-French were still the most privileged and had a stranglehold on aspects of Ivorian life. This transposed to direct-action of Ivorians, seen in the prevalence of anti-white violence. Angered Black-Ivorians took to the streets to vandalise businesses and homes of the white-French, and to attack (Pawson, 2004). The ‘hate radio’ broadcasted Charles Ble Goude the leader of the Young Patriots, “calling on the Ivorian air force to “retake the airport”, which had been seized by the French” (BBC Online, 2004: NP).

This paper has found what arguably is a ‘reverse diaspora’ of white-French living in Côte D’Ivoire. Following the continued anti-white violence over 5,000 white-French closed down their businesses and the majority moved back to France (Pawson, 2016). In the Ivorian context racism is a structural phenomenon that in operation has systematically discriminated against Black citizens on the basis of skin colour (Cashmore et al., 1996). However, this mass-migration of whites signifies discrimination beyond the meso and micro level. Black-Ivorian elites and institutions projected an anti-French discourse that impacted on all whites. The majority of whites in the nation were white-French. Yet, an interview with an Ivorian shed light on how, the attacks were on anyone who was white, and that the perpetrators would not ask if they were French or not (Fred, Appendix II, 2016). So, the basis of these attacks

was racial. The consequences of these attacks impacted at the macro level: the loss of businesses, loss of homes and a 'reverse-diaspora'. These ramifications are systemic. This arguably racialised all whites in Côte D'Ivoire as French-colonial cues. Though, the 'discursive' discrimination – discrimination through language and rhetoric - illustrates whites as one homogenous group (Boréus, 2006).

Another manifestation of these 'mutating' racisms is that of the practices of the Congrès Panafricain des Jeunes et des Patriotes, or colloquially, the Young Patriots (COJEP). The Young Patriots are supporters of former Ivorian President, Laurent Gbagbo, who was president from 2000, until his arrest in 2011 for Human Rights Violations. The Young Patriots took direct action to oppose the Islamification of the country that was supposedly instigated by the North. Furthermore, they stand against the neo-colonialism and imperialism present in Côte D'Ivoire. This further reiterates the presence of the liberation narratives, in an attempt to break free from the French stranglehold. The anti-Muslim, anti-Migrant rhetoric that underpinned this groups action translated into violence towards Northern citizens.

Furthermore, Chirot and McCauley suggest that the Southern Ivorian ideology of Gbagbo and the Young Patriots is "increasingly racist" (2006:99). These scholars suggested that this socio-political activist group were the Ivorian 'Brown Shirts'. As demonstrated, some of the behaviours of the Young Patriots are racist. Yet it is in bad taste to conflate their practices with the Nazi agenda that once influenced the essentialist base to Ivorians subordination under Colonialism. Gbagbo is undergoing trial at the International Criminal Court (International Criminal Court Online, 2016).

This case study finds that the ethnic differences and anti-immigration discourses, which have resulted in violent conflict, are greater problems than the anti-white rhetoric- although not to discount this as a mutating problem. Arguably the behaviours deemed as 'racist' by some scholars are not operationalised on a racialised basis. It is more appropriate and accurate that these occurrences are ethnicised, due to the influences for divide and discrimination being of projected ethnic practices and cultural differences.

Reductionism of reporting by the international monitoring bodies: stifling the racialised and ethnicised tensions in Côte D'Ivoire?

Notably, the reports produced by international monitoring bodies on tensions in Côte D'Ivoire are critical to this case study. The UN Special Rapporteur on Racism in Côte D'Ivoire is arguably in parts reductionist and contradictory. Although the funding for these reports may not allow for regular visitation, the report on Côte D'Ivoire was conducted in 2004. Since then, there has been national crisis and further ethnic conflict, which the report desired "to provide efforts resolve" (United Nations, 2004:2). The Rapporteur has failed to report on these occurrences, and contemporary atmospheres of racism. This time gap undermines the validity of the past report to present day discussions of racism and racialisation in this country.

Correspondingly, there are some contradictions in writing. Whilst this paper acknowledges the complexities of the current national climate, it is critical that recommendations are pragmatic and reports stay objective and concise. The UN Special Rapporteur's report states that:

"...Côte d'Ivoire has no tradition of xenophobia and that Ivorian society has developed a deep-rooted multi-ethnicity, a peaceful coexistence, based on intercultural values, mechanisms and practices forged over many years by all the

communities circumstance has thrown together, whether through migration, family and cultural ties, or economics.” (Diene, 2005: 2)

Contrastingly, the following paragraph highlights that there is “an undercurrent of on-going ethnic and cultural tension” that has caused the Côte D’Ivoire to be “deep in the throes of a dynamic of xenophobia” (Diene, 2005: 2). This is incongruous, as the rapporteur implies that the two phenomena are able to coexist. The Rapporteur omits to highlight that this is a situation of significant change. Suggesting the two coexist is reductionist in the light of the divisive and violent nature of the ethnicised tensions. A more accurate observation would be that despite being a nation of complex, mixed ethnic heritage, there are continuing conflicts based on narratives of difference.

Furthermore, the recommendations from the UN Special Rapporteur, for resolution of the tensions are unattainable and disputable. Considerations of what should be done are clear, yet the practicalities of the strategies are not. The report recommends that a “clear message reaffirming the values of tolerance” needs to be broadcasted from, and by, the government authorities (Diene, 2005: 2). In country of a segregationist internal divide, on-going tension and continued violence between the official government and a militant rebel group, this would be ineffective, if even effectuate. This suggestion is somewhat evocative of a pacification campaign, not one of resolve. As, it seeks to quash the tensions from the top down. This is reductive, as while leaders broadcast the tensions, they are perpetuated and lived by Ivorians. The approach for resolve should come from the grassroots of Ivorian society.

Further, Diene (2005) illustrates that the Côte D’Ivoire should engage an intercommunity dialogue project. It is questionable whether this strategy would work between the North-South divide, although it would be effective if implemented at a local level. Yet, this proposal is a more collaborative strategy to quell inter-ethnic tensions, as it mobilises the voices of ethnic groups and gives non-elite Ivorians agency and a political platform.

The rapporteur suggests that there should be legal repercussions for those inciting xenophobia (Diène, 2005).

An important issue highlighted by the rapporteur is the conflation of ethnicity, religion and culture. This is dangerous as it erodes the complexities of how these phenomena are interlinked (Diène, 2005). It details that:

...northerners, foreigners and those who oppose the President are being termed Muslims. Some of the media have fanned the hatred of certain sections of the population for Muslim communities, who have apparently been accused of wishing to “incinerate Côte d’Ivoire”. The Special Rapporteur has received reports of a proliferation of Islamophobic acts such as damage to places of worship, the destruction of Muslims’ property, as well as violence and torture and even summary executions of members of the Muslim faith. Several imams have allegedly been murdered (Diène, 2005: 16)

Whilst these prejudices are not racialised, they operate by discriminating on religious beliefs and practices.

Unquestionably, Côte D’Ivoire’s recent explosive political history is an urgent Human Rights concern. The Human Rights Watch have chronologically published on the situation. One report details that Ivorian xenophobia is the “new racism” (HRW, 2001:NP). It reports killings by members of the security forces, sexual abuse, detention and torture by members of the police and gendarmerie, disappearances, assaults threats on wounded and those assisting the wounded, religious persecution and mob violence. Human Rights Watch detail that this is the result of interethnic conflicts and “that the political and social climate remains volatile and characterised by intolerance, xenophobia, and suspicion” (2001:NP). One criticism of this

report is that it does not qualify the claim that the ethnic divide is a new racism. Whilst the horrors committed from either side appear to be systemic, there is no evidence that these conflicts are due to the racialisation of other groups. Moreover, even if the interethnic tensions could be considered on a racialised basis, meaning that the discriminatory practices were founded up on scientific race differences, they would not be 'new' phenomena (Banton, 1967). As, the evolution of the political, ethnic and religious tensions has arguably been ever present and is part of a historical cultural narrative from either 'side' (Chirof and McCauley, 2008).

Another note is of the workings of the internal Human Rights organisations of Côte D'Ivoire. The main Human Rights body, the Ivorian Human Rights League (LIDHO), is said not to have the "cooperation of authorities in its monitoring" (University of Minnesota Online, ND). With minimal support from state officials, the promotion of Human Rights will be undermined.

However, particular monitoring bodies may have reason to be tentative in reporting. Arguably, these reports fail to give critical insight to the workings of racialisation in this context, as they have no positive motivation for intervention. Perhaps it is because Côte D'Ivoire has no resources that are useful to western regimes. It can be argued that racialisation, racism and racial discrimination are not the principal concern of the nation's tensions. Nonetheless, it is still important for systematic review of forms of racialisation, as under the unstable domestic climate they are ever mutating and changing.

Conclusions: The nascence of a post-racial, post-ethnic Côte D'Ivoire

A note for future research that is beyond the remit of this case study is an intersectional approach to the operationalisation of racialisation: looking at the enduring impact of the post-colonial marginalisation of women. Before colonial rule, women's voices were valued in the community. Women had a role in community decision-making and through observable cues - by modes of dressing - they could communicate social and political statements (Hagan, 2010). Hagan (2010) suggests that this practice was diminished through the assimilationist state project of French colonial rule. This demonstrates that the colonial restructuring (or perhaps *de-structuring*) of community practices, eroded women's autonomy and agency. A feminist critique is that this silenced Black-Ivorian women's political voice, through a racialised agenda. However, as discussed, under the colonial implementation of white male hegemony, Black-Ivorian men were generally excluded from the political arena. This case study omits to find significant substantive evidence to analyse how gender can be brought to the debate: of the intersectionality of racialisation and racialised practices (Cooper, 1892).

Arguably the post-colonial struggle present in the Ivory Coast is mirrored in other countries of Africa. As demonstrated throughout this paper, the racialised and ethnicised occurrences are relational (Goldberg, 2009). It is counterproductive to conflate all current struggles to Côte D'Ivoire's colonial history. However, the interconnected and systemic issues surrounding politics, the economy, ethnic conflicts and national divide have come about due to the continued, unwanted and illegal intervention of the French. Notably, in order to mobilise Ivorian people, there is the need for the decolonisation of the white supremacist, post-colonial structures of governance. A new system of operation should be created by Ivorians - for Ivorians, considering their complex histories and socio-cultural compositions. Arguably, a post-colonialist approach must be taken for this country: for transformation and to overcome its trepidations, which are the result of residual colonialism.

Côte D'Ivoire is to an extent 'post-racial', in that it no longer discriminates against particular groups due to racialised ideas based on inferiority and race science. However, the repercussions of colonialism and the residual affects that the agenda left behind, impact on a

myriad of current affairs in the nation. Therefore, racialisation lives on covertly through Ivorian structures and practices.

However, the interethnic dynamic continues to be prevalent in all contemporary conflicts. This is one of great concern for the volatile state of the nation. Further conflict and abominable violence is unavoidable unless there is further resolution to the disagreements, which does not solely come from those in positions of authority. There is absolute potential for repetition of violent occurrences. To suggest that there is the need for de-ethnicisation – undoing ethnicities of Ivorians - would also erode the agency and fundamental rights to identity and free will (Cashmore et al., 1996).

This case study omits to find any existing racialisation that fits within the academic definitions and parameters. That is not to say that the continued civil unrest could not mutate into other racialised ideologies. However, to stretch occurrences to try to demonstrate that they are racialised is not empirical or the purpose of this paper. Therefore, this work has not found existing racialisation in Côte D'Ivoire. Rather, there is anti-white discrimination, which is not racist as it is not structural, and is part of a liberation revolution movement, rejecting the actual racist (and racialising) colonial histories. However, the conflation of ethnicity, religion, origin and political affiliation is dangerous as it ignores the intersectionality of Ivorian identity. The interethnic tensions have the potential to be a continued danger to the existence of Côte D'Ivoire as one state.

Therefore, in understanding how racism works globally, the situation in Côte D'Ivoire can help in terms of learned discrimination. The colonial racism that racialised black Ivorians historically still prevents the nation from being post-colonial. The oppression by the colonial 'elite', of Ivorians is mirrored in the contemporary oppression of mostly Northern Ivorians by Ivorian elites. Notably, this shows that the racial discrimination of the past has mutated into other forms of discrimination as the only way the state knows to operate under the residual colonial structures is to do so by divide. Arguably, the legacy of racism in this context has only moulded into another discriminatory and oppressive practice.

References

- Back, Les and John Solomos. *Theories Of Race And Racism*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.
- Banton, Michael. *Race Relations*. New York: Basic Books, 1967. Print.
- "BBC NEWS | Africa | Analysis: Ivory Coast's Hate Media". *News.bbc.co.uk*. N.p., 2016. Web. 23 May 2016.
- Boreus, K. "Discursive Discrimination: A Typology". *European Journal of Social Theory* 9.3 (2006): 405-424. Web.
- Cashmore, Ellis, Michael Banton, and Heribert Adam. *Dictionary Of Race And Ethnic Relations*. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Chiot, Daniel and Clark R McCauley. *Why Not Kill Them All?*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006. Print.
- Chiot, Daniel and Martin E. P Seligman. *Ethnopolitical Warfare*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2001. Print.
- Conroy, Courtney. "France As A Negative Influence On The Côte D'ivoire: The Consequences Of Foreign Interference". Undergraduate. Salve Regina, 2010. Print.
- Copnall, John. "BBC NEWS | Africa | A Young Patriot's Conviction And Anger". *News.bbc.co.uk*. N.p., 2016. Web. 23 May 2016.

Diène, Doudou. *Contemporary Forms Of Racism In Côte D'ivoire*. United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2004. Print. UN Special Rapporteur.

Dikötter, Frank. "The Racialization Of The Globe: An Interactive Interpretation". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31.8 (2008): 1478-1496. Web.

Goldberg, David Theo and John Solomos. *A Companion To Racial And Ethnic Studies*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2002. Print.

Goldberg, David Theo. "Racial Comparisons, Relational Racisms: Some Thoughts On Method". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32.7 (2009): 1271-1282. Web.

Hagan, Martha A. "Speaking Out: Women, Pagne, And Politics In The Cote D'ivoire". *Howard Journal of Communications* 21.2 (2010): 141-163. Web.

International Criminal Court,. "The Prosecutor V. Laurent Gbagbo And Charles Blé Goudé". *Icc-cpi.int*. N.p., 2016. Web. 24 May 2016.

Kofi, Explo. "Ivory Coast: The Spoils Of Colonialism". *Counterfire*. N.p., 2011. Web. 23 May 2016.

Langer, Arnim. "Horizontal Inequalities And Violent Group Mobilization In Côte D'ivoire". *Oxford Development Studies* 33.1 (2005): 25-45. Web.

Law, Ian. *Racism And Ethnicity*. Harlow, England: Longman, 2010. Print.

Lawler, Nancy. "Cote D'ivoire - Cote D'ivoire Since Independence | History - Geography". *Encyclopedia Britannica*. N.p., 2015. Web. 23 May 2016.

"Les Droit De L'hommes". *LIDHO*. N.p., 2015. Web. 23 May 2016.

McKenna, Amy. *The History Of Western Africa*. New York, N.Y.: Britannica Educational Pub. in association with Rosen Educational Services, 2011. Print.

Nugent, Paul. *Africa Since Independence*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print.

Pawson, Laura. "BBC NEWS | Africa | French Fears In Ivory Coast". *News.bbc.co.uk*. N.p., 2016. Web. 23 May 2016.

"The New Racism". *Human Rights Watch*. N.p., 2001. Web. 23 May 2016.

APPENDIX I

**AMENDED VERSION OF THE INTERNAL RESEARCH ETHICS APPLICATION
FOR BA DISSERTATIONS**

Are you planning to conduct fieldwork with (data on) human participants for your research?	<i>Please tick as appropriate</i>
Yes. (This includes online research methods and secondary data analysis.)	x
No, I am conducting content/ media analysis only.	

**INTERNAL RESEARCH ETHICS APPLICATION
Part A: Compliance with the module's block ethical approval**

Ethical review is required for all research involving human participants, including research undertaken by students within a taught student module. Further details of the University of Leeds ethical review requirements are provided in the *Research Ethics Policy* available at: <http://ris.leeds.ac.uk/ris/info/70/ethics>.

1. Will your research project involve any of the following	Yes	No
New data collected by administering questionnaires/interviews for quantitative analysis		x
New data collected by qualitative methods	x	
New data collected from observing individuals or populations		x
Working with aggregated or population data		x
Using already published data or data in the public domain		x
Any Other research methodology please specify below		x

.....

2. Will any of the participants be from any of the following groups? (Tick as appropriate)	Yes	No
Children under 16		x
Adults with learning disabilities		x
Adults with other forms of mental incapacity or mental illness		x
Adults in emergency situations		x

Prisoners or young Offenders		x
Those who could be considered to have a particularly dependent relationship with the investigator, e.g. members of staff, students		x
Other vulnerable groups, please specify below		x

Young mothers from disadvantaged backgrounds.

3. Will the fieldwork involve any of the following: (You may select more than one)	Yes	No
Patients and users of the NHS (including NHS patients treated under contracts with private sector)		x
Individuals identified as potential participants because of their status as relatives or carers of patients and users of the NHS		x
The use of, or potential access to, NHS premises or facilities		x
NHS staff - recruited as potential research participants by virtue of their professional role		x
A prison or a young offender institution in England and Wales (and is health related)		x

.....

4. Will there be any fieldwork/research undertaken overseas/outside the UK?	Yes	No
		x

If you have answered ‘yes’ to ANY of the above questions in 2, 3 or 4, this would mean that your project is particularly sensitive and you would need to apply for full ethical review, a faculty committee level process. Make sure that you discuss the ethical considerations of your project with great care in your assignment.

INTERNAL RESEARCH ETHICS APPLICATION

Part B: Ethical considerations within block ethical approval

5. Will the research touch on sensitive topics or raise other challenges?	Yes	No
Will the study require the cooperation of a gatekeeper for initial access to groups or individuals who are taking part in the study (eg students at school, members of self-help groups, residents of a nursing home)?		x
Will participants be taking part in the research without their knowledge and consent (eg covert observation of people in non-public places)?		x
Will the study involve discussion of sensitive topics (eg sexual activity, drug use)?		x
Could the study induce psychological stress or anxiety or cause harm or have negative consequences beyond the risks encountered in normal life?	x	
Are there any potential conflicts of interest?		x
Does any relationship exist between the researcher(s) and the participant(s), other than that required by the activities associated with the project (e.g., fellow students, staff, etc)?	x	
Does the research involve any risks to the researchers themselves, or individuals not directly involved in the research?		x

If you have answered 'yes' to any of the questions in (5), please describe the ethical issues raised and your plans to resolve them in the ethics section of your assignment.

6. Personal safety	Yes	No
Where will any fieldwork/interviews/focus groups take place?		
At my home address		x
At the respondent's home address		x
At the university or other public place (please specify below).	x	
Some other location (please specify below).		x

If you are planning to conduct fieldwork anywhere except at the university or other public place, your assignment should include a brief statement indicating any security/personal safety issues arising for you and/or for your participants, explaining how these will be managed.

Please note that conducting fieldwork within a home environment, unless you/ respondents are already regular visitors to this environment, will require strong justification and is generally not encouraged.

7. Anonymity	Yes	No
Is there any potential for data to be traced back to individuals or organisations, for instance because it has been unanonymised or anonymised in such a way that there remains risk (eg highlighting people's positions within an organisation, which may reveal them).		x

If you have answered 'yes' to question 7, you need to provide a strong justification for this decision in your assignment.

APPENDIX II

Semi Structured Interview with Fred* an Ivorian Student on: Racial discourse and Racialisation in the Côte D'Ivoire. 10th March 2016. 10.23AM

*Pseudonym given for anonymity

My name is Jo Llewellyn and I am conducting an interview on Racial Discourses and Racialisation in the Côte D'Ivoire.

Consent to record: Yes

Fred: So what was I saying about... [the FDA] in the Malenke it's a massive group. There's a lot of like languages inside as well. There's a lot of groups

Jo: Dialect of Bambra

Fred: Exactly, so Bambra, you can call it Jula (Djula) aswell. It's the same, it's the same thing. So you've got the Akan, I am from the Akan, there's loads, loads of languages in there as well, ethnic groups sort of thing, it is like an umbrella. So the Akan are in the South East, Kru I'd probably say West, Malinke from the centre to the north. There's three major groups, then there's others, more than 65

Jo: 80, I think it's 80 or something isn't it, but then 60 are major languages. Its crazy. Within that are there cultural differences as well? So within the umbrella... within the Akan it is a general common identifying group? So within that you have other [micro] cultures as well?

Fred: Yeah. So that makes it very difficult as well. When it comes to intermarriages and all, that you've got different traditions. As a man if you wanted to marry a girl from another group you have to go with the traditions.

Jo: So it goes with the maternal side [for culture, accept culture of woman]

Fred: Yes the maternal side. When you want to go and present yourself... we are not looking for your culture we are looking for the girls culture. Her parents are going to accept it based on what you do.

Jo: So, just kind of going back to the racial discourse and racialisation

Fred: I mean, talking... talking, it's going to overlap definitely there will be a lot of overlap but we will try and stay on the central points

Jo: Okay, yes, thank you so... have you experienced ethnicisation and ethnic differences by political elites for a political end?

Fred: Definitely, definitely, like okay let's go back to where I was. That coup, when that coup happened the guy from the west came. So what they did with that constitution was get the guy from the North, the actual president, get him out of the political discourse of the Ivory Coast, because...

Jo: on ethnic lines? Based on his ethnicity?

Fred: yeah because, there was this, I don't know like- it was a myth, people [from the North] most of them, they are from Burkina Faso, they are not Ivorian. So it's like having a French citizen come into Britain and be prime minister, people wouldn't like it, you know what I mean? So that was a sentiment that people felt. Like oh, we don't want any Burkina Faso citizen to come in and be president of the Ivory Coast. So that's where the civil war started basically. So once they did that, once they pushed the guy away, they couldn't. In the

constitution, so what the constitution said is that if you mother and father are not Ivorian, you cannot be part of it. He did everything to show he was Ivorian but they did their best to push him away. So once they did that that actually frustrated people from the North, because they actually saw themselves into that man because he was from the North. That's what I'm saying to you, the political discourse in the Ivory Coast is based on ethnic lines. If I vote for you, let's say, Jo, you know... because you are from Leeds- I'm from Leeds as well. But they don't see that ideology, of any politician- okay that's my agenda, okay I want to that for Ivorians- they don't really mind

Jo: so it's based on a shared identity?

Fred: Exactly, once I see myself unto you- I do that

Jo: Okay, so from that, do you think that there is an element to that which fits with the race discourse? So, is the kind of, would you say there is any difference in skin colour or skin tone, or pigmentation?

Fred: Well, that is very important, and I am sure you have talked about that with *** and all that. Because when it comes to everyone having the same colour, it is difficult to actually detect racism, you see it is difficult because we are all black or all white. But it is based on the ethnicity thing. So based on that ethnicity thing, people from the North were, sort of like, cut off from Ivorian society because there was the belief that most of them are from the Burkina Faso

Jo: So that's by most of the Akan group?

Fred: I wont say most of the Akan group. I would probably say most of the Ivorians, but people who felt they were 100% Ivorian were discriminating. Even lets say, Im from the south and when you were growing up, everywhere you go it was like oh this guy is from Burkina Faso there was this stereotype, of...

Jo: Would you say that was because of your skin colour or was it because of where you were from?

Fred: Okay, that's, there's two things. Because of your name. and then your- I wont say skin colour. Because of your name and you know, your accent, because it's different, because of the way you speak. Because people from the North speak French and you see their, their language in that as well so... They were sort of like discriminated against, based on that you see. Especially names, because, in the Ivory coast what happened is. Its mad, you see. If you are from the south, you got different names. I was talking about that umbrella. The Akan the Malinke the Krou, lets say the Akan, theres about 15 languages, that's an estimate. And then all these languages there's different names and different cities you see. SO for you to really understand that, Lets say Yorkshire. Let's say Yorkshire is for the Akan, and then Yorkshire you've got leeds hull Bradford, so many cities. They've got their own language, and their own names [family].

Jo: like accents?

Fred: exactly, like the accents as well. So if you're from Bradford, your name is Zaolo. If youre from Manchester, the surname there lets say smith sort of thing. So, just your name, if I show you my ID as an Ivorian. If you give me any Ivorian names, I will tell you where theyre from you see. So it made it difficult, it made it really easy for Ivorians if you wanted to push these Northern people away because...

Jo: they couldn't escape their names? Or their culture?

Fred: Yes, they couldn't escape. So that actually exposed them to discrimination: just their names. So that's what frustrated them and that frustration grew, and the civil war started. Obviously it's linked. So the guy who won the how do you call now. In 1993, in multipartyism, so they guy that came in

Jo: FPI

Fred: So in 2000 he won the election and that's when the political thing came in. So when he won in 2000, erm, when he won in 2000 what he tried to do, he tried to make the Ivory Coast as a sovereign state sort of thing, so we are not dealing with the French anymore. You see. So that's another thing.

Jo: So, you know, in History they were meant to have sovereignty in 1960

Fred: exactly, but it wasn't, that was just on paper, the French were still underground. Our parliament we used to rent it, despite it being on Ivorian soil, we had to pay a payment every month to the French Officials. Because they built it. So he's a socialist, so when he came he was like oh no theres too many things that the French are taking over, despite on paper we are not, so he came in with the ideology of socialism, patriotism everything for the Ivorian. And obviously that links to not wanting any 'foreigners' or it's not really the ideology but people from the village that's what they saw.

Jo: so with that, thinking about not wanting the French, especially. Can you talk to me a bit about anti-white violence and anti-white discourse?

Fred: exactly, exactly. When that came there was this lets say fight against. SO him bringing the ideology that the French that were dealing. He didn't like it. So he started dealing with the Russians, China. So that's when they hated him, the French. They did everything for him to get out of that parliament.

Jo: and this is the leader of the FPI?

Fred: yes, he was the presidential in 2000 you see. But him coming and bringing that ideology really made it difficult for him as well. So there was another coup in 2002. So, that coup led, they didn't really succeed but it led to the division of the country. It became north and south. And most of the rebels were from the north. Because obviously they were frustrated that they were discriminated because of their names and all that. They didn't like it. It was institutionalised as well

Jo: so it was systemic?

Fred: exactly, and they really didn't like it. I was, you know, I mean. You don't really see that but you feel that. And that's where the frustration really came from. The French are very clever, because they didn't like...

Jo: white French?

Fred: yes, white French, because they didn't like the fact that this guy came with this ideology of patriotism, Ivorian, everything Ivorian for the Ivorian fellows blah blah blah. They played on that division that was already there. They took those from the North saying, if you want we will give you everything, money.... So what they did, they went to Burkina Faso, and as a secret they set it up before attacking. But the French never admitted that they were behind this coup. They did it because they didn't like the guy.

Jo: so in 2002 you think the French were behind the coup

Fred: definitely, there's many

Jo: is that a popular narrative in the ivory coast? Is that a commonly thought thing? But it's never been confirmed?

Fred: yes. It's a common thing. But they played on that division, these guys came to attack so when they attacked it led to a division. So it was like a divide

Jo: a north south divide?

Fred: north south divide yes. Based on discrimination and all that. The FPI, president tried to push them [those in the north] but because there was this big French power, he never succeeded. It took him from 2002-2010. There was loads of agreement, peace talk but it never worked. But we were tired as well, Ivorian people were tired you see.

I moved here in 2006 and then there still... When you think about it that's 8 years of division of a country, people from the south couldn't go. Couldn't even dare to go there. And people from the north as well. It was visa versa. So people from the north because it was like a civil war. And they tried to come. It wasn't based on population but it was based on the military.

Jo: it was a military coup?

Fred: yes a military coup so what they tried to do is they tried to get the land. But the south pushed them out.

Jo: land of farming communities?

Fred: yes obviously more in wars they more you get

Jo: divide and conquer?

Fred: yes, that's what they were trying to do. That's how you win a war. So in 2010. Well the peace talk came and the rebels came to. They decided okay for the peace talk to take place we want one of our presidents/leaders to actually be prime minister.

Jo: Oh yes, so they appointed a prime minister under the president.

Fred: yes, I think 2007. The leader became president and he put most of the leaders in the government. They were malinke.

Jo: was there anti-white violence?

Fred: okay, have you got time? So the French were showing it, so what happened, everyone knew the French were behind. So there was frustration. But it was anti French.

Jo: anti white French?

Fred: you have black French as well but it's anti white French

Jo: because white French is the face of colonialism? It's the representation?

Fred: so 2005 the president of the ivory coast decided to make a massive attack- we were all tired- to make a massive attack against the rebels, from the south.

Jo: so push them back up to the north and out of your territory

Fred: exactly, but when you think about it, this is very tricky. So when you think about it, the guy from the FPI, he was from the West, so it was like west- south-east... against the north.

And that was based, obviously, on erm, political... power.

Jo: so the west east and the south all amalgamated despite their cultural differences because they wanted to overcome the north? Because they had foreign heritage?

Fred: yes, because for them it was easy to discriminate against them because of their names.

They shared many cultural values with them [neighbouring countries/Burkina Faso]. But for them it was so easy because they share names. So the president bought fighter/bomber jets with the Russians, China and then the French didn't like it. He decided to attack the rebels and the French got mad, and they said one of the pilots bombarded their camp. There was lots of documentaries that came out afterwards. Basically, they set it up. So what they did: it was French against Ivory coast. So the French destroyed all the aeroplanes. So that frustrated the population of: West, East and South. Because what we wanted was the rebels to get out of Ivorian life. And problems, poverty started, so people were tired. So that frustrated the population. That's when that anti-white started. Why do French people get involved. When people started getting mad and patriotism and sit ins, and power sort of thing. Sit ins in front of the French embassy. French people were actually getting beat, Ivory coast people would just attack them. The school I went to the director was French, proper French, white. I was friends with his son and all that.

Jo: Was his son white?

Fred: His son was mixed-race

Jo: So his mum was black Ivorian?

Fred: Yes, we were neighbours and we were all in the house [lists names of family] and he came in saying they 'beat my dad they beat my dad' and then we went there and he got beaten by the young [Ivorian] people. Because of the frustration. That happened on the day when the French army destroyed all the Ivorian aviation. It was mad. It became like that anti-white again, just there, it was like every other day you now that.

Jo: that you would hear of attacks?

Fred: Yes, so the French decided to sort of like leave the ivory coast. French businesses, supermarkets, they all got destroyed that was from 2005.

Jo: So there was like a reverse diaspora of the French community? They went off and elsewhere on mass?

Fred: Exactly, some of them left the ivory coast and came back, but lots of them. So that was the anti-white thing.

Jo: So how was that circulated? Was it through local narrative? Or was it through anything official, was it hinted at?

Fred: it wasn't... it wasn't... I wouldn't say- obviously erm I would probably say... Because we have national TV. So, you know obviously if there is a news on TV saying the French... this is what the French.

Jo: and here 'French' is attached to 'white'?

Fred: I mean like maybe if they see an English [white] person there, obviously you are white, they are not going to go and speak French to you to see if you're French or not.

Jo: They would just attack me?

Fred: Yes exactly, unless you start speaking, “oh no, no I am English” sort of thing. All the white in Ivory coast they started to worry, even English. So that’s funny as well, the English ambassador, because obviously you know the French and the English they’re friends. So what happened was they followed the French, they closed their embassy as well. So I had to get my visa, so I had to go to Ghana to get my visa to come to this country. Yes because the English were mad as well at what was happening so what they did was they closed everything as well. They closed the embassy and they closed everything. Then they moved.

Jo: So it was like a violent rebellion against this kind of white supremacist system.

Fred: Supremacist, yes exactly. So this guy, when he came into power he was showing that nationalism thing, that we have suffered a lot, and this was it. It was an ideology that became to take over, you know even me, back then I was probably like 12. And we sort of believed that yes come on, it was wrong for us to feel pain from the French.

Jo: and you agree with that still right?

Fred: Yeah yeah yeah. There was the feel that this was wrong. Him coming was something new?

Jo: Revolutionary?

Fred: Revolutionary. And then obviously the French didn’t like it. Why would someone just come in and change everything. So, they were against him until 2010. They forced him to you know, force a rebel to be a prime minister, people didn’t like it. They forced him to put some rebel leaders into government. People didn’t like it but they did it. But all this talks lead to that election in 2010. And then what he did as well, they forced him, you know the guy that got pushed away, from the RDR, they said he is not Ivorian at all. Yes, so they forced the president then to change the constitution to make it available for the presidential of 2010. Because the rebel were fighting, that was the cause of the rebel that ‘this is our leader’, they wanted him to be their leaders.

Jo: but they didn’t care if he was Ivorian?

Fred: they said he was Ivorian, that was the common belief that he was not Ivorian, but he proved a lot of things. So he brought a birth certificate saying he as Ivorian to national TV.

Jo: has there been an argument that it was not genuine? That he falsified the documents

Fred: exactly, you’ve seen that. Yes. Then this argument came that this was not true. And until now he is still our president! And then you look at it, back in 2009, all these fights came to him being president now. So he really, really, really wanted to be president. And then all this rebellion. When you think about it, at the same time as he wanted to be president, that’s when these other people from the Akan said no, you’re not president, you cannot be president. And that frustrated the gatherings from the north, and that’s when the rebellions started. And from the rebellion they came and said they want him to be, you know. SO when you think about it, it was like a process, until 2010 when the election came. SO they changed the constitution to allow him to be president, so that actually allowed him to be a candidate

Jo: So it’s manipulating ethnicity for political power?

Fred: Definitely, that’s the main thing that you’ve got actually yes. Obviously you need to refer all this so I will do my best to probably find some stuff.

Jo: There is stuff out there but it’s more history based stuff.

Fred: So talking about that presidential in 2010, that led to a massive, massive civil war. The guy, the then president, he is in court now, he is being judged at the international court. So that led to a massive massive fight. A massive civil war. So he said ‘okay that’s fine, him a candidate’, as long as we have peace in Ivory coast he can be a candidate. And some people didn’t like it as well “he’s from Burkina Faso” just leave it but he said no its fine we are tired we are just going to go to the election and see who is going to win. So he came and you know he became candidate. After the vote, there was these. What the then president did, he said okay that’s what I want: I want all the rebel to give in their weapons. We don’t want any, because they cant go to election, on election when the rebel still have their weapons and yes that’s a no.

Jo: they had an embargo

Fred: exactly, that was the agreement. So they gave up their weapons. Well, that was the picture they gave. But, there was this a lot of news saying people voting for the then president

from the FPI in the North were beaten up. So let's say that I was going to vote, and if they see that I am voting for the guy for the president they were going to beat me up. So they were coerced to vote for the guy from the north. People were coerced to vote for him you see. And there was many many cheats. So they actually came as well. SO he said what are we going to do. WE need to not include the election there.

Jo: so not count the votes? [from the north]

Fred: yes not count the votes. So there was a lot of corruption from the North. There wasn't any democracy there. They didn't allow people to vote freely.

Jo: so that was going against their ethnic ties, which was never done before. You voted for who represented you but they didn't vote for the rebels because they didn't want to live under that regime.

Fred: exactly, it was kind of, after they talked and agreement and all that, the division. People could move now, so you could go from the north to the south and the south to the north so people started moving. So people from the south who found themselves in there, obviously if I am from the south but I am working in the north I need to vote. They couldn't even wear a tshirt to say Vote FPI or something. So people there were really really coerced to vote for this guy from the North, Alassane Outtarra. So cancelling the vote from the north.

Jo: it silenced the population there?

Fred: exactly, and the rebel didn't like it. So they went mad as well. There was loads of evidences showing that they did it. They coerced people. All the FPI representatives got beat as well, so they cancelled it you see. But then that led to that massive civil war. So cancelling it gave power to people from the west. So that came back into the division, for like 3 months, and the French got involved again and bombarded these residents. The French made way for the rebels to come into a city.

Jo: Which then reinforced the anti-french anti-white rhetoric?

Fred: exactly.

Jo: I'm going to have to stop there due to time. Thank you!

Duration: 35 mins 44 seconds