2018

The Impact of Security Crises on Political Development: An Analysis of Coˆte d'Ivoire, Guinea, and Senegal

Zoe King

Claremont McKenna College

The Impact of Security Crises on Political Development: An

Analysis of Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, and Senegal

Submitted to
Professor Roderic Camp

By
Zoe King

For
Senior Thesis
Spring 2018
April 23 2018

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Violence and politics are inherently intertwined concepts. One can often be a catalyst for the other; violence can be used to achieve desired political outcomes, and politics can be used to end conflict. An effective political system can disincentivise the use of violence, while an ineffective one can encourage it. Within this analysis, I attempt to explore the relationship between security concerns and political development in three case studies: Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, and Senegal. These three countries have similar colonial histories, similar independence processes, though Guinea did become independent two years earlier, and are all located in the same region. Importantly, each country has come into existence relatively recently, between 1958 and 1960, and has thus gone through large political developments throughout its existence as it has adapted from the initial institutions set up by independence leaders. Each case study has predictably had quite different paths in both political development and security threats, and an entirely different relationship between these two concepts.

Before delving into the separate case studies, it is prudent to first discuss briefly the concept of security within this paper. Security within the developing world is naturally different than the traditional view of security found within the western world. The traditional view of national or state security is understood in terms of the physical protection of states from external threats, including war, border conflicts, espionage, sabotage, subversion and other threats that could be operationalized by actual or potential

adversaries.[1] In the developing world, these security threats can be augmented by regional insecurity and weakness of the state's military powers, which heightens external vulnerabilities. However, the discussions of security crises in the following analysis will focus almost exclusively on internal security concerns, not external threats.

In analyzing security in the developing world, it is useful to change the analysis from a power or capability centric metric, such as weapons capabilities or military size, and move towards a metric that is based more on sociopolitical cohesiveness, as presented by Barry Buzan in his paper "People, States, and Fear: The National Security Problem in the Third World." Buzan separates states into four categories: very weak states, ordinary weak states, middle ground states, and strong states. Very weak states are the typical definition of an anarchical state, with neither a widely accepted nor coherent idea of the state among the population, and no governing power strong enough to impose unity in the absence of a political consensus.[2] Ordinary weak states, which I argue contains the three states within this analysis, generally contain a governing power that can override a domestic environment where political identities are more strongly tied towards tribal, ethnic, political, or religious groups than to the state itself.[3] Middle ground states contain a widespread identification among the people of the idea and institutions of the state, yet still contain strong political identities that can occasionally clash violently with the central government.[4] Strong states contain a synthesis of state and society, a

---

[1]Edward Azar and Chung-in Moon, *National Security in the Third World: The Management of Internal and External Threats* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1988), 3.
[2] Barry Buzan, "People, States, and Fear: The National Security Problem in the Third World," in *National Security in the Third World: The Management of Internal and External Threats*, ed. Edward Azar and Chung-in Moon (Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1988), 19.
[3] Barry Buzan, "People, States, and Fear," 19.
[4] Ibid., 20.

difficult trait to develop in the relatively newly inaugurated states found in French West Africa.

When looking at security concerns related to sociopolitical cohesiveness over aspects of power itself, security risks move from external threats to threats to the sociopolitical climate within the state: political violence, major changes in the structure of political institutions, visible use of force by the state in domestic life, large role for political police in everyday situations, major political conflict over state ideology, lack of a coherent national identity or the presence of competing national identities, lack of a clear hierarchy for political authority, and a high degree of state control over the media.[5]

On the weaker end of the spectrum for sociopolitical cohesiveness, the concept of security can become entangled with the idea of state or regime security. Big concerns within the regime security specter include military coups, guerilla movements, secessionist movements, mass uprisings, and political factionalism.[6] Since many threats posed are threats to the governing power's ability to continue its hold on power, it is easy to treat the two terms as synonymous. However, within this analysis, while issues of regime security do count as a security crisis, the focus of security concerns will be more heavily based on insecurity for the population within a country. The internal instability of a regime collapse or threat of collapse will have very negative effects for the safety of the citizens, and will be included in the discussion for this reason. Also included lens when the safety of the citizenry is the focus is also the abuses of the government on their own populace, as we will see within the Guinea and Senegal case studies.

---

[5] Ibid., 21.
[6] Ibid., 24.

Similar to the concept of security, it is also necessary to describe what political development alludes to within this analysis, as it can be an equally vague term with a multitude of valid definitions. Generally speaking, political development is the analysis of the trends of change of political institutions within this country. In this work, the focus will be on how the political development has changed specifically in terms of public participation and the ability of the citizens to have an input or control in their governance, as well as how much governing institutions evolve to benefit the population rather than focusing on, say, solidifying and maintaining power. As well, political stability and durability are also important factors. Included within this analysis of political development is the fostering of civil society, presence of opposition parties, electoral processes, and how the country handles period of political uncertainty, such as matters of succession.

Using these metrics, this paper will first analyze the foundations of political institutions within the three states by exploring the creation of nationalist leaders in the pre-independence era, and how their personal development within these years affected their governance style after independence. Afterwards, the discussion will separate into the three distinct case studies. The purpose of this analysis is to first outline the major developments within each country in the political field, highlight the major security concerns within the country, and then analyze how these two sectors have affected the other, or if they have not, why there has been little connection between the two.

Chapter 2: Colonial Administration

The rise of African involvement in colonial political administration exploded after the end of the second World War, when France opened up the territorial government to include more input from Africans themselves. In these postwar years, the French political system in the colonies evolved away from the direct, authoritarian rule of the pre-war French colonial administration to become more closely related to a parliamentary system. Charles de Gaulle expressed this administrative evolution at the Brazzaville conference in 1944: "We are certain that there will be no progress if the peoples who live on their native land cannot profit from it both materially and morally, if this development does not bring them more closely associated with the directions of their own affairs."[7] From the mid-1940s to the mid-1950s, Africans gained rights to electoral politics, trade-union organization, and more universal citizenship.[8] These transformations allowed African voters to elect delegates to the National Assembly, to the Assembly of the French Union, to the Grand Councils in Dakar and Brazzaville, and to the territorial assemblies. By 1958, voters had expressed their opinions on four referenda, two constitutions, three National Assemblies, and three territorial assemblies. African representatives were able to twice elect members to the Assembly of the French Union, thrice to the federal grand council, and thrice to the French Senate.[9] While representation by Africans was still relatively modest—for example, in the 1945 convention of the Constitutional Assembly,

---

[7] Ernest Milcent, "Senegal," in *African One-Party States*, ed. Gwendolyn M. Carter (New York: Cornell University Press, 1962), 95.
[8] Patrick Manning, *Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa 1880-1995* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 139.
[9] Manning. *Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa*, 140.

only 6 Africans represented the 18 million French West African population—these changes did represent the first time that the colonial regime allowed French Africans to contribute to the institutions that directed their lives.[10]

Following the opening of political participation in the colonies, there soon developed dominant African personalities in colonial politics. As territorial assemblies became more powerful and the number of African political groups increased, the future leaders of the soon-to-be independent African states gained invaluable political experience and developed their political following throughout their maneuvering within the individual territories as well as through the interterritorial politics of the French West African administrative stage. The three dominant political figures in Guinea, Senegal and Côte D'Ivoire post-independence—Sékou Touré, Léopold Senghor, and Félix Houphouët-Boigny, respectively—all developed their bases of support and gained key political experience through their political activities in the pre-independence years. Léopold Sédar Senghor, the head of the nationalist movement in Senegal, and subsequent first president of Senegal, entered politics as one of the first African representatives to be elected in the National Assembly in 1945. He was previously unknown in Senegalese political circles, and a curious personality to enter the Senegalese nationalist movement, "a forty-year-old university teacher who had lived in France for nearly twenty years, who had acquired a French wife and citizenship, and whose claim to prominence was his reputation as one of France's leading young poets, hardly seemed the man who would come to master brokerage politics with a subtlety and skill matched by few other African

---

[10] Milcent, "Senegal," 95.

leaders."[11] Senghor had many identities: African and French intellectual, "man of the bush", Serer, political animal. He rose in prominence as a political leader after founding his own political party, the Bloc Démocratique Sénégalais (BDS), to oppose the then-dominant Senegalese section of the French Socialist Party, SFIO, which was led by Lamine Guèye.[12] Senghor's politics were always heavily based in his political philosophy, which envisioned a society that combined European technology and African communal values to create a more humanistic socialism.[13] Senghor was a master of balancing his various identities to connect with many different groups in Senegal, from the rural peasants to the urban elites. However, he had no interest in creating a single, unified movement for nationalism in Senegal—something which would have been more difficult in the extremely diversified and competitive tribal society found within the territory—and instead focused his energies into brokerage politics, balancing the different forces under the overarching umbrella of BDS.

   Côte D'Ivoire's Houphouët-Boigny was an early political leader, and maintained his strong control and influence in Ivoirian politics through to his death in 1993. Less outwardly passionate than many of the other African leaders, "his quiet self-assurance helped to bring people around to his view. But it was the fact that he could point to what he had accomplished, the abolition of forced labor, the bringing about of reconciliation with the French administration, and then the long string of successful economic projects, that steadily built up his reputation as the supernaturally 'wise of man' of the country."[14]

---

[11] J. Cartwright, *Political Leadership in Africa* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), 126
[12] Milcent, "Senegal," 97.
[13] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 127.
[14] Ibid., 102.

He first entered politics after founding Côte D'Ivoire's earliest political party, the Syndicat Africain Agricole (SAA), to defend the rights of smaller African farmers against the interests of the large French agricultural companies. Houphouët grew the SAA into an effective political coalition, changing the smaller, narrowly focused political party into the nationalist Parti Démocratique de la Côte D'Ivoire (PDCI), which was the Ivoirian branch of the dominant French West African political coalition, the Rassemblement Démocratique Africain (RDA). Houphouët developed the PDCI into an extremely efficient political organization, with local cells throughout the region, excellent communications, and an ability to mobilize supporters quickly.[15] As a representative in the French Constituent Assembly, Houphouët's passage of a bill to abolish forced labor in the overseas territories—a minor issue for metropolitan France, but hugely important to the African population—along with his entrance into the National Assembly, catapulted him into prominence in both thIvoirian politics and the interterritorial RDA movement.[16] In the initial stages of his political activity, Houphouët strongly allied the RDA with the French Communist Party, leading to harassment from the anti-Communist French. This included the imprisonment of activists, banning of the party's right to association, bribing of prominent figures within the organization, and even falsifying of elections.[17] This persecution gave Houphouët a stronger status as a nationalist leader, "French repression further enhanced Houphouet-Boigny's heroic stature. Not only had he fought for and won African rights, but in doing so he had not been arrested, and this had

---

[15] Manning, Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa, 143.
[16] Robert. J. Mundt, "Côte D'Ivoire: Continuity and Change in a Semi-Democracy," in *Political Reform in Francophone Africa*, ed. John F. Clark (Colorado: Westview Press, 1997), 183.
[17] Manning, *Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa*, 141-3.

showed himself to be as powerful as the Frenchmen. With these credentials, he could afford to compromise with the French and yet remain secure from most attacks."[18] And compromise he did. After years of harassment, Houphouët decided that the benefits of the alliance with the Communists had come to an end and reconfigured the party's associations with the French metropole, establishing strong connections to the French government and business community. This ushered in in a honeymoon period for relations between France and Côte D'Ivoire, leading the colony to financial security, even outdistancing Senegal in economic development.[19] Houphouët's willingness to radically alter the party did not reflect his compliance with the French government, but rather his focus on achieving his vision for Côte D'Ivoire, a vision that was heavily motivated by economic stability and growth.

Whereas descriptions of Houphouët-Boigny comment on his lack of outward passion and charisma, the first president of Guinea, Sékou Touré, was able to cement his popularity through his fiery and eloquent presence in the political field. Out of the three political leaders mentioned within this analysis, Touré was the most revolutionary:

The characteristic which first brought him to prominence and gave him support among the people was his courage and readiness to defy the Europeans, whether these were French colonialist, American or Russian…. Coupled with his dynamic style, his forceful oratory, a skill in organizing urban workers and a reputation for personal integrity despite his frequent tactical shifts, these qualities gave him a

---

[18] Cartwright, *Political Leadership,* 101-102.
[19] Virginia Thompson, "The Ivory Coast," in *African One-Party States*, ed. Gwendolyn M. Carter (New York: Cornell University Press, 1962), 241-2.

powerful appeal to Guineans…. Young, handsome and dynamic, Sékou Touré

was one of the few African nationalist leaders who were genuinely charismatic.[20]

Touré was outspoken about the negative effects of colonialism. For him, the biggest evil

to come out of the colonial regime was the destruction of the basic values of African

society and the rise of self-interest over solidarity.[21] Touré gained prominence as the head

of the Parti Démocratique de Guinée (PDG), the Guinean branch of the RDA. His

beginning in politics was not seamless; his association with the RDA began during the

years of harassment from the French administration over the party's affiliation with the

French Communists. This combined with the limits of political organization in Guinea at

the time—which was centered on organizing for the purpose of getting elected, but not

for long-term, ideological objectives like that of Touré's nationalistic party—meant that

Touré's, and the PDG's, popularity did not develop until into the mid-1950s.[22] Several

factors led to the emergence of Touré as the head political figure within the country. The

attacks from the French administration on his political party eventually had similar

effects as that of Côte D'Ivoire, giving the party a stronger image of rebelling against the

French in the interest of African rights. This, along with victorious labor movements led

by the politician, including a successful two-month strike to increase the minimum-wage,

heightened the positive connotation of Touré and the PDG with Guineans.[23] As France

moved into the Fourth Republic, Touré and the PDG had become hugely influential in

Guinean politics, dominating elections and the political discourse within the country.

---

[20] Cartwright, *Political Leadership,* 194.
[21] L. Gray Cowan, "Guinea," in *African One-Party States*, ed. Gwendolyn M. Carter (New York: Cornell University Press, 1962), 154-155.
[22] Cowan, "Guinea," 159-160.
[23] Cartwright, *Political Leadership,* 198.

With the beginning of the leftist regime of Guy Mollet in France, the French metropole's relationship to the overseas territories was again reconsidered. In 1956, the *loi cadre* was developed, a further liberalization of the indigenous political powers of the African territories. The law increased the power of the territorial assemblies, which had previously been largely advisory, established executive councils in each territory, and implemented universal suffrage for Africans.[24] This liberalization, while progressive, was not revolutionary enough to keep up with the rapid development of the African political evolution. By the time the law became effective, the political scene in the territories realized the inefficiencies and disadvantages of the law to the further development of political autonomy for French Africa.[25] In Senegal, these reforms were received with hesitancy. The acquisition of a "semiautonomous" status and expansion of powers in the colonial administrations were beneficial to Senghor and BDS. Yet, Senghor's vision for the African future was constructed around a strong federation between the various territories, and with the *loi cadre's* advancement of power at the territorial level, and subsequent reduction of power at the federal level, any possibility of building a base for a interterritorial government post-independence was destroyed. Senghor went as far as to call the law a "regression" for African political development.[26]

Guinea, under the more radical leadership of Touré, was stronger in its denouncement of the law. In Touré's own words:

> The loi cadre, by dividing the federations into separately administered territories,
> by refusing even to consider a coordinating government among the territories,

---

[24] Milcent, "Senegal," 100.
[25] Cowan, "Guinea," 155.
[26] Milcent, "Senegal," 100.

sowed the seed in Africa of the breakup of the federations. And it was not by

chance that French West Africa was given eight autonomous governments instead

of a single one. It was part of a nefarious scheme to continue the metropolitan

control over underdeveloped but potentially rich territories. It was to perpetuate

colonialism in a less apparent but nonetheless efficient form, in the final analysis

to continue the exploitation of the men and riches of Africa, who were to be

rendered the more vulnerable by this "balkanization."[27]

For Touré, the *loi cadre* resulted in more French control of the territories, the opposite of

the liberalizing narrative the French administration was using to promote the law. As

well, for the Guineans, the law provided proof that Africans were ready to handle their

own future. If they could be entrusted with these limited powers by the French

administration, then they were capable of handling enough power to decide the political

future of their territory.

Côte D'Ivoire was isolated in its strong support of the *loi cadre*. Houphouët, after

the rehabilitation of his relationship with the French administration, maintained this

strong relationship through to independence. In fact, Houphouët, after establishing

enough control over Ivoirian administration, was able to leave the PDCI in control while

he drafted the *loi cadre* with the French administration in Paris as a minister-delegate to

the presidency.[28] His contribution to the law reflects his personal views on the future path

of political development in the colonies. In contrast to Senghor and his dreams of an

African federation, Houphouët envisioned a Franco-Africa Republic where each

---

[27] Cowan, "Guinea," 163-164.
[28] Mundt, "Cote D'Ivoire: Continuity and Change," 184.

component country would have complete internal autonomy while a French led (and Parisian-based) federal parliament and federal executive would maintain control of monetary policy, defense, and foreign relations. His goal in this was to maintain some semblance of French control and contribution to the territories while establishing economic independence for Côte D'Ivoire. At the time, the colonial organization of the territories was economically disadvantageous for Ivoirians, as the richer territory was financially supporting its less prosperous neighbors.[29] Thus the "balkanization" of the territories, which was inherently undesirable by other African territories, was an extremely desirable choice for the Ivoirians.[30] With these strong divisions between the two powerhouses within the RDA, Houphouët and Touré, RDA membership became divided on the future of French-African relations. One camp followed Touré, who supported a strong federal structure within Africa itself, with the power to establish independence for the colonies and create new relationships with France on a confederal basis. Meanwhile, Houphouët's supporters favored a stronger federal relationship between the metropole and the territories, where France would act as a member of the group of states, on an equal basis as Africans.[31]

As the Fourth Republic of France deteriorated, which was predominantly brought on by the outbreak of a large-scale rebellion in colonial Algeria, the emergence of the subsequent Fifth Republic led by General de Gaulle meant that the political relationship of France to its territories was again to be reformed. With the introduction of the Fifth Republic, the French government held a referendum within the colonies to decide

---

[29] Thompson, "Ivory Coast," 242.
[30] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 107.
[31] Cowan, "Guinea," 164.

whether or not they wanted to continue their relationship with France into this new epoch for the administration. For the colonies, the proposed changes included joining the French Community, a new organization for the French presence in their overseas territories.

Debate quickly broke out among the Africans on the unprecedented choice. Cote D'Ivoire under Houphouët was supportive of the Franco-African Community. As with the *loi cadre*, Houphouët had contributed to the process of drafting the new constitution and the framework for the Community, thus the changes of the relationship between the French to the territories included many aspects desired by Houphouët.[32] However, the Ivoirian leader failed to understand the political tide in the wider African territories; his strong hold and influence in Cote D'Ivoire had lulled him into a false sense of security.[33]

Senghor and Lamine Guèye in Senegal were skeptical of the new changes, but lacked the complete control over the territory to coordinate a "no" vote. The French were able to use their control of the hugely influential Muslim marabouts to push support for inclusion within the Community. This left Senghor to promote a lukewarm support of the appeal, in which he masterfully utilized double-talk: "Yes to African unity, yes to independence, yes to association with France!"[34] Senghor, unhappy with the threat of retaliation by the French and the lack of discussion over future possibilities at independence, was advocating for a "yes" vote with the understanding that the territory would soon be making a stronger push for independence, with the hopes that the break could be conciliatory.

---

[32] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 108.
[33] Thompson, "Ivory Coast," 243.
[34] Milcent, "Senegal," 137.

The Guineans under Touré resonated with the Senegalese desire to have a concrete assurance of future options for independence, the difference was that the PDG had enough power to influence the vote within the territory. Touré remained as opposed to the Community as he was to the implementation of the *loi cadre*. He argued that the Franco-African Community offered no genuine independence for its members, and in fact reaffirmed many of the weaknesses in the *loi cadre* rather than attempting to improve the weaknesses of the previous law.[35] Touré argued for a redrafting of the constitution to include provisions that respect the right of Africans to "seek the right to free self-determination, to administer themselves directly, and to manage their own affairs." For Touré, the most important consideration for the future was the implementation of increased sovereignty and enthusiastic consent by all interested parties in current and future agreements.[36] With these changes, Guinea would vote "yes."

However, de Gaulle was using this referendum to reestablish French control over the territory after years under the more lenient Mollet government. Member states had to agree to association under French terms or face consequences.[37] His response to the Guineans demands for modifications was stern, and intended for the wider African audience who were on the fence about the Community as much as it was intended for Touré:

France proposes this community; nobody is obliged to join it. You have talked of independence. I say here even more loudly than I have elsewhere that independence is up to Guinea…. There will, of course, be some consequences for

---

[35] Cowan, "Guinea," 163.
[36] Cowan, "Guinea," 166.
[37] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 199.

Guinea, but there will be no obstacles in the way. Your country can do what it

wants the way it wants to and follow any course it likes. If Guinea says "yes"—

that is, if it freely, spontaneously, of its own accord accepts the constitution—and

if France on its side says "yes," then the African territories and the Métropole can

work together for mutual profit.[38]

The Guineans were willing to take the risk. With an overwhelming vote of "no" for the

referendum, they became the only colony to reject the Community and embarked as the

first French West African independent state established in 1958.

Although Guinea was the only territory to voluntarily leave the umbrella of

French colonization, the Community was not to destined to be a long-lasting, cohesive

institution. The massive affirmative vote in the referendum by the other territories was

not tantamount to acceptance of the ideology behind the French Community, nor was it a

consensus on Houphouët's ideology present within the text.[39] Senghor quickly moved to

establish the foundations of his long-awaited African federation, recruiting leaders in

Soudan (modern-day Mali), Upper Volta (modern-day Burkina Faso), and Dahomey

(modern-day Benin) to work on creating a federational authority within the Community.[40]

The French, apprehensive about attempts to consolidate power that competed with their

authority, subverted the cohesion of this proposed federation. Thus the Mali Federation

was born with only Soudan and Senegal after the efforts at sabotage by the French were

successful in poaching Dahomey and Upper Volta away from federation.[41] Still, with the

---

[38] Cowan, "Guinea," 168.
[39] Thompson, "Ivory Coast," 243.
[40] Milcent, "Senegal," 104.
[41] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 137-138.

creation of the Mali Federation, Senghor, with the combined leadership of Keita in

Soudan, felt comfortable moving the incorporated territories towards independence. Just

two years after the creation of the Community in 1960, the Federation made known its

intent to exercise its right to independence while maintaining its status as a member of

the Community, which was accepted by the French authorities.[42]

  Houphouët recognizing that his control over the Community was not as strong as

he had initially thought, quickly readjusted his policies within the Community. Beginning

with critiques of the Community not publicly expressed before—commenting on the

politicization of Community institutions, slowness and insufficiencies of French aid, and

the retention of French authorities in the territory—Houphouët began developing his plan

to strike out from the newly founded association.[43] His plan developed into the radical

decision to declare independence while leaving the Community altogether. Houphouët,

illustrating his mastery of political maneuvering, was able to leave the Community while

retaining his strong relationship with the French—including French sponsorship of Côte

D'Ivoire's statehood at the UN, agreements for international aid, and the increase of

French subsidies and foreign investment in the newly declared state.[44] By the end of

1960, all of French West Africa had become independent, marking the beginning of

political development run by the Africans themselves.

---

[42] Milcent, "Senegal," 105.
[43] Thompson, "Ivory Coast," 244.
[44] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 108.

Chapter 3: Côte d'Ivoire

Political Development

As a newly emerging state, Côte d'Ivoire was the rising star of French West Africa. Near the end of the colonial period, Houphouët had successfully transformed his strong relationship with the metropole into massive economic benefits, leading the new state into a promising future: "To the visitor, the Ivory Coast is plainly the 'miracle state' of Africa. From the glittering new office towers of Abidjan, to the neatly laid out plantations and over-flowing markets of small upper-country towns, there is an air of prosperity pervading the country and forming a startling contrast with the run-down appearance of, say, Senegal or Ghana."[45] This economic bliss period, with its accompanying pacification of strong popular opinions, helped Houphouët quickly solidify his power over the territory under the new Constitution. The image of Côte d'Ivoire as an economic paradise included certain apathies of the public towards politics. While other French West African nations were grappling with a particularly opinionated and outspoken citizenry eager to impact its own administration in major ways for the first time, Côte d'Ivoire was marked by the absence of political comment from the populace.[46]

Most observers argue that Houphouët was able to completely consolidate all government responsibilities under himself by 1963.[47] The first constitution, which was

---

[45] Ibid., 96.

[46] Ibid., *Political Leadership,* 96.

[47] Manning, *Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa*, 185.

crafted with the express desire for a strong and stable government, contained a few key provisions for the establishment of political institutions in the country. The role of president was given a five-year term and elected by universal suffrage.[48] The president was not only the chief executive but also the head of state. And while he was responsible to a national assembly, a vote to overthrow the president also entailed the dissolution of the national assembly under that president, limiting the willingness of the assembly to take action if it would hurt their positions as well.[49] Power under this system rapidly came to rest in the hands of a small group of men, with the predominant share of power in Houphouët's own hands.[50]

After this initial period of change, the state settled into a comfortable one-party regime. Some have categorized the regime as benevolent authoritarianism—democracy *à l'Ivoirienne*—where the president retained all of the power, but still remained attuned to his constituents through various processes.[51] These processes included his *dialogues*, a series of mass meetings with different sections of Ivoirian society where he could meet with locals and listen to their thoughts as he created policy decisions, and the more traditional resources of persuasiveness, a firm grip on the party machinery, and the wealth of the state.[52] The description of Jean-François Médard is particularly apt in describing the regime of the economically advantaged Côte d'Ivoire:

> We certainly do not pretend that Côte d'Ivoire is a pluralist, liberal democracy on the Western model; moreover, it does not pretend to be that. The absence of

---

[48] Thompson, "Ivory Coast," 273.
[49] Ibid., 277.
[50] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 113-114.
[51] Mundt, "Côte d'Ivoire: Continuity and Change," 185.
[52] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 115.

judicially protected civil liberties, the state monopoly of the press, the absence of

institutionalized opposition and, until recently, of free elections, permits us to

speak of an authoritarian political regime. But that is true of the overwhelming

majority of political systems present and past. Yet, there are immense differences

among different authoritarian regimes…. The Ivoirian regimes achieves a strange

combination of authoritarianism and liberalism, of authority and benevolence, of

firmness and moderation: in short, it is a paternalistic regime.[53]

With the combination of economic prosperity and stable, benevolent rule, many Ivoirians

had no need to question or seek to change the political situation in their country.

One of Houphouët's biggest strengths was his ability to peacefully coopt and

absorb potential sources of opposition. His publicly expressed opinion towards the

establishment of an opposition party was that he was not opposed in principle, but it

needed to develop when it would be constructive, otherwise it was an unnecessary

luxury.[54] Personal diplomacy, wealth, party organization, and the time-honored use of

political posts and prestige were Houphouët's preferred method of subduing challengers;

only when these methods had failed would the PDCI move into harsher approaches

including jailing, expulsion, and forced retirement. Even after using force, it was a

temporary measure. Opponents who eventually repented would be given other offers of

collaboration and absorption into the party fold.[55]

This strong emphasis on cooptation led to the PDCI have an extremely wide base

of support throughout the country as Houphouët and other party members worked to

---

[53] Mundt, "Côte d'Ivoire: Continuity and Change," 186.
[54] Thompson, "Ivory Coast," 275.
[55] Ibid., 280.

integrate the various ethnic groups and regions into the party's ideology. The inclusion of ethnic integration is key, as it later becomes one of the largest issues in Ivoirian politics, yet under Houphouët's reign it was kept under control through his integration and cooptation methods. Article 7 of the constitution was founded during this time, which prohibited political parties to organize themselves under ethnic, regional, or religious affiliations. Additionally, any citizen born on the Ivoirian territory with one native Ivoirian parent had the right to run for presidential office. Ethnic and regional conflicts were subdued as Houphouët made sure that wealth was distributed equally throughout the territory, implementing state development projects in areas that didn't receive the economic cushion of the cocoa producing regions.

As the economics of the state weakened towards the end of the 1970s, failings of Houphouët's political system began to surface. The political apathy of the Ivoirian populace was heavily based on the economic stability of the state in two main ways. With economic prosperity, many Ivoirians adopted a passive acceptance of the regime based on the continuity of economic development. Additionally, the PDCI's control over the politics of the territory was based on a patronage system—with political appointments and state goods as the product—and without the same levels of state resources the patronage system was insufficient to pull in possible opposition. This method of cooptation and absorption is sometimes termed "*le compromis houphouétiste*": a system created by Houphouët-Boigny where, in the absence of democratic channels of expression, political demands and political conflicts were kept stable through the use of the PDCI's, and the Ivoirian state's, economic strength to meet demands, develop minority dominated regions, appease political enemies, and keep the public in a state of

apathy.[56] PDCI's integration of the diverse elements of Ivoirian society had built little sense of nationhood apart from their willingness to cooperation in order to take advantage of financial growth.

With his control and influence waning as a result of the economic recession, Houphouët was forced to readjust the political system. In 1980, the first liberalization of the Ivoirian political system was approved, with the opening of National Assembly elections to competition between nominees for the same position, though still within the single PDCI party. While a multiparty system had yet to be installed, voters now had choice in their representatives at the local and regional level. The result was stark; there was an 82% turnover rate with a strong base of support for newer, young candidates over old incumbents. Houphouët strategy had worked perfectly, he had given voters the illusion of having voiced their opinions at the ballot, and now had a new cabinet of young PDCI representatives who, rather than being a strong voice for the discontent of the masses, owed Houphouët for their new positions.[57]

A more concrete liberalization came with the 1991 elections, the first multiparty elections in the state. Houphouët-Boigny controlled the transition to give the PDCI the best advantage against the main opposition party, the Front Populaire Ivoirien (FPI) headed by Laurent Gbagbo. Building upon his coalition-building capabilities fostered in the years of single party rule, Houphouët-Boigny assembled various factions of the PDCI into a strong coalition of the north, center, and southeast, as well as adopting an simple-majority electoral system that allowed foreigners to vote. This built a support base for the

---

[56] Chrysantus Ayangafac, "The Politics of Post-Conflict Elections in Côte d'Ivoire," in *From Civil Strife to Peace Building*, ed. Hany Besada (Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2009), 39.
[57] Mundt, "Côte d'Ivoire: Continuity and Change," 188.

PDCI that was extremely broad and all-encompassing, while the opposition reactively branded itself as a narrowly-focused ethnic party for the Bété people, which resulted in an easy victory—86 percent—for Houphouët-Boigny and the PDCI.[58]

The opening of elections at this point was a smart move by Houphouët-Boigny, as the economy worsened, and the patronage system weakened, a transition towards democracy was necessary. The choice to open elections himself, rather than calling a National conference and a reexamination of the constitution as advocated by Laurent Gbagbo, allowed Houphouët-Boigny to control the liberalization to the advantage of the PDCI and resulted in a strong PDCI in the multiparty political climate and an isolated and divided opposition.[59]

However, there were naturally some difficulties in the first national multiparty elections. As opposition parties were only newly allowed, the certification process of national opposition parties was delayed in the lead-up to the election, meaning that the time for new parties to campaign limited. As well, opposition parties faced difficulties acquiring permits for headquarters, setting up the infrastructure for campaigning such as telephones and printing presses, and establishing support bases to counter the power of the long dominant PDCI.[60] The results of this liberalization was a further strengthened PDCI, the creation of a parliamentary opposition, and a new government post of Prime Minister, which Houphouët-Boigny awarded to Alassane Ouattara.[61]

---

[58] Chrysantus Ayangafac, "The Politics of Post-Conflict Elections," 40.
[59] Manning, *Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa*, 196.
[60] Mundt, "Côte d'Ivoire: Continuity and Change," 191.
[61] Ibid., 192.

The next national elections held in 1995 presented an entirely different political climate. With the death of Houphouët-Boigny in 1993, and a resulting splintering of the PDCI between supporters of one successor—Henri Konan Bédié, the president of the National Assembly—and Alassane Ouattara—the former prime minister—the PDCI was heavily weakened and the political climate took a darker turn. Bédié argued that the constitution clearly outlined himself as the rightful heir to the presidency. This was officially accurate; Article 11 of the constitution stated that in the event of a presidential death, the president of the National Assembly assumes the role of president until elections could be called. Ouattara advocated for the appointment of an interim president and the immediate planning of new elections. Bédié ultimately won the struggle and declared himself president.[62]

As the next elections approached in 1994, Bédié as the new head of the PDCI faced a much more difficult path to electoral domination when compared to Houphouët-Boigny's relatively easy transition. Ouattara, and even Gbagbo and his FPI party, provided much more threatening oppositional capabilities than in the previous years.[63] Bédié had also lost the support of the northern section of his coalition, which had allied themselves with fellow northerner Ouattara. This tension with the northern coalition was anticipated, even without the split between Bédié and Ouattara. Northerners were beginning to be dissatisfied with the rewards for their loyalty and had begun demanding more high-ranking positions and development programs, especially since northern support heavily aided PDCI dominance in the multiparty system.[64]

---

[62] Chrysantus Ayangafac, "The Politics of Post-Conflict Elections," 34.
[63] Mundt, "Côte d'Ivoire: Continuity and Change," 194.
[64] Chrysantus Ayangafac, "The Politics of Post-Conflict Elections," 40-41.

Whereas Houphouët-Boigny had relied on his broad coalition to result in electoral success, Bédié instead switched to a system of narrowing the political power of those who would not support the PDCI. Bédié introduced the concept of Ivoirité, that is, the idea that only those who had two Ivoirian parents could vote and run for election. This move purposefully disenfranchised most northerners from the electoral process, as many people who lived there, though they were born in Côte d'Ivoire, had parents who came from Burkina Faso, Guinea, or Mali. The influx of immigrants in Côte d'Ivoire had historically been encouraged under the Houphouët-Boigny regime, part of the reason that he was so popular among that sector of the Ivoirian public, as a means of providing labor for expanding markets throughout the country.

With a formal amendment to the electoral code in 1995, just before the elections, Bédié successfully hindered much of the northern coalition from voting and even excluded Ouattara from running for president under accusations that he had Burkinabe lineage.[65]

This election began a tradition of using xenophobic beliefs and the manipulation of nationality as a means of exerting control over the political process. Whereas Houphouët-Boigny had emphasized coalition building through the distribution of state resources to stifle ethnic or regional tensions—which as discussed above included tools such as regional development projects and expanded voting rights—Bédié, who lacked the economic means of subduing oppositional opinions, used ethnic tension and exclusion as a means of guaranteeing his victory in the election. This shift, along with the continued economic failures of the state and the instability of opening up elections, caused large

---

[65] Ibid., 41.

public demonstrations over political issues to become increasingly common throughout the 1990s. Especially after 1993, public demonstrations, barricades, meetings, and sit ins were met with higher resistance from the state, including political assassinations, the use of excessive force, and the use of ammunition against protesters.[66] This climate of violence in the political domain was worsened significantly throughout the period, which multiple analysts see as one of the original sources of the brutality of political change within the country.[67]

While this method of control was effective in the short term, as Bédié won the election after both Gbagbo and Ouattara called for their political support bases to boycott elections, his success in politics was soon ended by military coup. In 1999, growing political tensions, as well as issues with the army, led to Côte d'Ivoire's first military coup. Headed by General Robert Gueï, the military leader declared that the purpose of the coup was to clean up Ivoirian politics and organize new elections.[68] Gueï also initially announced his plan to transfer power back to a civilian government, but soon decided to run for the presidency himself.

In order to improve his opportunity to move from military to civilian leader of the state, he further cemented the legalization of Ivoirité in Ivoirian politics by implementing a new constitution that included Article 35, which again stated that a presidential candidate must be Ivoirian by birth, must have parents who are both Ivoirian by birth, and

---

[66] Francis Akindes, "La Côte d'Ivoire depuis 1993: la réinvention risquée d'une nation," in *Côte d'Ivoire: la réinvention de soi dans la violence*, ed. Francis Akinde (Dakar: CODESRIA, 2011), 15-6
[67] Claudine Vidal, "La brutalisation du champ politique ivoirien, 1990-2003," in *Frontières de la citoyenneté et violence politique en Côte d'Ivoire* (Dakar: CODESRIA, 2008), 170-171.
[68] Chrysantus Ayangafac, "The Politics of Post-Conflict Elections," 35.

must never have acquired another nationality.[69] The constitutional change was augmented by a controversial Supreme Court decision, which disqualified fourteen of the nineteen presidential candidates—including Ouattara on citizenship grounds and Bédié for not submitting a proper medical certificate—essentially leaving the presidential race a contest between Gbagbo and Gueï only.[70] While turnout was only 35 percent, due to election boycotts from disenfranchised voters of both the PDCI and RDR parties, Gbagbo won with around 60 percent of the vote. While Gueï attempted to disband the National Electoral Commission and declare himself the winner, demonstrations from FPI supporters and confrontation with the presidential guard forced Gueï to flee and allowed Gbagbo to successfully declare himself president.[71]

While Gbagbo initially showed signs of attempting a national reconciliation to recover from the events of the previous years, chiefly through organizing provincial elections and decentralizing state authority, his efforts were not effective after September 19, 2001, when a group of around eight hundred exiled soldiers called the Patriotic Movement of Côte d'Ivoire (MPCI) launched coordinated attacks on government and military facilities in an attempted coup.[72] This coup attempt led to a prolonged civil war between rebel forces in the north and the government forces in the south. As this section examines political developments, and not security concerns, the discussion around the

---

[69] Ibid., 35.
[70] Ibid., 35.
[71] Gilles Yabi and Andrew Goodwin, "From Linas-Marcoussis to the Ouagadougou Political Agreement," in *From Civil Strife to Peace Building*, ed. Hany Besada (Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2009), 17-18.
[72] Chrysantus Ayangafac, "The Politics of Post-Conflict Elections," 35.

conflict in the upcoming paragraphs will center on the political demands of the rebels and the developments of the conflict in the political domain.

The original intent of the rebel movement was exclusively the removal of Gbagbo from presidential office; therefore the original MPCI group relied on a potential quick military victory and did not have any plans for what would come after the unseating.[73] Once it became clear that the military standoff would become long and protracted, negotiation, especially with international actors, became a chief tactic for the military group as it attempted to prepare itself for a long, sustained stalemate. The first set of demands from the MPCI were clear: the resignation of Gbagbo; new national elections open for all Ivoirians; a review of the constitution, specifically related to citizenship, candidate eligibility, and land-ownership; reintegration of rebel forces into the national military; amnesty for the rebels; and an opening up of the political sphere to northerners.[74]

International actors mediating the conflict recognized most of the political demands by the rebels as valid, and thus stopped efforts by Gbagbo and the central government to solve the conflict through force and annihilation, but the MPCI faced heavy difficulty in moving forward their agenda when it came to the resignation of Gbagbo from office. Thus French and West African negotiators gave the MPCI leverage by justifying the rationalization of their political demands, and by protecting them from Gbagbo's potential military backlash, but stopped short of recognizing the MPCI as a

---

[73] Jennifer Hazen, *What Rebels Want* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2013) 144.
[74] Jennifer Hazen, *What Rebels Want*, 144.

legitimate political actor that could make political demands, as they were not a political

organization with a popular mandate.[75]

Gbagbo and the central government repeatedly illustrated their reluctance to

acknowledge the rebels as anything but a military threat; even after the MPCI agreed to a

cease-fire and attempted to move into the negotiation of a peace deal, Gbagbo failed to

send representatives multiple times to sign the cease-fire agreement and encouraged

ECOWAS negotiators to leave the country all while continuing to attack rebel

strongholds, showing his preference for a military solution.[76]

When peace talks were finally initiated, they were unproductive and inefficient.

Gbagbo, while agreeing to give the rebels amnesty and reintegrate rebel soldiers,

continued to send low-level delegates with no representative powers to the peace talks

and refused to consider new elections, which was supported by the ECOWAS mediators.

These first peace talks ended in failure, as the MPCI withdrew over fears of being

sidelined from any political considerations and preferred to continue the stalemate until

the playing field was changed.[77]

By 2003, the peace talks had finally produced a peace accord agreed upon by both

sides. The Linas-Marcoussis Accord (LMA) was drafted in Paris, and included the

following compromises: the creation of a reconciliation government with full executive

powers, land reform, the drafting of an electoral timetable culminating in the upcoming

2005 elections, the revision of presidential eligibility, and the reform of nationality

---

[75] Ibid., 149-150.
[76] Ibid., 153.
[77] Ibid., 156.

laws.[78] While both sides gained necessary concessions, Gbagbo was left unsatisfied by weakening of the presidency that would come from giving powers to the reconciliation government and to the new Prime Minister, and the Forces Nouvelles, the evolved grouping of rebel forces, remained suspicious that these changes would truly force Gbagbo to lessen his hold on power.[79] While the peace accord had been signed, both parties continued to block any successful implementation of the deal itself. Specifically for Gbagbo, who, after appointing a new Prime Minister, refused to allow the Forces Nouvelles to allocate people to any of the reconciliation posts, halting progress on movements past the stalemate that had existed since the initial coup attempt.

An updated version of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement was drafted in early 2005, reflecting the urgency of development on the peace process as Gbagbo's presidential term came to its end. The Pretoria Accords, like Linas-Marcoussis, attempted to touch on all of the issues surrounding the conflict, including the demobilization and disarmament of militias, the reinforcement of the Independent Electoral Commission, the participation of the United Nations in the electoral process, and by pushing a new session of the National Assembly to amend legislation on nationality and identification laws.[80] Yet the continued mistrust of both sides of the reliability of the other, as well as the continued preference for potential military action over a negotiated agreement, meant that the successful implementation of the Pretoria Accords was also delayed indefinitely. With the end of Gbagbo's presidential mandate in October 2005, the United Nations

---

[78] Yabi and Goodwin, "From Linas-Marcoussis," 19.
[79] Ibid., 19.
[80] Ibid., 20.

extended the mandate for another twelve months and called for movement forward on the implementation of the accords.

While the extended mandate only pushed back the expected elections for one year, it wasn't until two years later that a movement forward in the peace process was achieved. As both sides faced the reality that the now four-year stalemate was not advancing their interests by any means, as well as the growing regional and international fatigue and heightened risks of popular revolt as the conflict was further left unsolved, a new peace agreement was drafted. President Gbagbo announced in late 2006 his draft of a "made in Côte d'Ivoire" plan and an intention to hold direct dialogue with the rebels to negotiate an end to the stalemate and the reunification of the country, which would be facilitated by Blaise Compaoré of Burkina Faso and ECOWAS. The Ouagadougou Peace Accord, named after the location of its signing, contained many of the previous deals from past accords, but also established more concrete steps for the implementation of the agreement. It outlined three steps towards resolving the conflict: the issuance of birth certificates to those who were born in the country but had never been officially declared in the registries and a national campaign of identification to issue identity and voter cards to the eligible population; a restructuring of the Ivoirian defense and security forces; and the removal of the "zone of confidence" and the French and UN forces monitoring it to encourage the reunification of the country.[81] With the Ouagadougou Accord, the government received the promise of the return of governmental administration to the north, including financial administration and taxation, which would undermine the ability of the Forces Nouvelles to finance any future elongation of the stalemate. As well, the

---

[81] Ibid., 21.

Forces Nouvelles were granted the right to fill the role of Prime Minister, which ensured that they could have more power in the political process as the conflict came to an end.

Security Crises

This section will begin by analyzing some of the issues of military development that helped push the initial coup attempt and turned the conflict into the stagnated civil war it became. Second, it will analyze how security developments either pushed each side to the negotiating table or maintained the conflict even longer.

The initial coup attempt clearly illustrated the weakness of the governmental forces, (FANCI) and the strength of the rebel group (MPCI) in the beginning period of the war. Partially due to the element of surprise, the rebels were able to take control of multiple important territories within the north in their opening strike without much resistance from the Ivoirian military. Ivoirian armed forces appeared unwilling to challenge the rebel's coordinated attacks, and in certain cases FANCI forces, especially soldiers who were northerners themselves, defected to the rebels. In the weeks following the failed coup, recruitment for the MPCI rapidly increased their numbers to an even stronger base. The subsequent period of recruitment increased the MPCI forces to over five thousand, while FANCI forces, which had numbered at five thousand before the rebellion and the ensuing loss of soldiers, diminished in size.[82] This loss of soldiers augmented already existing weaknesses of the FANCI defense line; the government forces were poorly equipped, had insufficient arms, were not properly trained, and lacked

---

[82] Jennifer Hazen, *What Rebels Want*, 146.

much motivation to fight against the rebels. These weaknesses were intentional. Gbagbo had hesitated to fully invest government resources into the state militia over concerns about his ability to control them, and had rather invested in the gendarmes, who he trusted more.[83]

The MPCI, on the other hand, was well prepared for its strike, especially since its original intent was to take down Abidjan in order to control the entirety of the state's territory. The main sources of military equipment and soldiers for the MPCI as it organized the coup attempt were the Ivoirian military itself and Burkina Faso.[84] Military exiles from the north had been building up for years, beginning in the years of General Gueï's coup, there had been a systematic purging of the Ivoirian military by targeting northerners. This was in coordination with the political disenfranchisement also happening in the Gueï years. Two generals who were dismissed in this purge—General Palenfo and General Coulibaly—would become important actors in the insurgency movement.[85]

Gbagbo had continued this exclusion of northerners who had been a part of the military in his regime as well; those who were thought to be sympathetic to Gueï or Ouattara after the election results were either removed or demoted to make room for Gbagbo's political base.[86] Seven to eight hundred soldiers, many of whom were scheduled for demobilization by Gbagbo or had faced harassment due to their traditionally northern names, participated in the rebellion for the rebels.[87]

---

[83] Ibid., 143.
[84] Ibid., 144.
[85] Chrysantus Ayangafac, "The Politics of Post-Conflict Elections," 35.
[86] Yabi and Goodwin, "From Linas-Marcoussis," 18.
[87] Jennifer Hazen, *What Rebels Want*, 146.

These dismissed soldiers constituted a large part of the MPCI's original membership. Their status as ex-Ivoirian military meant that much of the arms and ammunition in the early days of the rebellion came from defectors who brought equipment with them, or through planned seizures of Ivoirian resources, armed robberies of military depots, and the seizure of military equipment when the coup attempt took place and territory was seized. After the opening attack, FANCI had an estimated 40 percent loss of its arms stocks to the rebels.[88]

Burkina Faso also provided a strong source of support to the rebels. Exiled soldiers from the Ivoirian military used Burkina Faso as a safe haven before their attempted coup with support from the Burkinabè president, Blaise Compaoré. Compaoré also gave the growing rebel faction arms and training, contributing to their stockpile in preparation for the first attack. Compaoré did not attempt to hide his involvement in hosting the aspiring insurgency; he had repeatedly warned Gbagbo of the danger of not addressing the growing threat or solving the issues causing military exiles to be in Burkina Faso in the first place. He even offered to return soldiers, some of whom had been tried and convicted in absentia, but only if Gbagbo agreed to give them amnesty and reinstate them in the military. After Gbagbo's refusal, Compaoré continued his support of the rebels as they grew into the MPCI.[89]

In the early morning of 19 September 2002, the rebels began their mutiny in a series of well-coordinated attacks on military installations in the economic capital, Abidjan, as well as bigger northern towns, Bouaké and Korhogo. While successful in

---

[88] Ibid., 145.
[89] Ibid., 144-145.

taking control of these northern hubs, they were unsuccessful in taking Abidjan, and

retreated to Bouaké, which would become the headquarters of the MPCI, later to become

the Forces Nouvelles.[90] By the end of September, the rebels had a solid hold on all of the

northern territory. The rebels were unable to take Abidjan not because of the strength of

government forces, but rather due to the significant presence of French forces in the city,

which protected both Abidjan and Yamoussoukro, the economic and political capitals of

the state.[91]

  While the rebels were advantageous in the beginning stages of the conflict at

taking northern territory and engaging with governmental forces, as the conflict began to

move into a longer lasting stalemate the benefit given to the rebels begun to fade. The

MPCI's original arrangement was created to provide the best chances at taking territory

quickly and effectively, which is strategically beneficial for a short-lived coup, but as the

conflict evolved into a full-fledged rebel movement in a drawn-out standoff, their

resources, organization, and military strength weakened. This, along with the central

government's need to reorganize and replenish after their losses, led to a mutual cease-

fire agreement in mid-October 2002. The cease-fire effectively split the country in half,

with French, and eventually United Nations, forces patrolling a central "zone of

confidence," separating Gbagbo forces in the South from rebel forces in the North.[92]

  While both sides agreed to the cease-fire, and showed hesitant interest in

negotiating a peace agreement, it was clear that the two preferred to wait for a military

solution rather than move forward realistically on a diplomatic one. As discussed in the

---

[90] Ibid., 142.
[91] Ibid., 143.
[92] Ibid., 143-144.

previous section, throughout the stalemate there were many peace agreements

negotiated—Linas-Marcoussis Agreement (2003), Kléber Accords (2003), Accra I

(2002), Accra II (2003), Accra III (2004), Pretoria I (2005), and Pretoria II (2005)—yet

all of the accords listed were not successful in bringing an end to the impasse.[93]

Conditions on the ground did not incentivize political settlements for either side. The

"zone of confidence," patrolled by international forces, lowered the risk of attack and the

cease-fire offered a respite from large-scale battle. Given that the core demands from

both sides were incompatible at this point, neither the government nor the rebels saw a

need to focus on the peace talks and rather continued to restructure and strengthen their

military capabilities as it appeared that the only through conflict would either side

achieve fully what it wanted.

While the stalemate persisted through to 2010, there were a variety of situations

that happened during this time that rapidly changed the equilibrium. One such event was

the emergence of two new rebel groups in western Côte d'Ivoire towards the end of 2002.

The Movement for Justice and Peace (MJP) and the Popular Movement of the Ivoirian

Great West (MPIGO), appeared similar to the MPCI in intent; both groups claimed the

dual goals of avenging the former Ivoirian president and General Robert Gueï by

deposing President Gbagbo.

While originally focused on stressing their differences from the MPCI, by early

2003 they had completely matched their political demands to that of the MPCI as well.[94]

There were some important distinctions for these two rebel groups, however. Most

---

[93] Ibid., 141.
[94] Ibid., 156-157

important were their ties to Liberia and President Taylor. While the MJP was able to retain most of its Ivoirian character, it was initially backed by the Liberian president. Its overall role was insignificant as it was absorbed into the MPCI by mid 2003.[95] The MPIGO was more overtly Liberian in character. Most of its forces were Liberian soldiers promised free reign of any loot, and the rebel group was openly supported by Taylor as an attempt to punish Gbagbo for his own assistance to Liberian rebels. Taylor's support also reflected his wish to help establish a new president that would be friendlier to his regime. As well, if the western rebellion were successful, Taylor would be able to divert international attention from his own conflicts in Liberia, provide his fighters he could not support with loot as a means of payment, and provide a buffer zone to prevent both the MPCI and the Ivoirian government forces from getting too close to his border.[96] Much like the MPJ, the MPIGO was proven ineffectual at keeping territory and was absorbed by the MPCI by the end of 2003.

While ineffectual at lasting in the conflict long-term, the two new rebel groups complicated the situation. The Ivoirian government had to face three fronts, rather than just one, and had illustrated its preference to negotiate with MPCI forces rather than the pro-Liberian western rebels.[97] Perhaps the most important consequence of the introduction of the new groups was the result of their absorption by the MPCI. After the folding in of new elements, the MPCI renamed itself Forces Nouvelles, and was forced to restructure its organization as well. The difficulties of introducing the MPJ and the MPIGO caused the Forces Nouvelles to establish an administrative system, create a more

---

[95] Ibid., 157.
[96] Ibid., 157-158.
[97] Ibid., 158.

united front against government forces, and implement La Centrale—a centralized financial and taxation system for the northern region.[98] La Centrale developed into a quite stable and lucrative income-generating mechanism for the Forces Nouvelles, which allowed them to strengthen their position in the stalemate as they had a ensured ability to continue financing their presence in the conflict, something sorely lacking after their initial coup attempt.

With the arrival of the Ouagadougou Peace Accords, the inefficiencies of previous peace negotiations were finally overcome and the stalemate was broken. While the political concerns addressed in the Ouagadougou Peace Accords are already discussed above, one of the most important changes militarily in this negotiation from previous ones is the dismantling of the zone of confidence. The agreement stipulated the use of joint brigades from both sides to replace the UN and French Security forces, and the replacement of the zone with a "green line" dotted with observation points.[99] Given that the zone of confidence had previously been utilized more as an assurance to both sides that they were protected in the short-term from the other, the actual undoing of the blockade encouraged both sides that peace was forthcoming, as they were now both at a higher risk of attack as the defensive barrier was taken down; it was a purposeful illustration of both side's willingness to become more vulnerable as a sign of good faith.

---

[98] Ibid., 164.
[99] Yabi and Goodwin, "From Linas-Marcoussis," 21-2.

Analysis

The Ivoirian conflict presents many potential aspects of the relationship between politics and security crises to explore. Within this analysis I will focus on three specific aspects of the conflict which illustrate an intriguing link between the two concepts. The first will be the Bédié's use of Ivoirité, followed by Gueï and Gbagbo, to exclude the north from the political process in order to strengthen their potential holds on power, and how this political exclusion was mirrored by exclusion in the military forces. The second aspect will be the stalemate of the conflict, and how the reaction of the international community to the political demands of the rebels, and the natural incongruency of these political demands with Gbagbo's presidency, affected the peace process. The last link to be discussed will be the use of the elections of 2010, and the necessary acceptance of both sides of the results of these elections, as a means of finalizing the end of the conflict.

One of Houphouët-Boigny's biggest strengths throughout his presidency was his use of a patronage system to maintain both a solid hold on all levers of power and ensure the continued peace and stability of the nation's population in order to implement his most valued goal for the Ivoirian state—economic growth. However, with the economic recessions of the later years of his presidency, his ability to use a patronage system to guarantee both his hold on power and the stability of the populace wavered. While he was able to successfully maneuver the system to continue the dominance of the PDCI up until his death, his successor, Bédié, was not as apt at the political game as his mentor.

Bédié was the first to resort to political exclusion to strengthen his position. The exclusion of those who had parents born outside Côte d'Ivoire from any electoral process,

including voting and running for election, was a targeted attack on the political

expression of the northern half of the country. Many northerners were children of

immigrants from other countries, predominantly Burkina Faso, Guinea, or Mali, who

Houphouët-Boigny had supported in coming to Cote d'Ivoire as a provision of cheap

labor to help expand the economy.[100] With their exclusion, Bédié had a much easier time

winning the election, as his biggest opposition, Ouattara, and Ouattara's main political

base were excluded from the vote. While both methods of controlling power were

undemocratic attempts to strengthen their personal hold on the levers of power, under

Houphouët's system his manipulations strengthened the appearance of internal stability

while Bédié's relied on increasing internal instability.

Gueï only further codified this exclusion by adding it to the constitution, and

Gbagbo was willing to use it to his advantage in the election of 2000. Every potential

presidential candidate, except Ouattara as a northerner himself, was willing to invoke

Ivoirité if it meant the presidential seat. While Gbagbo originally opposed the change and

boycotted elections in 1995, he refused to change the system of Ivoirité when it gave him

an advantage in the presidential race of 2000. Similarly, while Bédié was the first to

introduce Ivoirité into Ivoirian politics in 1994, in the post-coup elections it was himself,

along with Ouattara, who boycotted the election in response to Gueï's

constitutionalization of the concept.

What is intriguing about the political exclusion was the correlation with military

exclusion. Throughout the Bédié years, military personnel were discriminated against if

---

[100] United States Institute of Peace, *Creating a More Inclusive Peace in Côte d'Ivoire*, by Kelly Campbell and Adams Fusheini, (Washington D.C., 2006), 1.

they had stereotypically northern names. This makes logical sense for Bédié and his party; the military is one of the biggest threats to the central regime, and if that military is staffed with people you are excluding from the political process, the risk of those personnel in wanting to overthrow the government only increases. In order to react to the potential danger of disgruntled military members, it is logical to take away their ability to access the country's weapons and sources of military power. Gueï continued this military exclusion as well, purging the army of northerners after his coup, including the exile of military leaders who were to become MPCI leaders after they fled to Burkina Faso. Gbagbo, after gaining power, also continued this process. Seven to eight hundred of the soldiers in the initial MPCI uprising were soldiers who had been scheduled for demobilization by Gbagbo, and the new president had also taken resources from Ivoirian military forces, which he did not fully trust, and place them in his local gendarmerie and presidential guard.

While the logic is clear for the military exclusion of those the government was repressing, the very exclusion itself helped to develop the rebel movement into the force that was able to take and occupy the northern half of the country for eight years. As we have already discussed, the first years of the MPCI's existence was supported by dismissed service members and the weapons that they had gained during their time in the FANCI forces. Their dismissal from the army, an attempt to decrease their threat to the central government, only gave them more motivation to become the MPCI itself.

Another aspect of the security/politics links within the Côte d'Ivoire case study to be analyzed is the treatment of the political demands of the rebels, especially in the opening stages of the conflict. The MPCI's core demands included Gbagbo's resignation,

new national elections open to all Ivoirians, a review of the constitution, the reintegration

of rebel forces into the national military, amnesty for the rebels, and the opening up of the

political sphere to northerners.[101] These demands address the two major concerns of the

rebel forces: their political and military exclusion. Successful reintegration in these two

domains was their chief goal. Yet, international actors who were mediating the conflict

refused to give the MPCI recognition as a political entity that could make political

demands; as a military group only military demands could be made. International actors

also inhibited the MPCI from asking for any political changes in the initial negotiations,

which delayed any possibility of the peace process to create an effective peace accord, as

the core of the conflict was the incongruency of the political demands of either side, not

the military issues which were a reaction to the political exclusion. Attempts by the

MPCI to create a political network in Europe, Mali, and Burkina also failed.

Furthermore, while the international community was objecting to the ability of the

MPCI to make political demands, they did recognize the legitimacy of the demands

themselves, which hindered Gbagbo's ability to react to the rebels. Gbagbo was not

allowed to use military force to end the rebellion even after he recuperated from the

damage of the initial attacks. With the inability of the MPCI to change the conflict

through neither attacks nor political demands, and the inability of the presidential forces

to use violence and Gbagbo's refusal to accept any political demands from the MPCI, the

conflict naturally settled into the long stalemate that it became.

The last aspect of the security-political relationship in the Côte d'Ivoire case to be

discussed is the use of the elections of 2010 as a means of finalizing the end of the

---

[101] Jennifer Hazen, *What Rebels Want*, 144.

conflict. With over six negotiated peace agreements signed throughout the conflict, the arrival of the Ouagadougou Accord, and its four supplemental agreements, were not guarantors of a finite ending to the conflict. Two aspects of the agreement made it strong enough to survive the implementation period. The first has been discussed in the security section: the dismantling of the zone of confidence. With the continuation of the zone, both sides were supporting the potential of future conflict, necessitating the maintenance of the buffer between the zones to protect from possible attacks. With its dismantling, along with the concrete developments in the reintegration of the rebels within the armed forces, allowed for the security aspect of the conflict to make meaningful development of de-escalation.

The second factor within this de-escalation is a significant progression on the political stalemate between the two entities, which was one of the biggest factors inhibiting the implementation of peace. The Forces Nouvelles needed an assurance that the political processes within the country would develop into a lasting system that would not again move towards exclusion for northern voters. As well, given the illegitimacy of the elections that had placed Gbagbo in power, the rebels required an legitimate election in order to restore a sense of validity to the central government and the presidential office. Gbagbo main interest was his hold on power, and while the Ouagadougou Accord put him at risk of losing the presidency, he was confident in his ability to win another election, or at least manipulate the climate into an election that he could win. With the arrival of elections in 2010, the peace process was thrown into uncertainty; if either side refused to accept the outcome, then any lasting movement towards peace would not be made. Gbagbo's failure to delay the elections of 2010, along with his failure to rig them

for his victory, was the necessary catalyst to end the conflict.[102] Even as Gbagbo refused

to step down after the legitimate elections took place and Ouattara was declared the

winner, his position gave the international community, the rebels, and the police forces

the unity they needed to work together to arrest the former president and place Ouattara

as a leader that both the central government and the rebel forces could unite behind.

---

[102] Jennifer Hazen, *What Rebels Want*, 170.

Chapter 4: Guinea

Political Development

As Guinea became a new state, it faced many challenges due to its antagonistic break with France. While de Gaulle had confirmed that any country who voted against the Fifth Republic was free to opt out, the slighted French government and French administrators engaged in punitive actions as a result of the "no" vote. French administrators and technicians were given a period of ten months to transition out of the country, with instructions to train their Guinean replacements, yet the majority of the administration left as quickly as they could, even going so far as to destroy telephone instruments and plumbing facilities, and destroying or taking vital files and paperwork with them as they left.[103] Fortunately, due to its strength during the colonial period, the PDG was a well-organized and disciplined party whose members were capable of taking over a good number of the important functions of government—including tax collection and maintenance of order.[104]

Another key advantage for the blossoming Touré regime was the strong internal political unity achieved during independence. In order to vote "no" in the referendum, the party had been obligated to ensure that the public voted nearly unanimously against the French. With independence achieved, the public was ready to work in unity to start building up the new country as had been promised in the lead-up to the referendum

---

[103] Cowan, "Guinea," 171.
[104] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 200.

vote.[105] Through his own popularity within the country, and due to the short period of harmony gifted as part of the referendum vote, Touré was able to establish a regime that wasn't simply a government with a single party, it was a political system where the political party *was* the government. Touré himself described the role of the PDG as the only necessary political institution in the government: "The PDG has not hesitated to say that more than ever it will retain its supremacy over all other institutions in the country. Only through the party can we… raise ourselves to the level of great responsibilities." Touré went even further by declaring "The party, then, is the supreme organ, occupying a role that is higher than the government itself. Within its hands are concentrated political, technical, economic, and judicial powers…. The Guinean regime is not a single-party system; the regime is itself the party and no distinction can be made between the two."[106] At this point in the state's political structure, all other organs of government are subordinate to the PDG. The tasks of the cabinet and the legislature are to apply the decisions of the party, the only power they have is to figure out the details and execution of policy already created through the party congress.[107]

While the country had adopted a Western-style constitution shortly after independence, which implemented a system of checks and balances including the sharing of power between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, Touré quickly implemented the norm of party superiority over the branches of government and ultimate supremacy of the PDG over all aspects of political and civic life.[108] According to him, the

---

[105] Cowan, "Guinea," 177.
[106] Ibid., 177.
[107] Ibid., 207.
[108] 'Ladipo Adamolekun, *Sékou Touré's Guinea: An Experiment in Nation* Building (London: Methuen & Co, 1976), 12-13.

separation of powers "has no other result than to dispossess the people of its prerogatives by making superior to its interests, either those of the state, of the army, of justice or, in parliamentary democracy, of the parliament."[109] Even political influences that were outside of direct government control–such as youth, worker's and women's organizations—were placed under control of the PDG, with a single party-supported and controlled body for each organization type, and even mandatory participation in certain instances, such as the PDG youth organization.[110] The Touré regime implemented many rule changes that increased its control over civic life and civil society. These changes included the abolition of private schools, subordination of religious leaders to the party-state, elimination of independent press, party control of all cultural and sports activities, socialization of the economy, establishment of state farms and cooperatives, elimination of liberal professions, and the monopolization of all intellectual life by PDG ideology.[111]

Touré had various descriptions of his regime type. While not reluctant to use the term "dictatorship," he differentiated between democratic and undemocratic dictatorships. In his view, the PDG, while having complete control over the political, economic, and technical development of the state, represented the will of the people. According to Touré's definition, as long as PDG leadership truly embodies the wills of the people, all of the leadership's decisions are democratic. Touré argued that the fundamental principle upon which the party is organized is democratic centralism: "from top to bottom and bottom to top all decisions of whatever nature take into account the

---

[109] Ibid., 28.
[110] Ibid., 18.
[111] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea: An Assessment*, by Sheldon Gellar, Bob Groelsema, Mamadou Kanté, and Mary Reintsma. PN-ABY-651 (Washington, DC, 1994), 21-22, https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNABY651.pdf

will of the majority of members."[112] This idea of democratic centralism also entails the

election of leadership at all levels of party organization, mandated reports by all party

organs to the electors, and the obligatory acceptance of all decisions of higher party

organs lower in the hierarchy. While the party created methods of solving intraparty

disagreements or criticisms and established dialogues between the lower echelons and

elite members of the party, resolutions laid down by the party leadership must be

executed fully, even if lower members did not approve.[113]

With complete control over all political life, the PDG established four main

objectives: to maintain Sékou Touré in power; to establish control of the PDG under

Touré's direction over all facets of Guinean life; to enable the Guineans to determine

their own pattern of economic and cultural expression; and to develop the economy.[114]

Touré had a Fanon-esque vision for Guinean society, with a complete psychological

reconversion of the people that completely removed all of the colonial economic

structures designed to benefit only the Europeans. For Touré, this vision could only be

achieved with national unity and the full support of the masses, which led him to continue

to consolidate power. Only the total mobilization of the energies of the people under the

direction and guidance of the party could lead to his ideal liberalization of society.[115]

The realization of the goals of Touré's regime and the PDG quickly fell short of

anticipations. With control entirely in the hands of the PDG, meaning that control was

entirely in the hands of Touré himself, the capacity of a small number of people in

---

[112] Cowan, "Guinea," 179.
[113] Ibid., 179.
[114] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 199-200.
[115] Cowan, "Guinea," 188.

obstructing the nation's political, economic, and social development became clear.

National unity was hindered by the compulsory nature of party membership and the

party-controlled aspects of daily life. As well, the attempts of equality and fairness within

the party structures were undermined by the development of a party elite, which had a

much higher standard of living and social status than regular citizens.[116] This elite,

representing the party leadership, was corrupted by the promotion of political appointees

based on Touré's impression of a candidate's political fervor and opportunism, rather

than qualifications and skill.[117] Furthermore, the original "democratic centralism" aspects

of the PDG rule diminished over time, with the internal debates and discussions over

policy issues found within the early 1960s falling out of practice as power became

increasingly concentrated in the hands of Touré.[118]

As the country entered into the late 1960s, the Touré regime became increasingly

suspicious and repressive. Various real and alleged plots to overthrow the regime towards

the end of the 1960s, and an unsuccessful invasion from Portuguese Guinea in 1970 led

Touré, who had now centralized power almost entirely in his hands, to become

increasingly paranoid, and heightened his need to have complete control over the

population.[119] Power was further centralized under Touré and his most trusted associates,

which led to more corruption as family members and other associates took advantage of

the shift of the power of PDG from mass party to a small circle of political elites.[120] The

---

[116] 'Ladipo Adamolekun, *Sékou Touré's Guinea,* 25-26.

[117] Aguibou Yansané, "Guinea: The significance of the coup of April 1984 and economic issues," *World Development* 18 (September 1990): 1233.

[118] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea,* 21.

[119] Ibid.,, 20.

[120] Yansané, "Guinea: the significance of the coup of April 1984," 1233.

dictatorship became increasingly brutal, with some sources estimating that tens of thousands of Guineans were victims of political violence, thousands were jailed for oppositional beliefs, and over one million citizens fled the country, becoming exiles.[121] The repression and brutality of the Touré regime in the later years was only ended with his death in 1984 at the age of 62.[122]

With the instability that came with the death of Touré, military forces were able to successfully stage a coup and take power away from the PDG. Less than a month after Touré's death, a radio statement declared that the Guinean armed forces had taken power, suspended the constitution, and had dissolved both the PDG and the National Assembly.[123] The coup was headed by Lieutenant Colonel Lansana Conté, who became the head of state and chairman of the Military Committee for National Redress (CMRN), which became the new governing entity. The CMRN, who framed the takeover as a means of resolving the brutality and injustice of the Touré regime, which they cited as "brutal and callously inhuman," [124] declared that they would move towards democratic reform, and argued that the undemocratic coup would soon transition to a civilian regime.[125] The new regime was successful in eliminating many of the worst abuses of the Touré regime—freeing political prisoners, closing down the infamous Boiro concentration camp, restoring civil liberties—and liberalizing the economy in its initial years.[126]

---

[121] Brendan Fogarty, "Guinea's Golden Boy: Doré's Dangerous Balancing Act," *Harvard International Review* 32, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 22.
[122] Fogarty, "Guinea's Golden Boy," 22.
[123] Yansané, "Guinea: the significance of the coup of April 1984," 1231.
[124] Ibid., 1231.
[125] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea,* 24.
[126] Ibid., 4.

However, Conté soon argued against an early return to civilian rule, asserting that a deliberate approach to reforms would be more beneficial to the country.[127] Between 1984 and 1990, the CMRN remained the sole governing institution, during which there were no national or municipal elections, no political parties, no constitution, and no separated governing bodies. The CMRN, with Conté as its leader, consolidated power over the government and the military.[128]

In 1990, a federal constitution was finally created. The new constitution established a strong executive branch, allocating presidential powers that included determining and managing national policy, ensuring the execution of the law, naming ministers and all civilian employees, leading the military, and extensive pardoning power.[129] Furthermore, the constitution stipulated that the president would lead the provisional legislative body until an election for the National Assembly was held, elections which were delayed by Conté who could use his delegated powers to postpone elections during a transitional period.[130] The first national elections were held in 1993 for the presidency, which Conté was easily able to win amidst wide criticisms of possible fraud.[131] The 1993 election served as a means for which Conté could finally assert his legitimacy as a democratically elected national leader, rather than a leader resulting from the coup of 1984. He was again elected in 1998 and 2003, with his margin of victory increasing with each election.

---

[127] Yansané, "Guinea: the significance of the coup of April 1984," 1231.
[128] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea,* 24-25.
[129] Ibid., 58.
[130] Ibid., 58.
[131] Fogarty, "Guinea's Golden Boy," 23.

Even while he continued to use undemocratic means to ensure his uncontested hold on power, there were democratic evolutions within the years of Conté's regime. The 1990 constitution established provisions protecting the civil liberties and political rights of Guinean citizens, protected freedom of speech, religion, property rights, and religion, and prohibited discrimination based on race, gender, or religion. As well, the constitution provided safeguards against abuses of state forces and military on citizens.[132] Throughout the Conté years, Guinean civil society began to develop with the emergence of political parties, human rights associations, a free and independent press, and the proliferation of NGOs.[133] The free press in particular flourished in this time, as well as free speech for the opposition to speak out against the ruling administration, though this was lessened in the later years of the regime as Conté began to jail strong opponents and parties.[134] [135]

The end of the Conté regime came with his death in December of 2008. With the death of Conté, Guinea went through a similar process as with Touré's death, with military captain Moussa Dadis Camara announcing hours after the dictator's death that he had seized control of the capital through military coup. Left, again, with the uncertainty of succession, a military coup was a means of maintaining stability as Camara attempted to fill the power vacuum left behind with the death of President Conté. Ambitious and charismatic, he initially promised public reform and free and fair elections within two years as a means of building legitimacy. Camara also promised that he nor any member of his military coup would run for office.[136] Tensions were heightened as the possibility

---

[132] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea,* 57.
[133] Ibid., 63.
[134] Ibid., 90.
[135] Fogarty, "Guinea's Golden Boy," 22.
[136] Ibid., 23

of Camara running became stronger in the preparatory period for the transition into civil government. Responding to the tension, Camara asserted that "Any political leader who makes trouble by organizing strikes of protests or any other forms of mass mobilization will simply be removed from the list of candidates and will also be prosecuted."[137] The public continued to resist, forming a 50,000-person rally to speak out against the possibility of Camara running for office. The event turned deadly as forces from the Presidential Guard fired directly into the stadium crown, and hunted down those who ran into the streets.

The brutality of the attack ended Camara's political aspirations, as he was shot by an associate next month. By February 2010, the military junta formerly led by Camara announced its decision to hand over power to a provisional government, which would hold elections later in the year. General Konaté, who took over Camara's role as head of the military leadership, also declared the appointment of Jean-Marie Doré, an opposition leader, as prime minister of the provincial government, significantly decreasing the power of the military in establishing the new governmental system.[138] Elections were held later in the year, and Guinea's next president became Alpha Condé.

---

[137] Ibid., 23
[138] Ibid., 22.

Security Crises

As discussed in the previous section, Touré's initial philosophy towards governance was his self-titled "democratic" dictatorship, where the party had complete control over all aspects of government and civil life, but worked to implement the will of the people. For Touré's initial goals for Guinean society—a deconstruction of colonial institutions and restructuring of a new, completely independent and fulfilling social structure—absolute control was a necessity. However, for a variety of reasons, once complete centralization was achieved, Touré would quickly ignore the revolutionary foundations of his independence movement in order to instead foster a brutal, undemocratic dictatorship that would inflict much harm on Guinean society. Touré's regime itself became the main security threat to Guinean citizens in the initial decades of the country's existence.

His shift from charismatic independence leader to oppressive ruler is complex, but many authors believe that his brutality correlated with his paranoia of losing power. A series of events that came after the initial years of post-independence control proved to Touré that his regime was not invincible. A 1970 invasion by Guinean exiles, with support from the Portuguese navy and neighboring Guinea-Bissau, though unsuccessful, pushed the president's paranoia into a new domain. After the invasion, there were mass arrests and public hangings for those who Touré viewed as potential opponents, even those within the PDG. The paranoia became worse as the years progressed, especially after other leaders within the independence and nationalist movements in the region were toppled, such as through the coups overthrowing Nkrumah and Keïta in Ghana and Mali.

As his hold on power became more tenuous, Touré's obsession with using any means to remain in power only worsened.[139] The increasing hostility and vindictiveness of the Touré regime led to a mass migration of Guinean citizens to neighboring countries. Between 1 and 2 million Guineans fled from the country during this period. His paranoia also led him to shut down any potential sources of challenge to his hold on power. He readily arrested or killed alleged enemies, jailing tens of thousands of citizens in the infamous Boiro Camp prison, where many did not survive.[140] By 1977, only a small number of Touré's close political associates remained. Out of the 71 initial ministers and secretaries of state that he had appointed, nine had been shot or hanged, eight had died while in detention, eighteen were serving a life sentence for hard labor, twenty-one had served prison terms but had been freed, five had escaped abroad, and only eleven avoided any kind of punishment.[141]

With Touré's increased spiral into paranoia, the political development of the country further stagnated. The regime demanded total loyalty, encouraged spying, denounced anti-revolutionary or contradictory opinions, and was naturally suspicious of university graduates and intellectuals who had studied abroad.[142] Fear of retribution stifled any potential for oppositional opinions, free press, civil society, or any kind of contribution to the governance process by those who were not Touré or Touré's closest and most trusted associates. Touré also lost any hope for his initial dreams of a new future for Guinean society, as the climate of the country towards the end of his regime

[139] Yansané, "Guinea: the significance of the coup of April 1984," 1233.
[140] Cartwright, *Political Leadership in Africa,* 194-195.
[141] Ibid.,, 208.
[142] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea,* 22.

was that of "sullen indifference" for his revolution; apathy increased as citizens lived in fear, watching the disappearance of many, the growth of corruption, and the loss of any kind of mass support that was necessary for the changes Touré had initially promised.[143]

With the death of Sékou Touré in 1984, the future of the country became quite unstable, becoming a security crisis. Warnings were delivered about the potentiality of ethnic violence among the three main ethnic groups, as well as the risk inherent in the uncertainty of who was going to assume power and what the change would mean for the future of Guinean politics.[144] Soon after Touré's death, the uncertainty was resolved as a bloodless military coup took place. The unresolved issue of succession gave the military the opportunity to enact a significant regime change on the grounds of seeking to avoid civil war.[145] Guinea's armed forces announced by radio their ascension to power, declaring the suspension of the constitution, the country's political party, and the National Assembly.[146] The coup was enthusiastically accepted by the Guinean people.

The first challenge of the Conté regime was transitioning from military rule to a democratically elected government. Yet, the first elections were not held until 1990, six years after the death of Touré, and elections for the presidency were further delayed until 1993, where Conté became a democratically elected leader and president of the nation.

Conté's regime was marked by an interesting relationship between the military and the central government. In the beginning years of the regime, the military was seen as a beneficial presence in society, as it was the force that had liberated people from the

---

[143] Cartwright, *Political Leadership in Africa,* 208.
[144] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Guinea: Potential Sources of Conflict and Instability*. PN-ACN-619 (Washington, DC, 1998), 6, https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnacn619.pdf
[145] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea,* 23.
[146] Yansané, "Guinea: the significance of the coup of April 1984," 1231.

oppressive Touré regime. And the military, supervised by Conté, took steps to liberalize the country in response. Political prisoners were freed, the Boiro concentration camp was closed down, and basic civil liberties were restored.[147] A USAID report succinctly summarizes the view of the military by the public at this stage:

> First, the military carried out the coup that brought down the old regime. Second, the military claims that it was the force which brought democracy to Guinea. Third, it claims to be the guarantor of political stability and national unity. Fourth, the military receives many national honors. A special day was set aside to celebrate the 36th anniversary of the army. President Conté owes his position as national leader to the military which chose him to lead the country after the coup and which agreed to gradually power to a civilian regime. As an interest group, the military has traditionally been well taken care of in terms of national budgetary allocations.[148]

The military was seen as the savior of stability and peace. However, there was also an ingrained fear of authority, as evidenced through interviews of Guinean citizens, who cited a fear of the authorities and crossing government officials and their collaborators as a big motivation for their interactions with any authority—whether it be military, governmental, or other.[149]

Another key insight into the civilian-military relationship found within Guinea during these years is found when analyzing the security situation surrounding the country. Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea-Bissau, all neighbors of Guinea, were all

---

[147] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea,* 24.
[148] Ibid., 78.
[149] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Guinea: Potential Sources of Conflict*, 21.

undergoing violent, anarchic conflicts during this time. Interviews with Guinean citizens in the late 1990's indicates that the people of Guinea strongly preferred to maintain a peaceful and stable environment even if that meant development objectives were pursued at a slower pace.[150] The presence of war-torn refugees, with Guinea having more refugees than any other African country in the mid to late 1990's further cemented the necessity for Guineans to continue pushing for stability and peace, as Guineans knew there was no easy path out of the country if flight were to become necessary.[151]

As well, the Guinean military provided a substantial number of troops to assist in quelling the violence occurring just past the borders—an estimated 50 percent of Guinea's army during this time period was occupied with either maintaining the security of the borders or assigned to the ECOMOG mission operating in Sierra Leone.[152] The importance of the military in protecting the country from the chaos abroad, as well as its necessity in maintaining stability internally, naturally led to widely supported policies that continued to keep the military happy—including large budget allocations, celebrations, and more leeway in their interactions with other members of society.

Yet, by leaving military power unchecked, it often served as a force of injustice in Guinean society. Oversight of military forces became a key issue of the Conté regime. As a former general throughout the Touré regime, Conté remained the only active general and, as president, determined all of the nation's military policy. Nothing concerning the military, or the military budget, would be delegated to the National Assembly.[153]

---

[150] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Guinea: Potential Sources of Conflict*, 5.
[151] Ibid., 24-26.
[152] Ibid., 12.
[153] Ibid., 11.

Furthermore, the public, conveyed frustration over continued corruption of police and military forces, especially in terms of arbitrary detention and torture, unexplained disappearances, bribery, and collaboration with bandits.[154]

While the 1993 elections formally switched the Conté regime from military leadership to a democratically elected governance, the use of undemocratic processes to limit the feasibility of opposition influencing governmental activities leaves the Conté regime as a long-standing, military backed authoritarian regime, albeit less oppressive than his predecessor, but still lacking in many opportunities for liberalization.[155]

The death of Conté brought another crisis extremely similar to that of Touré's death. An unclear line of succession meant the Guinea was thrown into uncertainty, especially since it was clear that the potential future president could amass most power for himself, using the last two long-lasting regimes as an example. A few hours after the death of Conté, a group of army officers, led by Captain Camara, took power in another bloodless coup, much like the one that brought the Conté regime to power. Once again, Guineans welcomed the arrival of the new source of power and were hopeful about future opportunities for growth. Camara, again much like Conté, suspended the Constitution and governmental institutions. He also took it a step further by promising free and transparent elections in the next year with a guarantee that the country's candidates for that election would not come from the military coup members.[156] It initially appeared that Camara was

---

[154] Ibid., 35.
[155] Ibid., 20.
[156] Amnesty International, *Guinea: "You Did Not Want the Military, So Now We Are Going to Teach You a Lesson:" The Events of 28 September 2009 and Their Aftermath* (AI Index: AFR 29/001/2010), February 2010, 8.

using the security crisis stemming from the lack of successor to take power and advance necessary democratic reforms.

However, a crisis soon returned as Camara began to exhibit clues that he would be running in the next election cycle, leading to unrest among the civilian population. This dissatisfaction led the planning of major demonstration in Conakry Stadium on the 28th of September in 2009 to oppose the possibility of Camara running for office, and soon became the scene of a massacre. On the eve of the demonstration, the Minister of the Interior announced that all future demonstrations would be banned, with no reason given for the decision.[157]

The resulting reaction from Guinean security forces as the 50,000-member rally continued as planned was brutal. Witnesses first describe police officers blocking entries and exits to and from the stadium, followed by the launching of tear gas grenades and guns fired into the air.[158] Soon after, guns were fired directly into the stadium, people were bayonetted as they attempted to flee, and many women were raped, both in the street or whilst kidnapped houses. In only a few hours, more than 150 people were killed by ammunition or bladed weapons, over 40 women were raped in public or in private houses, more than 1500 people were wounded, with many others missing. Additionally, many demonstrators were arrested and arbitrarily detained, many of them undergoing torture. Witnesses recounted seeing attackers wearing the "red berets" of the Presidential Guard, as well as other militiamen in civilian clothing committing other acts of violence.

---

[157] Amnesty International, *Guinea: "You Did Not Want the Military,"* 9.
[158] Ibid., 10.

[159] Witness statements provide a disturbing illustration of the violence and chaos of the events:

> We were surprised to see the 'red berets' appear in closed ranks. They opened fire on the crowd in every direction. It was like a war film; I have never seen anything like it in all my life. Someone told me to hide and so I hid underneath the seats. I heard bullets whistling by.[160]

> Blue shirted soldiers [belonging to the gendarmerie] threw tear gas grenades into the crowd. Immediately afterwards, the 'red berets' opened fire on the crowd and people fell to the ground. People trampled the dead bodies underfoot in order to escape. As I was running, there was a boy in front of me who had been stabbed in the neck with a dagger. The blood spurted out, it was like seeing a cockerel that has had its throat cut, running loose. The boy, who was wearing a white shirt, was screaming as he lay on the ground with his arms and legs convulsing. Meanwhile, the 'red berets' fired into the crowd, aiming at the head and chest. I heard one of the 'red berets' say: 'Open the gate, let's get the bastards out of here'. People rushed towards the gate but a 'red beret' grabbed a girl who was running away and knocked her over, she struggled while he tried to undress her. Two other 'red berets' came to help him, held her down and hit her with their black truncheons. Another one undressed and raped her.[161]

---

[159] Ibid., 5.
[160] Ibid., 10.
[161] Ibid., 11.

The disastrous events of September 28th led to an end of the potential Camara regime. While it is clear the military leader was attempting to continue the trend, begun by Conté, of establishing a long-reigning, undemocratically uncontested presidency after a bloodless coup, the events at Conakry Stadium ended any possibility for that future. With heavy international outrage and pressure, fractures within the military leadership worsened. In December, Lieutenant Abubakar Toumba Diakité, attempted to assassinate Camara by shooting him point blank in the head. Evidence supports the theory that Diakité tried to kill Camara due to fears that the blame for the massacre would be put on him.[162] Regardless of the intent, the result of the attempted assassination was the closure of Camara's involvement in Guinean politics, as he was moved to Morocco for treatment and did not return back to the country afterwards.

The events of September 28th highlight a continuance of the issues of civil-military relations found throughout the Conté regime. The line between military/special operations forces and local policing has been blurred throughout the years within Guinean society, with the repeated deployment of military units alongside police and gendarmerie against peaceful, unarmed citizens, resulting in most cases in unlawful killings, excessive force, and arbitrary detainment.[163] Evidence collected after the attack indicate that in the months after the death of Conté, recruitment policies for the gendarmerie were lightened, and in order to rapidly expand the available gendarmerie forces entrance tests were disposed of and training was lessened in order to more quickly deliver more forces.[164] The military followed suit, with Camara and the CNDD

---

[162] Fogarty, "Guinea's Golden Boy," 23.
[163] Amnesty International, *Guinea: "You Did Not Want the Military,"* 24.
[164] Ibid., 32.

reintegrating soldiers "under observation," as well as previous soldiers who had been dismissed for "alcoholism, desertion, banditry, drugs and undesirability."[165] While these decisions were made at the beginning of the Camara coup, they were certainly present during Conté regime as well. Government officials have acknowledged that under Lansana Conté "the rules governing recruitment into the armed forces were not respected," and that "the decision-making process is corrupted."[166] This emphasis on rapid, irregular recruitment with inadequate training and no detailed regulations of security forces, especially in a society that puts them in high esteem, leaves a lot of potential for the problems with harassment of civilian populations by security forces that we have seen throughout Guinea's development.

Analysis

A key issue of Guinean security present throughout all years of this analysis is the oversight of military and police forces. This issue of oversight can be attributed to many variables, and some of them are politically based. These political causes for the lack of strong supervision can be separated into two categories: Guinean's fear of limiting military and police forces' ability to maintain internal stability and the role of military-led regimes in failing to effectively implement oversight of the security sector.

The first section focusing on Guinean's personal beliefs surrounding sources of authority has been alluded to in previous discussion. Throughout the years under Touré's

---

[165] Ibid., 33.
[166] Ibid., 37.

rule, he himself became a strong source of political instability within the country. Touré's intolerance, vindictiveness, and paranoia resulted in an internal climate of fear and uncertainty, which led to the mass migration of Guinean's to neighboring countries. After his death, this climate of political instability lessened internally as Conté controlled power through much less oppressive means, yet the regional climate further cemented Guinean's preference for stability without development over progress with instability. Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea-Bissau became clear illustrations of anarchical conflict with the complete collapse of the existing political system, contributing to the Guinean people's desire to maintain a peaceful environment to ensure continued stability, leaving development objectives as a lower priority to the main goal of maintaining cohesion.

The military and police forces played a large role in Guinean's views of ensuring the continued implementation of this cohesion. Interviews undertaken while under the Conté presidency illustrate the popular view that the military is the best guarantor of stability, and their preference that public policies continue to keep the military happy and ready to defend the unity of the country.[167]

As the public remained hesitant to control the force of stability for the county, government incentives to oversee the military were never fully developed either. Under Touré's presidency, the role of police and military forces was to act as another hand of the president's authority. Conté, while he modestly attempted to establish some civilian oversight of military forces, remained the country's only active general and exclusively determined military policy.[168] Given his role as a general before the coup of 1984, and

---

[167] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea,* 70.
[168] U.S. Agency for International Development, *Guinea: Potential Sources of Conflict*, 11.

given that he owed his position as presidency in part to the support of military forces of his leadership, his impartiality in controlling this sector of society was suspect. Predictably, evidence of the continued deregulation of security forces persisted throughout the Conté years. Under his presidency, the rules governing recruitment into the armed forces were rarely respected.

As well, Conté continued the policy of the Touré presidency of using military and police forces interchangeably, most notably through using elite military forces in policing and public order roles. Guinea has repeatedly seen the deployment of elite military forces against peaceful, unarmed civilians, many of these forces never having received training in proper use of lethal force. Additionally, police and gendarmerie forces, given the lack of strong distinction between them and more lethal forces, have also visibly committed unlawful killings and used excessive and arbitrary force against unarmed Guinean citizens.[169]

This deregulation of military and police forces continued more aggressively after the coup of 2008. Immediately upon taking power, Camara recruited hundreds of new gendarmerie units without any entrance test, a requirement under the Conté years, and shifted their training period to be much more rapid.[170] Camara also integrated back into active rotation military forces that had been previously dismissed for reasons of alcoholism, desertion, banditry, drugs, and undesirability.[171] Even further, military units previously trained to defend the Guinean border against armed incursions from Liberia

---

[169] Amnesty International, *Guinea: "You Did Not Want the Military,"* 24.
[170] Ibid., 32.
[171] Ibid., 32.

and Sierra Leone were moved into a new role overseeing large public demonstrations by citizens.

Another issue of the security-politics relationship throughout Guinea's existence as a state has been the role of military coups in both hindering political evolution while, in a sense, progressing it. The first successful military coup in 1984 was a finite end to the Touré regime and the potential of the PDG to place another president in power and continue governing with little to no change from the previous administration. In this sense, the military coup was a means of progress for the Guinean state. It allowed the Conté regime to begin which, while it used undemocratic means to maintain its hold on power, was a big liberalization from the previous twenty-six years. Under the Conté administration, Guinean civil society developed, including the presence of political parties, opposition, NGOs, elections, freedom of press, and the ability to publicly show dissent.

The Camara military coup of 2008 had a similar role in Guinean society. With the successful coup, Conté's associates could not appoint another president who could continue to dominate politics similarly to the twenty-four years under Conté. With the coup, an end of that period of Guinean politics also resulted. While Camara did not directly liberalize the political scene within Guinea, the change in regime allowed Guineans to begin demanding things that they had previously not demanded under the previous administration—most predominantly the demand for free and fair elections with candidates that were separate from the military body that had originally taken power. And even though Camara fought, quite violently, against these demands, it was his excessive use of force that ended his presidential run and forced the military coup leaders to appoint

a non-related opposition leader as the head of the provincial government, which led to the elections of 2010 where a non-military president was finally elected.

However, this use of military coups as a means of liberalization was most likely a side effect, or at least not the main purpose, of the coups initial intent. Both coups, with Conté being successful and Camara being unsuccessful, were attempts to set up long-lasting, inherently undemocratic regimes. While Conté had opened up Guinean political life to include opposition, free speech, and civil society, he did not open it up so much that any of these new aspects of political life in Guinea could pose a direct threat to him in upcoming elections. And Camara, while initially advocating for a separation between military coup associates and the transition to civilian governance, decided to use the opportunity to attempt a similar shift as Conté had done. It had become a cycle of military coups with small political liberalizations with each new regime, but overall a lack of effective political change as each administration only changed what was palatable to its hold on power.

Chapter 5: Senegal

Political Development

Senegal has had a significantly different political development process than the other two countries presented in this analysis. While a single-party regime in the opening years of the country's existence, the amount of control that Senghor and the UPS were able to exert over Senegalese society was much lower. While Senghor did have a lot of political currency at the nation's conception— "Senghor…is *the* great Senegalese leader. He is political power in Senegal. Moreover, he is the secretary-general of the 'dominant' party, the UPS. Nothing can be done in Senegal against his open opposition. One can even imagine that with the support of the masses (which he has acquired completely) Senghor imposes his point of view on the other branches of the government"[172]—there were more limits imposed on his authority than the other dominant rulers in our comparative African states. Senegalese society itself imposed many of these limits. Five major problems at independence—a dry land vulnerable to droughts, huge gaps between urban and rural sectors, a reliance on a single major export crop (peanuts), the existence of hugely influential wealthy religious leaders, and the continued presence of French influence over government and society—had a large role in limiting Senghor's ability to take risks in the political domain.[173] As well, the ruling party, UPS, had less cohesion than other nationalist parties of the era. The UPS was more of an all-inclusive coalition of

---

[172] Milcent, "Senegal," 119.
[173] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 127.

political forces, rather than a strong party capable of mobilizing the masses in pursuit of national development goals.[174] Since Senghor focused on bringing different political opinions under the overarching fold of the UPS, and not on indoctrinating the various factions of the party into his specific ideology, the UPS acted more as a federation of political movements rather than a proper, unified party.[175]

Additionally, the nation's first constitution did not set up a presidential regime, but rather a parliamentary system with a bicephalous executive. The inaugural constitution defined the position of President under a seven-year term, with the delineated roles of the office including being the chief of the army, presiding over cabinet meetings, and, with approval, appointing upper civil servants and army officers. The president circulates the law, and can send a proposed law back to the National Assembly, but must accede if the Assembly retains its point of view.[176] The prime minister, who is designated by the president, has more extensive powers, including determining the nation's policy, directing the actions of government, assuring the execution of the law, national defense, and the direction of the administration and armed forces. The National Assembly, whose members are elected for five-year terms by direct universal suffrage, has the power to vote in laws and the budget, as well as ratifying treaties and international agreements.[177]

Naturally, the implementation of this constitutional organization differed slightly from its description. Senghor retained a decent amount of political power due to his leadership of the UPS party, which was the only party in the National Assembly, as well

---

[174] Edward J. Shumacher, *Politics, Bureaucracy and Rural Development in Senegal* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 20.
[175] Milcent, "Senegal," 124.
[176] Ibid., 118.
[177] Ibid., 119.

as his appointment of someone who was an ally, Mamadou Dia, to the role of Prime Minister. Dia was quite apt at retaining powers in his position as Prime Minister, which in the constitutional description is quite the important role, by reserving for himself key ministerial posts in important sectors for financial, economic, and administrative services. Senghor entrusted his associate with the day-to-day responsibilities of state administration, while he concentrated his own attentions on the relationship between Senegal and metropolitan France as well as on interterritorial politics within newly independent West Africa.[178]

The National Assembly, while given immense power through the constitution, did not wield that power effectively in these foundational years. Comprised of solely UPS members, the ability of representatives to control the political agenda and push back against party lines was limited. Interestingly, since the Assembly representatives were elected in large electoral districts (rather than a single national list) they did retain a focus on representing their own regional focuses in the National Assembly, since smaller regions had a lot of power in deciding who represented them. This meant that individual representatives were more likely to push back on the government's decisions that were harmful to their region.[179]

Another key difference in the Senegalese regime was the absence of a de jure single-party status, though a de facto one-party system was established. Senghor, a master of brokerage style politics, a crucial skill in the Senegalese political domain, had

---

[178] Shumacher, *Politics, Bureaucracy and Rural Development*, 61.
[179] Milcent, "Senegal," 120.

absorbed or co-opted all serious opposition under the umbrella of the UPS party.[180] The

UPS did not attempt to control the totality of the nation's life, unlike Touré's PDG.

Youth and labor movements were allowed to grow independently of the party, militant

and extreme views were debated within the party congress, and perhaps most

importantly, the party did not give direct orders to the government; representatives of the

government, while still all members of the UPS, were more independent in their

governmental roles.[181]

In terms of opposition, however, a de facto one-party regime was created through

the UPS' use of persuasive and coercive strategies to ensure the absence of feasible

organized opposition to the UPS' control over government institutions.[182] The major

opposition party, PRA-Senegal, faced heavy discrimination in the first decade of the

state's existence. The party's freedom of maneuver was greatly restricted, the

government censored all media that published pro-PRA material, and it was nearly

impossible for the party to hold public meetings. Additionally, several members of PRA-

Senegal's leadership were arrested in 1961.[183] This limiting of the opposition's access to

the public, as well as harassment from the state, established the de facto single-party

system even though the presence of opposition parties was legal.

In 1962, a crisis brought on by the split between Prime Minister Dia and President

Senghor led the major changes in the balance between the political institutions found

within the inaugural constitution. The break between the two allies was brought on by

---

[180] Richard Vengroff and Lucy Creevy, "Senegal: The Evolution of a Quasi Democracy," in Political Reform in Francophone Africa, ed. John F. Clark (Colorado: Westview Press, 1997), 206.
[181] Milcent, "Senegal," 133.
[182] Schumacher, *Politics, Bureaucracy and Rural Development*, 20.
[183] Milcent, "Senegal," 125.

supporters of President Senghor voicing their suspicions of Prime Minister Dia's

expansion of power within his governmental role, which they saw as leading to a

potential coup. At the end of 1962, the relationship between the two, and their respective

supporters, had grown increasingly strained, and ended with the arrest of Prime Minister

Dia for his political oversteps.[184]

 In the following year, the constitutional system was altered to address the

problems of the bicephalous executive that were proven unworkable. The new

constitution of 1963 instituted a much stronger presidential system, with the abolition of

the role of Prime Minister and the investment of all executive power into the hands of the

President. The increased powers of the president included the following: the elaboration

and implementation of all national policy; many increases in law-making and executive

rule-making authority; and new powers in policy initiation, formulation, and

implementation.[185] Furthermore, the electoral process was changed to create a single,

nation-wide winner-take-all system based on a party list, strengthening the one-party

structure already established within the country.[186] The regime had moved a large amount

of governmental responsibilities and roles into the executive branch, which was now

solely occupied with the role of the President, and weakened the role of the already

uninfluential National Assembly.

 The first major liberalization of the one-party system came in 1974, when the

Senegalese government passed a series of regulations that weakened the limits on

registering political parties. This reform came about after a series of protests from both

---

[184] Schumacher, *Politics, Bureaucracy and Rural Development*, 65-67.
[185] Ibid., 70.
[186] Vengroff and Creevy, "Senegal: The Evolution of a Quasi Democracy," 206.

urban centers, predominantly student groups, and rural sectors, predominantly peasant farmers, forced the UPS to adapt and reform the electoral system.[187] Senghor himself even acknowledge the overcentralization of power, announcing in an official statement that the constitution of 1963 had "too often provided all agents of the State with an easy pretext to unload their responsibilities onto the president of the Republic."[188] These first amendments reestablished a government headed by a prime minister, though the restoration stopped short of creating another bicephalous executive. The aim was to deconcentrate presidential power, increase the responsibility and authority of cabinet ministers, and upgrade the role of the National Assembly.[189]

In 1976, a more concrete liberalization of the system was passed with the establishment of a de jure three-party political arrangement. The UPS was given the preferred "social democratic" slot; the urban-oriented coalition led by Abdoulaye Wade received the more conservative "liberal democratic" slot; and the more extreme, previously banned Marxist party, the PAI, was given the "Marxist-Leninist" slot. This change, while a move towards democracy, was still labeled "democracy on a leash," as the three slots were defined to make the UPS the preferred party with voters, as well as decrease the opportunity for opposition to create a coalition that might oust the dominant party.[190]

Even with the establishment of codified opposition (though disadvantaged), the UPS was able to stay in power for another twenty years. Senghor decided to step down in

---

[187] Ibid., 206.
[188] Schumacher, *Politics, Bureaucracy and Rural Development*, 81.
[189] Ibid., 82.
[190] Cartwright, *Political Leadership*, 144.

1981, handing over the reins to Abdou Diouf, who was his Prime Minister at the time. The resignation was seen as a politically advantageous move for the PS, as the law of the country allowed Diouf to stay in the role of president until the next election cycle in 1983, giving him two years to benefit from his unelected position to build up his support base and create a legitimate argument for his long-term presence in the presidential office when the time for elections came around.[191] Diouf's term in power was highlighted by the decision to end the restrictive policy on opposition parties, opening up the party landscape. However, the Diouf regime continued to further restrict election regulations, while abolishing the presidential term limits that Senghor has implemented in the liberalizations of the 1970s. [192]

In 2000, a major shift in Senegalese politics arrived with the election of Abdoulaye Wade of the PDS party to the presidency, the first peaceful handover of the presidency from one party to another in all of Africa.[193] This *alternance* was initially lauded by the international community as the mark of true democratic progress for the state, yet it soon became apparent that this progress was easily derailed. Wade, rather than building on progress of the previous decades of political liberalization and democratic institutional progress, reversed course by draining institutions of their substance and stripping the other branches of government of their powers, making them impotent.[194] Many of his actions after taking office have been implemented with the

---

[191] Mamadou Diouf, "L'échec du Modèle Démocratique du Sénégal, 1981-1993," *Africa Spectrum* 29, no. 1 (1994): 47, accessed November 23, 2017, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40174511.
[192] Penda Mbow, "Senegal: The Return of Personalism," *Journal of Democracy* 19, no. 1 (2008): 156.
[193] Catherine Lena Kelly, "Senegal: What Will Turnover Bring," *Journal of Democracy* 23, no. 3 (2012): 121.
[194] Mbow, "Senegal: The Return of Personalism," 159.

intent of helping himself stay in power, at the cost of many of the functional aspects of the democracy.

One of the key issues of the Wade regime was the weakness of opposition. After the *alternance*, the PS became the major opposition party. Its influence was quickly decimated by defections, with key party membership joining the PDS in order to maintain their access to state resources. After Diouf ended the limit on the number of opposition parties, a jump in diversity was seen. Yet, by 2000 this had become a weakness of the Senegalese political regime, with many parties acting as "telephone-booth" parties—tiny organizations with few members that haphazardly participate in elections. [195] Wade was able to take advantage of this system, offering opposition parties incentives to join the majority coalition which inhibited the motivation for opposition to actually oppose the actions of the majority party.[196]

Security Crises

For Senegal, the main security crises throughout the country's development has been centered in the Casamance region, where rebels have maintained efforts at secession for decades. Yet, internationally the conflict has not gained much attention, and domestically the conflict has had little effect on the political development of Dakar-based politics. The conflict began at the end of 1982, when demonstrators in Ziguinchor publicly demanded independence, attacked the Senegalese flag, and chanted slogans

---

[195] Kelly, "Senegal: What Will Turnover Bring," 124.
[196] Ibid., 125.

against the central government.[197] The Senegalese government quickly reacted with political oppression and military intervention, including the arrest and sentencing of the movements leaders for threatening national integrity.[198] This initially small uprising has turned into a long, protracted confrontation between the Senegalese state and the MFDC (Movement of Democratic Forces of Casamance), which has continued, though at times seemingly resolved, until the present day.

The reasons for independence are varied depending on which source, and which lens—economic, political, historical, etc.—is taken. It can be argued that the issue of independence for the *Casamançais* began with the arrival of the Portuguese and has continued in some form into the formation of the Senegalese state. Father Diamacoune, a leader within the movement, has presented this argument, declaring that Casamance has fought for 348 years for its independence, against the Portuguese, the French, and the Senegalese, and is only continuing a fight which began pre-imperialist intervention. In his view, the *Casamançais* have been in active conflict for 306 of those years, and in passive conflict for 42 of them, including in the colonial and post-colonial periods.[199]

For leaders like Father Diamacoune, the Casamance region is distinct from the rest of Senegal. With a different climate, different fauna and flora, and different majority ethnic group, there are many visible differences which can form the base of a separatist movement. The Jola[200], a predominantly catholic ethnic group is quite separated from

---

[197] Amnesty International, *Senegal: Climate of Terror in Casamance* (AI index: AFR 49/01/98), March 1998, 3.

[198] Amnesty International, *Senegal: Climate of Terror,* 3.

[199] Vincent Caupin, "Une trêve en pointillés," *Croissance* November 1993, 30.

[200] Jola is the predominant spelling used in English sources. Most French sources use the spelling Diola.

their Wolof-speaking, Muslim neighbors who dominate the social and political spheres of society.

Another large problem is the physical separation of the region from the rest of the country. As illustrated by the image below (Figure 1), Casamance is located underneath the Gambia, which can impede efforts to easily access the region. Transportation between Dakar and Casamance is limited to three options: a boat from Dakar to Ziguinchor, a route through the Gambia which can be difficult due to issues of crossing international borders, or even delays due to blockages in crossing the Gambian river, or going around the Gambia, which can add a large amount to the travel time between the two entities. Transportation is not always feasible between the two as well, there have been issues with the maritime route, which is the most efficient method of travel, after naval accidents, causing the region to fluctuate in its accessibility.

Figure 1: Casamance Region of Senegal[201]

---

[201] "Casamance: Thirteen dead in attack in restive Senegalese region," *BBC News*, 6 January 2018.

Another argument for the causes of the conflict focuses, rather than distinctness of Casamance from the rest of the country, on the access of the *Casamançais* to the resources of the state. The Senegalese state has been accused of restricting access of Jolas to important posts and responsibilities, taking land that has been traditionally Jola owned, attempting to penetrate local society, and forcing the loss of Jola identity.[202] Perhaps most importantly, many accusations center on the failure of Senegal to invest and develop the region, with many economic incentives and programs focusing solely on Dakar and the areas surrounding the capital city.[203] Economic programs initiated in the region tend to monopolize the agricultural market, lower the prices for crops, and interfered negatively in rural production, all things which would negatively affect the villagers who rely on agricultural means to support themselves.[204]

In 1998, a meeting between one of the MFDC's leaders, Father Diamacoune, and the Senegalese First Lady, Elizabeth Diouf, represented a symbolic attempt to illustrate dialogue between the secessionist movement. The conversation that followed illuminates clearly the narrative of each side:

> ED - "Mister l'abbé, I know that you just celebrated your birthday on the 4th of April. I wish you a happy birthday. But the 4th of April, it is also the day of Senegal's national holiday. You are thus the most Senegalese of the Casamançais."

---

[202] Pyt Douma, "Poverty, relative deprivation and political exclusion as drivers of violent conflict in Sub Saharan Africa," *Journal on Science and World Affairs* 2, no. 2 (2006): 64.

[203] Ferdinand de Jong and Geneviève Gasser, "Contested Casamance: Introduction," *Canadian Journal of African Studies/La Revue canadienne des études africaines* 39, no. 2 (2013): 213.

[204] Ferdinand de Jong and Geneviève Gasser, "Contested Casamance," 224.

FD - "I thank you, Madame President. But here, we have a problem, it is the Senegalese army."

ED - "You must take action in favor of peace."

FD - "It is not me, Madame President, who asked for the war. It is you and your army who impose it on us."

ED - "You are a man of the church, a man of peace, you must fight for peace. I consider you a friend. The army isn't here except to protect the population."

FD - "It is the contrary: the rebels do nothing except defend themselves. You must, before anything else, give the order to your army to retreat from Casamance."[205]

Throughout this conversation one can see how the opposing sides construct their own perspective on the conflict. For the First Lady, she begins by asserting the "senegality" of Father Diamacoune, and then transitions into her assertion on wanting peace, if only the rebels would stop resisting. For Father Diamacoune, who doesn't directly respond to his supposed senegality, his narrative surrounds the image of Senegal's army intruding on an otherwise calm state. For him, the future potential of peace between the two entities is the removal of the Senegalese military presence in the region. Interestingly, the issue of the actual separation of the Casamance region is not discussed, potentially due to the irreconcilability of both sides to the view of the other.

After the initial confrontations between the Senegalese state and the rebels took place in 1982 and 1983, which led to the deaths of over one hundred people, the

---

[205] Christian Castéran, "La guerre cachée de Casamance," *Jeune Afrique Économie* May 1998, 127-128.

Senegalese state attempted to take a more ambiguous, less confrontational stance on the region in order to lessen the ability of the MFDC rebels to recruit new soldiers. However, while the government attempted more diplomatic means of solving the conflict—such as hiring young *Casamançais* to work in local bureaucracy and setting up a committee of wise men to discuss underlying causes—there were also continued efforts to punish rebel movements, including increased repression and the monitoring of suspected supporters of the MFDC and key members of the Jola community.[206]

The effect of the conflict on the general population of Casamance has been extremely large. Civilians face insecurity from both sides, dealing with abuses from the rebels themselves as well as the Senegalese army. Interviews with refugees in neighboring Guinea-Bissau reveal a complicated view of both rebel movements and the Senegalese army. One refugee details experiences with the army coming into their village and demanding knowledge of hidden rebels. When no one responded, the army resorted to shooting randomly, killing women and children, and causing the rest of the village to flee.[207] Another refugee describes hostility towards the rebels themselves, who many refugees see as an instigator of the violence that forced them to leave their homes.[208]

A comprehensive report by Amnesty International supports these views. Interviews conducted for this report relay many abuses on both sides. Amnesty has condemned the Senegalese army for their mistreatment of civilians, use of torture, unexplained disappearances, and ignorance of judicial rights. Also included in the report is abuses from the MFDC, including deliberate and arbitrary killings, especially of those

---

[206] Pyt Douma, "Poverty, relative deprivation," 65.
[207] Géraldine Faes, "La guerre s'installe," *Jeune Afrique* no. 1680, 25.
[208] Géraldine Faes, "La guerre s'installe," 26.

who were suspected of helping the Senegalese army, and the rebel group's harassment of civilians, which includes the use of beatings, arson, and murder to get civilians to relinquish food, money, and even new recruits.[209]

While the Amnesty report condemns both sides of the conflict for their abuses towards civilian populations, the report especially condemns the Senegalese army itself, by arguing that "these massive violations of human rights cannot be explained away as 'regrettable errors,' since the Senegalese army is unanimously seen as a well-structured and well-disciplined army.... Senegal itself proudly claims to have republican security forces that obey the orders of the political authorities."[210]

The conflict has also seen a large variation in the level of violence and military confrontation throughout the years. In the beginning years of the conflict, the capability difference between the army and the rebels was striking. Descriptions of the MFDC at its conception portrays a group of men traveling on foot in simple jeans and T-shirts, most often illiterate, using old worn-down guns. Compared to the well-armed Senegalese army, with access to armored vehicles, helicopters, and airplanes and forces that vastly outnumbered the rebels, the MFDC was not an existential threat in any capacity.[211]

Yet, after years of confrontation predominantly marked by violent public demonstrations and governmental suppression, the MFDC launched a more armed-based struggle in 1990 with increased attacks on military targets and civilians who were suspected of collaboration with Senegalese authorities.[212] This shift also came with a

---

[209] Amnesty International, *Senegal: Climate of Terror,* 38.
[210] Ibid.,, 2.
[211] Christian Castéran, "La guerre cachée de Casamance," 128-129.
[212] Amnesty International, *Senegal: Climate of Terror,* 3.

surge in weapons capabilities for the MFDC, which gained access to heavy weapons and rocket launchers.[213] It is commonly assumed that the MFDC acquired these weapons through the neighboring Guinea-Bissau, which after ten years of independence conflict had become an demonstrated arsenal for weapons. Given the presence of predominantly Russian and Cuban arms within the arsenal of the MFDC, it is safe to assume that the weapons were bought through Guinea-Bissau, though through private operators, not through the Bissau-Guinean state.[214] In 1997 the first mine appeared in the conflict, after an attack by the MFDC killed ten civilians and wounded thirty-five. Mines became a useful tool for the outnumbered MFDC; after the first mine attack in November 1997, there had already been dozens of deaths and more than 150 wounded by mines attacks by May of 1998.[215]

Throughout the conflict there have also been many attempts at peace, but certain aspects make stable peace difficult to achieve. One of the biggest causes is the difficulty in discerning who is the leadership in the MFDC, and how much control selected leadership has over the rebel troops. Multiple ceasefires agreements have been negotiated through Father Diamacoune, a leader of the separatist movement, but scattered rebel groups often are not notified of the updated engagement status or choose to ignore the leadership of Diamacoune. During the Diouf presidency, a close friend of the president revealed the struggle of negotiation, even when it was the will of the central government to work through the conflict through dialogues: "Talk to the rebels? But we have asked only for that. The problem is that we do not know with whom to negotiate. They are

---

[213] Christian Castéran, "La guerre cachée de Casamance," 128.
[214] Géraldine Faes, "La guerre s'installe," 25.
[215] Christian Castéran, "La guerre cachée de Casamance," 127.

everywhere, and they are nowhere."[216] Another source alludes to Diamacoune's tenuous

hold on the other rebels, asserting that after he was placed on house arrest in the initial

years of the conflict he lost both his credibility and his influence over the other resistance

fighters.[217]

And while Dakar, the international community, and rebel leaders may agree upon

certain ceasefire or de-escalation arrangements, controlling rebel groups, and in some

cases the Senegalese army, can be complicated in the region. Rebels know the land and

climate, can live with local populations, and find refuge in the forest whenever necessary.

With no structure to the wandering rebel bands, even if certain rebel factions support

negotiations towards peace, there remains the possibility of those who disagree

continuing to move the conflict forward.

An especially adept illustration of this issue is shown through a peace treaty

signed by both parties in 2004, when Father Diamacoune, then Secretary-General of the

MFDC, and Mister Ngom, Senegalese Minister of Home Affairs, signed an accord in the

center of Ziguinchor. While hailed as a historic moment for peace, and thus extensively

covered by the Senegalese national media, the peace treaty was not a comprehensive end

to the conflict. The event was a political victory for President Wade, but not presented as

"his" peace treaty, as he did not attend the signing nor arrive to the event until after the

signing was over. This illustrated his desire to convey a clear message that the treaty was

signed between a Minister of Home Affairs and an insurgency leader, not between two

heads of states.[218] As well, Father Diamacoune's authority over all of the rebels was

---

[216] Christian Castéran, "La guerre cachée de Casamance," 129.
[217] Samba Moussa, "Sénégal. Introuvable paix," *Jeune Afrique Économie,* 20 November 1995, 14.
[218] Ferdinand de Jong and Geneviève Gasser, "Contested Casamance," 214.

uncertain. Multiple factions within the MFDC refused to recognize him as Secretary-General, and they followed in refusing to recognize the peace agreement.[219] Attacks and conflict have continued past this event, with soldiers dying in clashes with rebels in 2010[220], 2011[221], 2013[222], and even into the current year, 2018.[223]

Analysis

Senegal presents a completely different case than the other two previously discussed within this text. With both Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea, the major security crises mirror the political development of the country. However, with Senegal, security crises and political development appear to be almost entirely separate. Casamance, though it has been a long-running secessionist conflict within Senegal's borders, has not had a major effect on the political development of the central government.

A key difference between Senegal and the other two case studies presented above is the process of political development itself. In Guinea, the political climate of the country post-independence has been long period of stagnation or even regression followed by a burst of instability and moderate political change. Touré's regime was a regressive political development period, followed by a burst of instability with the Conté coup of 1984. The burst was followed with further stagnation until 1990 when elections were first held, yet the democratic process remained uncompetitive and Conté's power

---

[219] Ibid.," 215.
[220] "Senegal soldiers die in clash with Casamance rebels," *BBC News*, 27 December 2010.
[221] "Casamance 'MFDC rebels' kill Senegal soldiers," *BBC News*, 21 December 2011.
[222] "Four killed in Senegal's Casamance region," *BBC News*, 2 February 2013.
[223] "Casamance: Thirteen dead in attack in restive Senegalese region," *BBC News*, 6 January 2018.

was virtually unchecked throughout the rest of his presidency. 2008 became the next eruption of uncertainty with Conté's death and the subsequent military coup of Captain Camara, who committed a massacre against his own people in his attempt to solidify his hold on power. This massacre led to meaningful political development with the handover of power from military leaders to civilian-led provisional government. Each political progression is a direct consequence of a security crisis; without any kind of threat, there is little to no political development throughout the country's existence up until 2010.

Côte d'Ivoire has a similar relationship. While early political developments within the country were instituted under the leadership of Houphouët-Boigny in reaction to the economic recession lessening his hold on total power, such as the opening of the country to elections, later developments, most importantly the end of the political exclusion of the north, developed in response to the use of violence to catalyze the change.

In Senegal, political change has not been a result of security crises. In fact, governmental reactions to public protests has been a much bigger explanatory factor to progression in the governmental institutions of the country. The opening up of the single-party system came in 1974, after the Senegalese government reacted to protests from students in urban centers and farmers in rural centers demanding change. Senghor stepped down from power through his own volition in 1981, and did so at a time where his successor could advantageously take advantage of the election cycle to build up a foundation for his presidency before he had to face the uncertainty of the vote. This led to a stable Diouf presidency until 2000, when the governmental systems allowed a peaceful transfer of power into the Wade presidency and the shift from the dominance of the PS to

the PDS. These evolutions were the outcomes of either public demand or the initiative of the politicians themselves, there were not security elements to catalyze the changes.

If one takes the lens of public protest as a threat of future violence, then protest as a means of political change through security concerns can be considered. However, public protest is still not entirely a threat to the state unless certain evolutions take place within the protest movement that intensify its potential for instability, which varies based on the amount of the population that protests, the ability of the movement to endure over time, and its potential to control the authority of the central government through force.

As well, certain aspects of the conflict have affected its ability to push for change at the national level. As previously discussed, Casamance is a particularly isolated region within Senegal. The existence of Gambia, a sovereign state, in the center of the country and the added difficulties of getting to Casamance without crossing Gambia due to issues of infrastructure means that issues plaguing the region seem especially disconnected from the rest of the country. This issue is heightened by the fact that the secessionist movement is often strongly associated with the Jola ethnicity, which only constitutes around 5 percent of the population.[224] Considering the dominance of the Wolof ethnic group, combined with the fact that other ethnic groups within Senegal feel no strong allegiance to the *Casamançais* movement, there isn't much geographic or cultural strength to the conflict's ability to influence other entities within the state.

As well, in the initial period of the conflict, the military capabilities of the secessionist movement were insignificant compared to that of the Senegalese army. Previous discussions have highlighted the state of the rebels at the conflict's

---

[224] "The World Factbook: Africa – Senegal," *CIA*, 2018.

conception—barefoot men in t-shirts with old, worn-down guns—who posed no threat to the well-armed central military and illustrated no potential to move the conflict out of the region to threaten other areas of the country. Even as the rebel groups have evolved in their weapons capabilities, they have kept the violence to the Casamance region, centering attacks on visiting tourists, Senegalese soldiers, or other citizens of the Casamance region.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Throughout this discussion, it has been clearly illustrated that, unsurprisingly, the relationship between security crises and political progression is clear, and quite complicated, in each case study. Whereas Côte d'Ivoire has one of the strongest links between the two concepts, and Senegal has a less strong link in terms of the effect of the security threat on governmental politics, what is common among the case studies is that these predominantly internal security threats are political in nature, and the intended outcome of those who wield violence or the threat of violence is to change a political outcome.

Looking back on Barry Buzan's definition of state sociopolitical cohesiveness, many of the security threats discussed throughout the paper have fallen into his delineated list of concerns related to sociopolitical strength. Recall that ordinary weak states generally contain a governing power that is strong enough to override the domestic environment with more primordial loyalties among the populace. Given that the citizens of the state recognize the local loyalties more strongly than their national identity, the central government tends to use military power and authority as a means to strengthen a sociopolitical consensus on statehood.[225] Because of this strong emphasis on power and authority, and less focus on the consent of the people in supporting an idea of nationhood, challengers who want control of the state target weaknesses of government power in their struggle for power. Security crises will this relate to this targeting, resulting in the

---

[225] Barry Buzan, "People, States, and Fear," 19.

common events of sociopolitical struggle in weak states: military coups, guerilla movements, secessionist movements, mass uprisings, and political factionalism.[226] All of these events target the government's ability to maintain sociopolitical cohesion, either by attacking the government's ability to wield power (military coups), or the local population's willingness to let the government control the notion of statehood (guerrilla movements, secessionist movements, mass uprisings).

Each state within this analysis has witnessed an attempt at breaking down the government's ability to maintain this sociopolitical cohesiveness. Côte d'Ivoire has experienced a military coup that developed into a long-running internal conflict between rebels and the central government. Guinea faced two military coups. Senegal has lived through decades of secessionist conflict.

As well, each state witnessed the government's reaction to these threats, which became as much a security crisis for the population as the original threat itself. Citizens of Côte d'Ivoire lived through the eight-year conflict, facing insecurity from the violence between the government and rebels, as well as potential violence from Liberian funded rebel groups coming in from the west. Guineans experienced mass oppression during the Touré regime as he acted on his fears of losing his authority over the population. They also faced the large public massacre as a result of Camara's attempts to break down the public protests, a threat to his use of power to uphold his government. Senegalese citizens, particularly those who live in Casamance, face violence from both the rebels of the secessionist movement and reactive violence from the Senegalese army, an issue that

---

[226] Ibid., 24.

warranted a scathing report from Amnesty International on the abuse of military and rebel personnel towards the inhabitants of the region.

From this theoretical lens, an analysis can be made surrounding the political intents of the security threats as well. Côte d'Ivoire's attempted military coup was an attempt by the MPCI to take control of the central authority of the state so that they could reinstate the ability of the north to participate in politics. When they were unsuccessful at taking control of the major cities of the southern region of the country, the conflict settled into a stalemate as each side waited for either a military means of achieving their political goals, or an acceptable diplomatic resolution. As well, it can be argued that the concept of *Ivoirité* and the resulting exclusion of the north was developed because Bédié and subsequent political leaders did not have enough sociopolitical strength to maintain their hold on power. The exclusion was a means of reinforcing a tenuous hold on authority by the government.

Guinea's military coups were often explained by the coup throwers as a reaction to the poor governance of the previous administration; they were a reaction to the previous administration's abuse of its authority to maintain its hold on power. These abuses were prevalent partially to compensate for the weaker hold on sociopolitical cohesion of the Guinean government. Senegal's secessionist movement developed when a local minority within the country decided that the government, and the state of Senegal, did not represent their national identity, and thus did not have the right to administer them.

As well these security crises have interesting relationships to overall political development; Côte d'Ivoire's eight-year conflict led to a more democratic political

process without northern exclusion and Guinea's military coups resulted in slight liberalizations in the new administrations and were an impetus for political change. Meanwhile, Senegal's Casamance conflict has not had a large enough impact to affect government institutions in Dakar. When an ordinary weak state faces a threat to the government's ability to promote a certain idea of statehood—whether it be military coup, secessionist conflict, or other—once the conflict has been resolved, the government's previous method of sociopolitical cohesion cannot be maintained.

Côte d'Ivoire's government first used patronage, then the idea of *Ivoirité*, to help the government maintain control over the entire country. Once the conflict had ended, the state could not return to patronage nor *Ivoirité* to maintain a new idea of statehood, as those had already proven too weak to impose unity in the absence of a strong national identity. As a result, the state implemented new elections, with the political participation of the northern half of the country, to establish a new government system that was strong enough to impose unity on the entire state.

Guinea had a similar experience. First the government used extreme oppression, then undemocratic processes and a strong respect for military forces, to help maintain the central government's hold on the entire territory. Each military coup broke down the levers of power that the previous administration had used, and with each military coup Guinean citizens grew bolder in what they were willing to demand from the government. As such, Conté could not use extreme repression to maintain control, and Camara could not use illegitimate electoral processes to continue his leadership of the country. After Camara responded to this shift in authority with violence, which decreased the government's ability to control the population, a shift to a fair and more legitimate

election was necessary to give the government a consensus once again that it could decide what statehood meant.

Senegal presents in intriguingly unique situation in comparison. The government never lost its ability to control the idea of statehood; it is a stronger state in comparison to the other two case studies, potentially falling into the middle ground category outlined by Buzan. While the secessionist movement has tried to dislodge the government's authority in the southern region, it has been unsuccessful in both that objective, and in enacting any change in the central government's institutions. As a stronger state, the government of Senegal relies less on the use of authority and power to maintain Senegal's statehood, and relies more heavily on the consensus of Senegalese citizens with the government on the idea of statehood. This, combined with the secessionist movements inability to threaten the central government's hold on power, results in a secessionist conflict that has not resulted in large evolutions for the government itself.

Thus we reach an interesting conclusion. When a state lies on the lower end of the spectrum of sociopolitical cohesion, making it a weaker state, large security threats result in a shift of government institutions. These shifts are usually democratic in nature, as the government needs to either increase its power to control the population, which is weakened after facing a large threat, or attempt to become a stronger state. To become a stronger state, the government must foster a stronger consensus between citizens and the government on what the state *is*. This can be achieved by increasing political participation, holding elections, and giving citizens a bigger role in their own administration—all factors of political development as defined within this analysis. Once a state becomes stronger on the sociopolitical spectrum, internal threats lessen their

ability to attack the weakness of the country as a state, and security concerns began to

rely more heavily on external threats, the traditional view of security. While violence and

politics are inherently intertwined topics, they need not be as strong as some cases

explored within this analysis.

Bibliography

Adamolekun, 'Ladipo. *Sékou Touré's Guinea: An Experiement in nation Building*. London: Methuen & Co., 1976.

Akindes, Francis. "La Côte d'Ivoire depuis 1993: la réinvention risquée d'une nation." In *Côte d'Ivoire: la réinvention de soi dans la violence*, edited by Francis Akindes, 3-38. Dakar: CODESRIA, 2011.

Amnesty International, *Guinea: "You Did Not Want the Military, So Now We Are Going to Teach You a Lesson:" The Events of September 2009 and Their Aftermath* (AI Index: AFR 29/001/2010), February 2010.

Amnesty International, *Senegal: Climate of Terror in Casamance* (AI index: AFR 49/01/98), March 1998.

Ayangafac, Chrysantus. "The Politics of Post-Conflict Elections in Côte d'Ivoire." In *From Civil Strife to Peace Building*, edited by Hany Besada, 33-51. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2009.

Azar, Edward and Chung-in Moon. *National Security in the Third World: The Management of Internal and External Threats*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1998.

Buzan, Barry. "People, States, and Fear: The National Security Problem in the Third World." In *National Security in the Third World: The Management of Internal and External Threats*, edited by Edward Azar and Chung-in moon, 14-43. Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1988.

Cartwright, J. *Political Leadership in Africa*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983.

Castéran, Christian. "La guerre cachée de Casamance," *Jeune Afrique Économie* May 1998: 126-130.

Caupin, Vincent. "Une trêve en pointillés," *Croissance* November 1993: 29-31.

Cowan, L. Gray. "Guinea." In *African One-Party States*, edited by Gwendolyn M. Carter, 149-236. New York: Cornell University Press, 1962.

de Jong, Ferdinad and Geneviève Gasser. "Contested Casamance: Introduction," *Canadian Journal of African Studies/La Revue canadienne des études africaines* 39, no. 2 (2013): 213-229.

Diouf, Mamadou. "L'échec du Modèle Démocratique du Sénégal, 1981-1993," *Africa Spectrum* 29, no. 1 (1994): 47-64.

Douma, Pyt. "Poverty, relative deprivation and political exclusion as drivers of violent conflict in Sub Saharan Africa," *Journal on Science and World Affairs* 2, no. 2 (2006): 59-69.

Géraldine Faes, "La guerre s'installe," *Jeune Afrique* no. 1680: 24-27.

Fogarty, Brendan. "Guinea's Golden Boy: Doré's Dangerous Balancing Act," *Harvard International Review* 32, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 22-25.

Hazen, Jennifer. *What Rebels Want*. New York: Cornell University Press, 2013.

Kelly, Catherine Lena. "Senegal: What Will Turnover Bring," *Journal of Democracy* 23, no. 3 (2012): 121-131.

Manning, Patrick. *Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa 1880-1995*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Mbow, Penda. "Senegal: The Return of Personalism," *Journal of Democracy* 19, no. 1 (2008): 156-169.

Milcent, Ernest. "Senegal." In *African One-Party States*, edited by Gwendolyn M. Carter, 87-148. New York: Cornell University Press, 1962.

Samba Moussa, "Sénégal. Introuvable paix," *Jeune Afrique Économie,* 20 November 1995: 14-15.

Mundt, Robert J. "Côte D'Ivoire: Continuity and Change in a Semi-Democracy." In *Political Reform in Francophone Africa*, edited by John F. Clark, 182-203. Colorado: Westview Press, 1997.

Shumacher, Edward J. *Politics, Bureacracy, and Rural Development in Senegal*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Thompson, Virginia. "The Ivory Coast." In *Africa One-Party States*, edited by Gwendolyn M. Carter, 237-324. New York: Cornell University Press, 1962

United States Institute of Peace, *Creating a More Inclusive Peace in Côte d'Ivoire*, by Kelly Campbell and Adams Fusheini, (Washington D.C., 2006).

U.S. Agency for International Development, *Democratic Governance in Guinea: An Assessment*, by Sheldon Gellar, Bob Groelsema, Mamadou Kanté, and Mary Reintsma. PN-ABY-651 (Washington, DC, 1994), https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNABY651.pdf.

U.S. Agency for International Development, *Guinea: Potential Sources of Conflict and Instability*. PN-ACN-619 (Washington, DC, 1998), https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnacn619.pdf.

Vengroff, Richard and Lucy Creevy. "Senegal: The Evolution of a Quasi Democracy." In *Political Reform in Francophone Africa*, edited John F. Clark, 205-224. Colorado: Westview Press, 1997.

Vidal, Claudine. "La brutalisation du champ politique ivoirien, 1990-2003." In *Frontières de la citoyenneté et violence politique en Côte d'Ivoire,* 169-181. Dakar: CODESRIA, 2008.

Yabi, Gilles and Andrew Goodwin. "From Linas-Marcoussis to the Ouagadougou Political Agreement." In *From Civil Strife to Peace Building*, edited by Hany Besada 17-32. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2009.

Yansané, Aguibou. "Guinea: The significance of the coup of April 1984 and economic issues," *World Development* 18 (September 1990): 1231-1246.