France’s universalistic idea of citizenry has been complicated by a history of colonialism, racialization, and selective acceptance of difference. Although Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité (Liberty, Equality, Brotherhood) is France’s motto, the consequences of colonial rule continue to impact the lives of non-autochthonous French citizens today. Since the colonial days, immigrants and citizens of non-European descent have been subjected to structural violence, which has resulted in marginalization, poverty, limited opportunities, and racism. By taking a critical perspective of historical, political, and economical factors, this research traces the building blocks of structural violence that has been exerted on the Franco-Maghrebian minority population in France. This thesis is meant to not only expand the understanding of the lived experiences French citizens of Maghrebian origins, but it also sets out to expand and complicate the anthropological research relating to structural violence. Through extended interviews and participant observation, this research highlights the consequences of structural violence from the perspective of Franco-Maghrebian women in Marseille, France. In these interviews and
observations, I found that my informants experienced structural violence through poverty, marginalization, limited resources, restricted opportunities, segregation, negative health consequences, and racism. Furthermore, all of these consequences lead my informants to feel different from their fellow French citizens. Ultimately, what they have experienced is second-class citizenship and alterity within their own country.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Structural violence “does not show” (Galtung 1969:173), in the same way that personal violence does, but it can be traced by taking historical, political and economic factors into account (Farmer 2004; Fassin 2011). However, as anthropologists, we can illuminate structural violence by exploring its adverse consequences experienced by people living in poverty and who are often subject to marginalization by racism (Farmer 2004; Fassin 2011; Galtung 1969). This thesis investigates the ways a group of women of North African descent living in ethnic enclaves in Marseille, France have experienced the consequences structural violence. These consequences are made clear in their stories associated with poverty, a lack of space, a lack of public works, and segregation. They and their ancestors lived under a political and socio-economic system that racialized them, marginalized them, and left them feeling alienated from the French nation.

The thesis will be divided into six chapters. The first chapter provides an introductory overview of the research, the researcher, and the research site. The second chapter will discuss the methods used in collecting data. The third chapter will review the relevant literature on structural violence and the related concept of governmentality in order to provide an explanation for the use of the theory of structural violence as the best way to understand the everyday experiences of racism and marginality that characterize the lives of this group of women. This chapter will also discuss how citizenship and alterity relate to structural violence in the context of France. Chapter four analyzes the political and socio-economic forces that have worked historically to create a racialized, subordinate North African population within the French nation. Chapter five analyzes in
more detail the ways structural violence affects the everyday lives of women of North African descent living in the city of Marseille. Finally, chapter six will offer a conclusion that emphasizes the how all of the negative consequences of structural violence have led this group of women, born in France, to feel excluded from feeling fully French.

**Entering the Field**

During the fall of 2012, I started my adventure teaching English in the French Rivera, setting out to improve my French and explore the relations between people of different ethnic origins in France. I had learned in French classes and in an Anthropology class that inter-ethnic relations in France could be tense, particularly between those who identify as *français de souche* (autochthonous\(^1\) French) and those who came from or whose ancestors came from France’s former colonial empire. On the third day I was in France, I had to get copies of my passport and other papers, so I went to the local copy shop in Fréjus. This is where my adventure and intrigue really began. At the time I did not speak French very well but I understood it quite well and could more or less follow what others were saying to me. In this tiny shop, an old man, who appeared to be an autochthonous Frenchman, sat grumpily at his desk waiting for customers. A fellow English assistant and I entered and timidly asked if we could get copies of our passports. He responded yes and then we began to try to banter with him. I asked him where he was from and he stated he was from Morocco. This intrigued me and I began asking him questions about his life in Morocco. The man was a *pied-noir*\(^2\) (black foot), something I

\(^1\) I have translated the identifying term *français de souche* to autochthonous French because of the way French identity and belonging relate to certain historical and prescriptive characteristics that

\(^2\) A *pied-noir* refers to someone of French or other European descent who was born or lived in French North Africa.
realized after he said that he and his family had been in Morocco since the 1920s and that he moved to France in the 1960s after Morocco gained independence from France. Then, suddenly, without provocation and with my passport in hand, he began to rant about how there are too many Muslims in France and he misses the day when there were no Muslims in France. Of course, this day has not existed for hundreds of years, but I did not disagree with him, given that he was holding my lifeline in his hand. He went on to say that all Muslims do is live off welfare and have babies so that they can build an army for the impending race/religion war in Europe. What he was saying was terribly offensive to my friend and me, but we could not say anything back given the circumstances. He swore that there would be a war in the next twenty to thirty years, provoked by the “violent Muslims” who were “invading his country.” After recovering our passports, we quickly left and were in shock about the level of xenophobia that this man expressed and the hysteria he felt about having Muslims in his country. This interaction, and many others that I had while I was living in the south of France from 2012-2013, drove me to want to understand the other side of the story. I asked myself, how do Franco-Maghrebian-Muslims feel in France? What are their experiences? Do they feel like they are French or do they feel excluded from full Frenchness?

Although French law does not allow for statistics to be taken based on one’s race, ethnicity, or religion, some statistical research conducted by scholars using ethnographic data has shed some light on some characteristics of the Franco-Maghrebian-Muslim population. Based on demographic research in the 1990s, Maxwell speculates that Maghrebins represent approximately 5.1 percent (2,984,438) of the French population (2012:31). The Franco-Maghrebian population, many of whom are also Muslim, have
been subjected to racism, Islamophobia, and general discrimination (Fassin 2015). These factors have lead them to disproportionately live in poor living conditions, experience discrimination in employment, have lower wages, and are overrepresented in the justice system (Fassin 2015; Kalev and Marzel 2012; Silberman and Fournier 2008). In 1998, 79.3 of those living in the denigrated public housing buildings were non-European; 47.9 percent of the non-European inhabitants were Maghrebian (Ware 2015:206). In an extensive survey of two different cohorts of students who graduated high school in either 1992 or 1998, Silberman and Fournier (2008) found that students whose parents were born in North African were more than twice as likely to be unemployed as those whose parents were born in France (11.6 percent versus 23.2 percent)(2008:63). Other studies suggest that during the 1990s, young men of Algerian origin had an unemployment rate around 50 percent (Hargreaves 2015:242). Furthermore, “children of North African immigrants earn about 20 percent less than those of French natives,” as they are subjected to barriers in obtaining employment and are disproportionately represented in low-wage employment sectors (Ware 2015:21). A study of police profiling found that men of Maghrebian and sub-Saharan African origins were stopped and searched six to eight times more than whites. This racial discrepancy is also seen in the prison system where three-fourths of young adults are men from African and Caribbean origins (Fassin 2015:5). While these statistics can start to explain broadly how the Franco-Maghrebian minority experiences life in France, I wanted to explore their experiences on the ground from an ethnographic, case-study perspective.

When I started my master’s degree program at Oregon State University in the fall of 2013, I decided to design a research project that would explore a sub-sample of the
greater Franco-Maghrebian population’s experiences living as a racial minority in France. Inspired by the works of Keaton (2005; 2006), Killian (2006), Kalev and Marzel (2012), and others who emphasize the importance of exploring how women of (North) African origin “perceive themselves,” I decided to take a sub-sample that included only women in my study. Additionally, this decision was made due to my positionality as a woman. It is important to note here that much of the literature is focused on the experiences of French women of Maghrebi origin in Paris. Furthermore, Mitchell (2011) has highlighted the stark differences of inclusions and exclusions in these two cities, Paris and Marseille; thus it is important to add to the literature a nuanced, ethnographic study of female Franco-Maghrebians in Marseille.

Marseille is a city that has been the home for immigrants from many countries over decades and even centuries. Over the course of 200 years, several waves of immigrants of various origins have become racialized as different from the French and viewed as dangerous to the French state. In particular, the parents and grandparents of my informants who came either during the second or third wave of immigrants were subjected to even harsher racialization, as they were perceived as being the uncivilized, “asocial” other. The structural violence fueled by their racialized alterity has both physically and mentally excluded my informants and their ancestors in many ways from feeling fully French. All nine of my informants experienced forms of exclusion through structural violence that has systematically marginalized non-autochthonous French and those whose ancestors came from North Africa.

---

3 For a detailed description of these waves of immigrants, see Temime (2006).
4 Even as French citizens, several of my informants were also subjected to this evaluation and other forms of racialized evaluations as will be discussed in chapters four and five.
Before embarking on my fieldwork, I contacted several local non-profits and NGOs in Marseille so that I could have easier access to my informants. Given the years of exclusion and marginalization that my informants have experienced, and given my positionality, as I will discuss further below, I knew that I had to find an insider to be able to access the population that interested me. Therefore, after months of sending fruitless emails, I finally received a response from Ramzi Tadros, one of the co-directors of the non-profit organization *Approches Cultures et Territoires* (Cultures and territories coming together, here on referred to as ACT). ACT describes itself on its website (http://www.approches.fr/) as an organization that shares the values of liberty, equality and fraternity with all persons, regardless of their real or imagined ethnic, religious, regional, or national differences. They acknowledge the multiplying forms of structural violence and exclusion of certain groups of people and they work towards transforming this growing paradigm. The organization provides tools for addressing issues around cultural and ethnic diversity and discrimination to experts, local stakeholders in education, culture, and social work, as well as the broader community of concerned citizens in the region. ACT engages in direct action with local professionals through four means: support and expertise, training, organizing and helping others organize conferences, and producing publications on local issues (http://www.approches.fr/-Nos-actions-).

When the director, Ramzi Tadros, and I met in France during the spring of 2014, we discussed the goals of the organization as well as my own goals for working with them and producing an anthropological thesis that addressed similar issues in the same
region as their work. Shortly after our meeting, Ramzi offered me an internship with
ACT. The purpose of this internship was for me to aide ACT in their project that would
eventually come to fruition as an exposition in Musée d’Histoire de Marseille (History
Museum of Marseille) regarding the experiences of people who had lived in the
bidonvilles (shantytowns) in the northern districts of Marseille. Given my anthropological
background, I was asked to conduct interviews with people who had lived in these
shantytowns, asking them about their own and their families’ experiences immigrating to
France and living in these shantytowns. Since my research agenda regarded a similar
topic but over a longer period of time and dealt only with women, I blended our projects
to create something useful for everyone. My final research project reflects my own
research goals as well as those of ACT and was conducted in an ethical way in
accordance to the Institutional Review Board.
Chapter Two: Methods

Location and Population

The Mediterranean port city of Marseille is the French city most influenced by migration (Cesari, Moreau, and Schleyer-Lindenmann 2001; Témime 2006). In 600 BCE, the Phoenicians first settled in the region, establishing a port town that would come to experience centuries of immigration fluctuation. Since the early 20th century, Marseille has particularly seen an influx of North Africans or Maghrebians from France’s former colonies. During WWII, 1,570 cities in France were bombed, resulting in 68,778 causalities and over 100,000 injuries (Valla 2008). Several French cities, such as the western city of Saint Nazaire, were completely decimated and in desperate need of reconstruction. In an attempt to rebuild the country’s ailing cities, immigrants, primarily of North African descent, flocked to the cities in search of work. Consequently, immigrants who had come to rebuild France’s infrastructure were faced with a housing crisis. As a result, in Marseille, as in many other large cities (Paris, Lyon), new low-income apartment complexes were constructed during the sixties and early seventies that mainly served immigrants from the former French colonies working low wage jobs at the port or in factories (Cesari, Moreau, and Schleyer-Lindenmann 2001). In Marseille, these Habitats Loyer Moderés (HLM) or cites (projects), were primarily constructed in the northern districts (13th-16th) (Cesari, Moreau, and Schleyer-Lindenmann 2001; Dell’umbria 2012). The placement outside of the city center of government subsidized, high-rise, blocked apartments served to isolate the diverse immigrant population from mixing with those of European decent (Nasieli 2010). Immigrants, their children, and their children’s children continue to be the majority of habitants in these districts and
have therefore carved out a region of the city in which ethnic minorities live in largely
dilapidated accommodations and are trying to make lives for themselves.

Within these neighborhoods, I sought to speak with women whose parents or
grandparents emigrated from North Africa. I hoped to gain some insight into their
perspectives on their lives and the lives of their family members to understand whether
they assimilated into French society or experience(d) exclusion from full French
citizenship. I chose to speak almost exclusively with women given my positionality as a
woman and given that studies have shown that women’s experiences differ from those of
men (Keaton 2005; Keaton 2006; Killian 2006; Santelli 2008). Additionally, there is a
gap in the literature regarding the lived experiences of young women of immigrant origin
living in the northern districts of Marseille. Given this gap, this study aims at
understanding the experiences of women of North African origin, between the ages of
eighteen and fifty-six, who lived and/or are currently living in the northern districts of
Marseille.

Sampling

Given the short duration of fieldwork, the most effective way to sample the
population was through purposeful and snowball sampling (Bernard 2011). I started
finding informants through my gatekeeper, Ramzi Tadros of ACT, and used my position
as an intern at ACT to find women who would be interested in talking with me. Most of
my informants were in some way associated with ACT, whether by volunteering for the
organization, going to their events, or as friends of those who work there. After my first
three interviews, I was able to find more informants by asking my interviewees if they
knew other women interested in talking with me. I also found an interviewee at a protest
in a northern district. The protest was staged because of the discriminatory attitudes of a local movie theater towards people of the area. Additionally, I met two of my informants at a local renter’s association where people of the cité\(^5\) (projects) gathered regularly to discuss issues of concern to the area. In total, I interviewed nine women between the ages of eighteen and fifty-six, who are descendants of North African immigrants, and who live or lived in the northern districts of Marseille. These women’s names have been changed to pseudonyms and will be referred to as Samia, Karima, Lola, Zarah, Fatimah, Farah, Heba, Sara, and Myra. All but one of my informants were born in France and they were all French citizens.

**In-depth and Semi-structured Interviews**

As interviews are an essential element of anthropological research (Bernard 2011), I employed this method through both in-depth and semi-structured interviews with my informants. I created a rough protocol with questions that would guide my informants to elucidate their life stories and the stories they remembered from their parents’ and/or grandparents’ lives. I asked follow up questions when necessary and allowed my informants to speak freely, even if it felt off topic at the time. In total, I collected nine recorded interviews ranging between forty-five minutes and three hours. I also had many informal interviews and discussions with my informants, including an informal focus group. These interviews were all conducted in French.

\(^5\) The term *cité* refers to public housing projects that usually consist of a conglomeration of apartments that houses people with low-incomes. This concept is similar to what people in the US call the projects.
For analyzing the data from interviews and participant observation, I have used grounded theory to guide the coding of my interviews. I also used the computer software program NVIVO to organize my codes (http://www.qsrinternational.com/).

**Participant Observation**

“Participant observation is the foundation of cultural anthropology” (Bernard 2011:256), and is therefore a vital data collection tool for this project. This method requires the fieldworker to immerse herself in the cultural surroundings while taking detailed records of her observations (Bernard 2011). As I worked, volunteered, and protested in the northern neighborhoods, I was able to collect many fieldnotes about my observations of the lives of the women around me. These observations helped to inform my analysis about women’s experiences. I conducted participant observation over a period of ten weeks.

**Validity and Reliability**

As an anthropology master’s student, I have been exposed to a variety of research methods through courses and in-the-field experience. My coursework in feminist theory and transnational feminisms has informed me on how to conduct research while being sensitive not to Orientalize, exoticize, or subjectify my informants. The six years of anthropological and women’s studies coursework have informed my approach, methods, and analysis of the data. Past ethnographic research projects have sharpened my skills as a researcher, particularly, a project I conducted regarding the experiences of Saudi female students at an American university. That experience prepared me to investigate sensitive
issues endured by an ethnic and religious minority group women living in the United States.

In order to ensure that my findings were reliable, I was constantly analyzing the data in the field including asking my informants if I understood the situations correctly. I also engaged in reciprocal ethnography when I returned to Marseille in the fall of 2015 where I discussed with several of my informants my findings to ensure that I had understood what they had said correctly.

Given that I translated my interviews, I should also address my experience mastering the French language. As an undergraduate, I took many classes in French and minored in French in addition to completing a four-month international exchange program in France. Between my undergraduate and graduate studies, I lived in the south of France for nine months. During this period, I taught English to beginning and intermediate English learners in a middle school. In order to ensure that my students understood what I said, I was constantly translating what I said in English to French. Additionally, given that I was living in France, I was speaking and learning more French everyday during that period. Furthermore, during my graduate career, I engaged in an independent study course with a French professor at OSU. During this course, I read complicated French texts and discussed them with him in French. After this preparation of my French language skills, I lived in France again for three months during which I conducted my field research and worked in a French non-profit organization. Furthermore, in the fall of 2015, I moved back to France and worked again as an English teacher. Therefore, both my educational background and the amount of time I have spent
living and working in France has qualified me to be able to understand my informants’
stories and translate them into English.

**Positionality**

As mentioned above, I went to Marseille knowing that I was a white, middle-class
American woman going to “study” non-white women from the impoverished
neighborhoods of Marseille. In defining my positionality and those of my informants, I
draw from Alcoff (1988) and others who emphasize that race, class, and gender are
markers of positions in society and not essentialized qualities. In writing this thesis, I
have taken precaution to not essentialize my informants’ positional markers as non-white
French females of the lower-middle classes; rather I address how they experience these
positional markers.

In building rapport with my informants, my connection with ACT helped show
that I was aware and engaged with addressing issues that relate to their lives.
Furthermore, I made sure to start my interviews by explaining that they are the experts
and that I am there to learn from them. During my interviews, I was very aware of my
own positional markers and took measures to soften class/status differences (i.e. I didn’t
bring my iPhone to interviews until one day I asked an informant about whether or not I
could and she responded that of course I could and that everyone has an iPhone
nowadays). While analyzing my data, I transcended my own class and racial barriers by
focusing on their spoken word and by participating in reciprocal ethnography. When I
returned to Marseille in the fall of 2015, I met with several of my informants and
discussed with them my results. This process of bringing my results back to my
informants allowed me to make sure that I interpreted their stories correctly and was able to transcend the racial and class boundaries that existed.
Chapter Three: Reviewing the literature: Theoretical frameworks

I will briefly explore the literature on several theoretical frameworks and key concepts that will be useful in analyzing my data in the discussion section of this thesis. The main theoretical frameworks I will be exploring are structural violence, governmentality, citizenship, and alterity.

**Structural Violence**

In examining experiences of my informants, I feel it is important to first define structural violence and explain how it could be a helpful framework in discussing my informants’ experiences. Although structural violence has been a “fundamental part of modernity and social relations of capitalism,” it has not always been understood or named directly (Fleming 2011:24). Early works by Engels and Sartre, who both identified the way different classes can affect life expectancy, started to scratch the surface of structural violence but a broader perspective of this term needed to be addressed (Fleming 2011). It was not until 1969, when Johan Galtung published his article, “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” that this term was introduced to the academic world (Fassin 2011; Fleming 2011). However, many researchers still describe structural violence as an “abstract and illusive concept” (Fassin 2011:293). As Bourgois and Scheper-Hughes stated in response to Farmer’s article, structural violence, “remains too much in a black

---

6 An alternate lens that could be used to analyze the experiences of my informants and their ancestors could be Iris Young’s (2011) five faces of oppression: violence, exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness and cultural imperialism. Like structural violence, oppression is exerted in a way that reduces the potential of other human beings (Young 2011). However, I have chosen to use the theoretical lens of structural violence for two main reasons. First, I understand oppression and its five faces as results of structural violence; therefore, by approaching my research from the perspective of structural violence, I can address several of the faces of oppression but I am not limiting my scope regarding the consequences of structural violence. Second, as I articulate in this section, I feel that the scholarly discourse on structural violence has been limited and I wish to expand on how this theoretical framework can be employed.
box” and needs “to be elaborated, complicated, and diversified—perhaps even redefined” or else it will not be adequately addressed by academics (2004:318). I especially agree with Bourgois and Scheper-Hughes’ point about the need to complicate and diversify the use of this allusive concept. In the following paragraphs, I will outline and criticize some of the main writings on structural violence, concluding with how I will be employing this theoretical framework.

Galtung (1969) was the first to officially coin the term structural violence. In his article “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” he explores the link between peace and forms of violence by thoroughly defining them and their relations. Whereas his discussion on peace is quite interesting and important, it is more relevant to my data to highlight the intricacies of various forms of violence. He begins by emphasizing that violence is defined as the “cause of difference between the potential and the actual,” or what increases the distance between both somatic and mental realizations and actual realizations (Galtung 1969:168). He continues on to describe six distinctions that help define violence, including: physical versus psychological, negative versus positive, objects involved or not, personal actor versus structural (indirect), intended versus unintended, manifest versus latent. These distinctions (except for the positive versus negative) can be easily visualized with the illustration taken from Galtung’s article below.
Essential to understanding his conceptualization is how he describes the different forms of violence in relation to both personal violence and structural violence. Personal violence involves a subject, an object and an action, where both the object and subject are people. However, structural violence does not follow this relation as it is built into the social structure. He articulates this in an example of a man beating his wife (personal violence) versus “when one million husbands keep one million wives in ignorance there is structural violence” (Galtung 1969:171). Furthermore, personal violence is more visible, “whereas structural violence is silent…[and] may be seen as natural as the air around us” (Galtung 1969:174). Both forms of violence can be exerted physically and physiologically, in manifest and latent ways, and with and without objects. Galtung goes into depth about the relation between these two categories of violence, concluding that although the various forms of personal and structural violence may be “seen as logically independent,” they are actually “continuous with each other: one shades into the other” (Galtung 1969:182). He gives an example of this interrelatedness in that police violence is, by definition, personal violence but the police are “called into action by expectations deeply rooted in the structure” (Galtung 1969:179–180). This correlation between
personal and structural violence is particularly important in relation to my research as I feel that my informants have experienced interrelated personal and structural violence.

How exactly do these correlated forms of violence come to fruition? Galtung approaches personal violence by using a systematic typology of how the human can be a target of personal violence. He focuses on somatic violence against the anatomy (i.e. poisoning) and physiology (i.e. denial of movement) of humans. The anatomical forms of violence involve trying to destroy the human being, whereas the physiological forms work to prevent humans from functioning to their full potential (Galtung 1969:174–175). How the physiological forms work to destroy functionality is through the denial of input, or sources of energy, and the denial of output, or movement, which can be both somatic and mental (Galtung 1969:175). An example of personal violence regarding the denial of movement could be elucidated in instances of denying someone a job based on race, gender, or ethnicity. However this example also relates to structural violence, because as said earlier, the two are intertwined such as when racial discrimination hiring becomes the accepted social practice. In regards to structural violence, inequalities in resources and the distribution of power are central forces. To explain the mechanisms that engender structural violence, Galtung explores the relation between key ideas used in the science of social structure and stratification. These fundamental ideas include the actor, system, structure, rank and level. The relations among these terms are best explained by directly drawing from Galtung’s writing.

Actors seek goals, and are organized in systems in the sense that they interact with each other. But two actors, e.g. two nations, can usually be seen as interacting in more than one system; they not only cooperate politically, e.g. by trading votes in the UN, but also economically by trading goods, and culturally by trading ideas. The set of all such systems
of interaction, for a given set of actors, can then be referred to as a structure. And in a structure an actor may have high rank in one system, low in the next, and then high in the third one; or actors may have either consistently high ranks or consistently low ranks. (Galtung 1969:175)

Furthermore, actors such as the nation state are actually in themselves integrated structures (Galtung 1969:175–176). Ultimately, Galtung asserts that there are six major mechanisms that are present in society and that lead to structural violence; briefly summarized, these include: 1) linear ranking order, meaning the ranking is complete and known; 2) acyclical interaction pattern, meaning that all actors are connected through one correct path of interaction; 3) correlation between rank and centrality, meaning the higher the rank, the more central one’s position is to the interaction network; 4) congruence between systems, meaning the interaction networks are similarly structured; 5) concordance between ranks, meaning one’s rank on one system tends to be similar in other systems; and 6) high rank coupling between levels, meaning that high level ranked actors are tied to each other (Galtung 1969:176). The presence of these six factors aggravates inequality given that those in lower positions are “deprived because the structure deprives them of chances to organize and bring their power to bear against topdogs” (Galtung 1969:177). Among these six mechanisms, I will specifically focus on the existence a linear ranking order and an acyclical interaction pattern. These two mechanisms are clear in how my informants and their ancestors have continued to occupy a low rank within the French society and their path of interaction with the greater French society is dictated by their subscribed otherness.

Another scholar who examined violence and structural violence was Dr. Michael Fleming (2011). Fleming, like Galtung, asserts that we need to incorporate structural
violence into the broader discussion of violence. In exploring the usefulness of the concept of structural violence, Fleming incorporates several types of violence that could fall under the umbrella-like term of structural violence. To begin, he draws from Engels’ discussion of how different life expectancies of different classes are associated with inequities engendered by the capital-labor relationship. Later, Sarte also addresses how these class biases in life expectancy are “inscribed within our dominant social relations” (Fleming 2011:24). However, Fleming asserts that we need to look beyond just life expectancy differences as a result of structural violence. He highlights how Bourdieu’s term of symbolic violence, which Fleming feels should be called representational violence, is also an aspect of structural violence (Fleming 2011). For Bourdieu, symbolic violence involves a process of internalization or naturalization of one’s relative position as the dominated (Bourdieu 2001). Bourdieu argues that, “the dominated apply categories constructed from the point of view of the dominant to the relations of domination,” to perceive themselves (2001:35). This embodiment of social classifications makes one’s position as dominated seem natural (Bourdieu 2001: 35). Their naturalized position as the dominated is perpetuated and reproduced by individuals and institutions such as families, the church, the educational system, and the state (Bourdieu 2001:34). Therefore, symbolic violence is, “violence which is exerted upon a social agent with his or her complicity” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2004:272). Furthermore, a third type of violence that one needs to draw attention to as part of structural violence is one that is used to, “ensure the continuation of the dominant social relations” (Fleming 2011:25). Reflecting Galtung’s idea of manifest structural violence, Fleming describes this as intentional structural violence. By including symbolic violence and intentional structural violence,
Fleming has expanded the previously narrow view of how to understand structural violence.

Navigating the lived experiences and historical facts about Haitians, Farmer explains structural violence as,

violence exerted systematically—that is, indirectly—by everyone who belongs to a certain social order: hence the discomfort these ideas provoke in a moral economy still geared to pinning praise or blame on individual actors. In short, the concept of structural violence is intended to inform the study of the social machinery of oppression. Oppression is a result of many conditions, not the least of which reside in consciousness. (2004:307)

In his method of exploring structural violence, he calls for researchers to take a critical approach that includes looking at the historical, geographic, political, economic, and biological “materials” as a way to trace structural violence. Analyzing these materials is important to anthropologists given that, “any social project requires construction materials, while the building process is itself inevitably social and thus cultural” (2004:308). Therefore, the adverse effects of structural violence, “death, injury, illness, subjugation, stigmatization, and even psychological terror—come to have their ‘final common pathway’ in the material” (2004:308). As will be discussed later, I believe governmentality and its social technologies of control fit into this category of material building blocks, and thus are important to address. Structural violence is exerted through the materials used to structure society and the adverse effects can be traced by anthropologists in the experiences of, “people who live in poverty or are marginalized by racism, gender inequality, or a noxious mix of all of the above” (Farmer 2004:308). Farmer’s perspective on the adverse effects allows for a slight broadening of the use of the term structural violence to describe people’s experiences; however he still has a focus
on life expectancy. To complicate the use of the term structural violence further, I will now draw from Didier Fassin’s discussion of structural violence.

Fassin (2011) integrates previous scholars’ views of structural violence in several ways, but also extends the conceptualization of structural violence. Firstly, similar to Farmer, Fassin is interested in looking at the effects of structural violence. By this I mean that he is interested in how structural violence has led to a lower life expectancy of black South Africans given their high rate of AIDS. However, he is also drawing from Galtung’s definition of violence when he says that structural violence, “interferes with people’s needs, capabilities, and aspirations” (Fassin 2011a:293; see Galtung 1969).

Although Fassin, like the other theorists, still seems to be fixated on a lower life expectancy as a major effect of structural violence, he also explicitly acknowledges how it, “combines in various ways economic inequality, social justice, racial discriminations, and diverse forms of denials of human and citizen’s rights” (Fassin 2011:293–294).

Although both Farmer and Galtung briefly discuss the diverse discriminations as results of structural violence, Fassin explicitly addresses the denial of rights to the citizen, an idea very close to what I will argue. However, I will take this argument further by showing how structural violence has led my informants, who are French citizens, to feel alterity compared to the autochthonous French. Another way Fassin resembles Farmer is how he takes into account the historical, political, socio-economic, and racial factors that lead black South Africans to be inscribed with inequality (Fassin 2011a; see Farmer 2004). This inscription of inequality seems to have been drawn from Galtung’s discussion of how the central factor in structural violence is an inequality of power distribution (Fassin 2011a; see Galtung 1969).
Although I agree with many of the points made by Galtung, Farmer, and Fassin, I feel that the literature on structural violence has too narrow a perspective of the impacts of structural violence, as they tend to focus on how it leads to a lower life expectancy (Galtung 1969; Fassin 2011a; Farmer 2004). I agree with the approach used by Fassin and Farmer, which includes investigating the historical, political, and socio-economic factors that lead to structural violence. I will particularly address these factors in my historical overview in chapter four. Additionally, I will follow Fassin’s and Farmer’s method in exploring the effects of structural violence, rather than trying to theorize how structural violence can be defined. In chapter four, I will be guided by what Fassin has called the inscribed inequality; however, I address this persistent inequality as a result of the racialization of otherness experienced by North African immigrants and later by their French descendants.

As I mentioned at the beginning of this section on structural violence, I agree with Bourgois’ and Scheper-Hughes’ comment that researchers need to expand the breadth in looking at structural violence and its impacts (in Farmer 2004). I discussing my informants’ experiences, I will argue for a broadening of this narrow field of studies of structural violence beyond the focus on life expectancy. Instead, I will show the ways that my informants have suffered the effects of structural violence through their experiences of having limited resources and direct experiences of marginalization, racism, and exclusion. Furthermore, I will expand the experiences of structural violence to include the impact on one’s feeling of belonging.

To fully understand structural violence, one must also understand governmentality. Consequently, I will address governmentality and its technologies given
that these concepts are part of what Farmer (2004) has called the “material” building blocks that can be used trace to structural violence.

**Governmentality and Its Social Technologies**

As mentioned above, structural violence can be traced by taking a critical look at the material building blocks of a culture. Farmer (2004) and Fassin (2011) argue that this can be done by critically examining historical, political, and socioeconomic factors that have constructed the structural violence experienced by my informants. In investigating the political materials, I draw attention to how governmentality in France and its social technologies of control have been used to differentiate immigrants and their descendants from the autochthonous French. In referring to governmentality, I am drawing directly from works by philosopher Michael Foucault and interpretations of these mechanisms by other theorists. According to Foucault, governmentality is,

> The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security. (Foucault et al. 1991:102–103)

Additionally, governmentality refers to the way that in the “West” the governments have controlled sovereignty and discipline through various technologies and knowledge schemes; these knowledge schemes and technologies developed through the establishment of various fields of population studies emerging in the 18th century (Foucault et al. 1991). This is to say that there exists an, “intimate bond between social science and modern forms of government” (Derksen and Beaulieu 2011:704). Furthermore, governmentality is related to Foucault’s idea of the entwinement of knowledge/power as political power is exercised through the knowledge of the human
mind; and, “this knowledge is obtained and deployed through techniques that act on the mentality and behavior of individuals, groups and populations” (Derksen and Beaulieu 2011:704). Moreover, it must be emphasized that this mode of governing does not end at the state level, but it has spread to every domain of social life (Derksen and Beaulieu 2011), penetrating the structural level of society. As I move forward in tracing the political building blocks of structural violence, I argue that the techniques and technologies of governmentality have worked over the years in France as a way to set apart Maghrebian immigrants and their descendants from the autochthonous French.

**Governmentality and Citizenship**

To contextualize the concept of governmentality, I draw from Ong’s ethnography *Buddha is Hiding: Refugees, citizenship, the new America*, which provides an excellent example of how social technologies of governmentality can be explored. In Ong’s ethnography, she employs a Foucauldian lens regarding the power structures that Cambodian refugees experience through time and space (2003). Ong argues that biopolitical rationality, which makes “strategic use of bodies of knowledge that invest bodies and populations with properties that make them amenable to various technologies of control,” is a central concern of the modern liberal state (2003:8). These technologies of control are embodied in policies, programs, codes, and practices produced by the government, and are used to shape the rationales, practices, and norms of individuals. They are also used by bureaucrats who draw from a specific knowledge that is used to control the conduct of their subjects in places like schools, workplaces, hospitals, vocational training schools, and welfare offices (Ong 2003). However, Ong points out that in these places biopolitics is not the only knowledge informing decisions, but racial
schemes, democratic values, feminist principles, and ethics all intersect in different locations and are used to regulate and control people (Ong 2003:9-10).

In relating governmentality to citizenship, Ong describes how the state deploys “social technologies of governmentality” that are informed by a particular knowledge and are used to mold the citizen subject (2003:7). Additionally, it is the state that has the ability to legally define the citizen and thus has the ability to reject those who are not submissive to their technologies of control. However, since governmentality does not stop at the state level (Derksen and Beaulieu 2011), its logics in defining who is a citizen penetrate the social hierarchy, leading to the racialization and exclusion of certain groups. These technologies and “processes of being subjected, by objectifying modes of knowledge/power, and self-making, in struggling against imposed knowledges and practices are central to understanding citizenship as “sociocultural processes of subjectification”’ (Ong 2003:16). Ultimately, Ong argues that,

achieving citizenship is an unending process of struggle against undemocratic exclusions based on ethnicity and race, with the assumption that the social status of a particular minority will improve over time with cumulative increases in experiences of adversity and material gains, and will in turn lift up the individuals belonging to that group. (Ong 2003:4)

By focusing attention at the intersection of social technologies of governmentality and the immigrant (or refugee in Ong’s case) in relation to citizenship and belonging, Ong has set an excellent example to follow for other ethnographers studying various immigrant groups. Although I appreciate and will draw from how Ong has explored the relationship of citizenship of governmentality, I would like to continue my discussion on citizenship to further clarify how citizenship is experienced in France.
Complicating Citizenship and Alterity in France

Reiter (2012) explores of the meaning of citizenship in France and Portugal, emphasizing the presence of second-class citizenship. In discussing how second-class citizenship can be illustrated, Reiter asserts that one must see that citizenship consists of rights, responsibilities, and duties that are collectively enforced and not entitlements (Reiter 2012:1068). This assertion focuses on more than the legal definition but the collective nature of what it is to be a fully participating citizen. To explore this idea more, he explains how there are two main concepts that can help us understand the participation in citizenship: formal and substantive. Formal citizenship relates to the legal status of having citizenship whereas substantive citizenship encompasses both a social role and a relational asset (Reiter 2012:1070). By emphasizing the social role, Reiter attests that this implies citizenship is a practice that engenders people with certain rights and duties that the state and the collective body should protect. Therefore, if, “some citizens are not treated as citizens, citizenship remains an empty concept” (Reiter 2012:1070).

Furthermore, understanding citizenship as an asset can show how substantive one’s citizenship is compared to another’s, therefore implying that, “its unequal distribution divides the citizenry” (Reiter 2012:1071). In highlighting the gaps between citizens, one can make more sense of the meaning of exclusion and inclusion in relation to citizenship. Some people are excluded from fully living the role as a citizen while at the same time others, in contrast, experience inclusion and use this power to defend their privilege (Reiter 2012). These mechanisms that distinguish those that are included from those excluded from having full rights to substantive citizenship include racism (Reiter 2012; Jugé and Perez 2006; Jelin 2003), as well as xenophobia, “prejudice and stigmas,
segregation and discrimination based on race, ethnicity, gender, age, and social class” (Jelin 2003:101). The result of the implementation of these mechanisms creates alterity and second-class citizenship (Jelin 2003; Reiter 2012; Jugé and Perez 2006).

In France, experiencing second-class citizenship is directly related to how the collective and the state assess someone as being other (Reiter 2012; Jugé and Perez 2006). Theoretically, France has a, “universal notion of inclusion” that comes from the French revolution; however in practice, France has had a long history of subgroups that have been marked by marginalization and otherness (Jugé and Perez 2006:188; Reiter 2012; Cooke and Vassallo 2009). Ultimately, this false notion of a universal citizenry and the persistence of alterity fostered, “racial hierarchies and discrimination” (Jugé and Perez 2006:190). This universal notion of citizenship was complicated by colonization and the incorporation of colonial laborers. Whereas colonial subjects were in some ways members of the French empire, they did not qualify for French citizenship unless they abandoned “their cultural, social, and religious identity” (Jugé and Perez 2006:195). Jugé and Perez (2006) argue that this logic, previously called assimilation and now called integration, still exists today. Furthermore, at the center of being French is whiteness (Jugé and Perez 2006). Therefore, at the center of exclusion from full citizenship is the colonial logic of non-whites being other to the French. This point will be further contextualized when I bring light to my informants’ stories.

In the following chapter, I will address the construction of structural violence in France and in Marseille. This will be done following the lead of structural violence scholars, who explore the topic through critically examining political, historical, and socio-economic factors that have engendered the structural violence. Additionally, I will
borrow from Ong and Foucault in their understanding of governmentality and its technologies of control as they are useful concepts in describing the political factors that engendered the structural violence incurred by my informants and their ancestors. After addressing the construction of structural violence in France and specifically Marseille, I will highlight its adverse effects through the words of my informants in Chapter 5.
Chapter Four: Exploring the Traces of Structural Violence Incurred by My Informants and Their Ancestors: A Historical, Political, and Socio-Economic Perspective

[The] racial logics of postcolonial immigrants and the European metropoles to which they migrate are dialectically related in and through a prior history of colonization. (Silverstein 2005:367)

Colonial France and the Racialized North African

Amidst imperial competition between European powers in the 19th century, France expanded its empire through its colonizing mission in Algeria (Silverstein 2004:41). As France gained more control of Algerian territory, colonial scholars began researching the two major ethnic groups (Arabs and Berbers) in order to know where the populations were on the Lewis Morgan’s social evolutionary scale (Silverstein 2005:369). The social evolution model developed by anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan placed stationary societies at the highest rank of evolution whereas nomadic lifestyles were of an earlier phase of social evolution (Silverstein 2005:370). The strategy to “study” colonial populations was used as a technology of governmentality and informed colonial France on how to “civilize” their colonial populations. Using the social evolution model, the colonial military racialized the Arab and Berber (such as those from the Kabylie region in Algeria) populations in their North African colonies based on their relative level of civilization. For clarity, I am using racialization to mean, “the processes through which any diacritic of social personhood—including class, ethnicity, generation, kinship/affinity, and positions within fields of power—come to be essentialized, naturalized, and/or biologized” (Silverstein 2005:364). Scholars perceived the Arabs’ historical nomadic process as being militaristic and from the east, whereas they viewed Berbers as having engaged in civilized intra-Mediterranean migration (Silverstein
Therefore, colonial and employment agencies perceived the Berbers as more civilized and better equipped for French life. Furthermore, French political thinker and historian De Tocqueville intensified this racialized view of the Arab nomadism by claiming it was pre-modern and an obstacle to the French civilizing mission in the colonies. In the colonies, the civilization process involved forced mobility of the subjects to either relocate and settle in cities where they could be more easily controlled and “civilized”, or if male, be recruited as temporary colonial workers (Silverstein 2005). These processes of governmentality served to identify the other (the colonial subjects), and worked towards essentializing their alterity. In other words, it created racialized alterity in that their perceived race and the essentialized perception of certain characteristics informed their alterity. In turn, this alterity became naturalized.

The racialization of otherness that North African population was subjected to continued into the 20th century, fueled by scholarly discourse that informed technologies of governmentality. Historian Pierre Hubac and demographer George Mauco both published about migration as a natural process of the nomad (Silverstein 2005:369), which essentialized all immigrants as nomadic, racializing their otherness in comparison to the French’s “settled” population. Silverstein makes this point clear as he noted that scholars like Mauco openly discussed fears, “that the unfettered presence of lesser-evolved races on French soil constituted a weakening of the French nation” (2005:370). Additionally, colonial workers’ statuses as colonial subjects rather than French citizens situated them as separate from the French and other immigrant groups who had obtained French citizenship (Silverstein 2004:43). This strategy of differentiating the colonial
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7 George Mauco and his racist perspective of North African immigrants later became integral to designing the post WWII immigration policy in France.
population from French citizens was a tactic used by the government to maintain the colonial population’s alterity and to keep them at a lower rank in the social structure. As technologies of governmentality permeated from the state level, the colonial discourse of the nomadic and lesser-evolved Algerian immigrant worker eventually leaked into public discourse. This seepage of a racialized (mis)understanding of the integral North African labor force led to popular fear, social backlash, and the internalization into the common imaginary of the dangerous and unpredictable North African immigrant.

Following scholarly and colonial discourses that informed tactics used to separate colonial populations from the autochthonous French, popular discourse through the media emerged. The combination of these factors led to a widespread anti-immigrant backlash across France in the 1930s. This backlash was fueled by discourse that clearly painted immigrants as barbarians that were threatening France’s cultural and economic future (Silverstein 2005:370). In Marseille, the right leaning press *Marseille Matin* continued the anti-immigrant discourse by regularly denouncing the foreign invasion and correlating it to the increase in crime (Hayot 1985:6). Film’s like *Justin de Marseille* and *Borselino* emerged in the 1930s and 1940s and continued to depict Marseille’s mythical image as a seedy underworld, overrun by foreigners and Italian mobsters (Témime 1985:37). The colonial and scholarly discourse informed the government’s social technologies of control: legal exclusion from citizenship and the on-the-ground social exclusion of the North African colonial worker. Furthermore, the immigrants’ already racialized position of other kept them in a low rank within the social structure, thus making them susceptible to the adverse effects of structural violence.
These colonial logics have informed the technologies of governmentality used to racialize North African immigrants as the ultimate other in France. This racialized position of other is one example of the structural violence experienced by this generation of North African immigrants. As the racialized other, they occupied a low rank position in the social structure and therefore were subjected to the political wills of the powerful class, the autochthonous French. Generations of North African immigrants, many of whom settled in France, experienced the adverse effects of their racialized otherness and lower rank in French society. Furthermore, as I will highlight in chapter five, their French citizenship-holding children and grandchildren continued to occupy this position as an adverse effect of structural violence. Although their children and grandchildren were born in France and hold French citizenship, they often are far from feeling fully French. My research and others have documented this sentiment (Ribert 2009; Said Bouamama 2009).

**Post WWII and Decolonization: Immigration politics**

French national politics after WWII strongly impacted Marseille, particularly in regards to the national immigration policy and the state’s overall economic benefit of having colonial and postcolonial laborers (Silverstein 2004:24). To help control the massive migrations of the post-war period, several international organizations were established: the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Labor Organization (ILO), and the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). They all had the main goal of creating global political order and developing a series of projects and programs that targeted the migrant labor force (Silverstein 2005). In effect, these entities, “organized around the goals of continually quantifying and predicting world
population movements and of controlling the potentially threatening tides and floods of migration streams” (Silverstein 2005:371). This logic was clearly informed by the previously racialized characteristic of the ever-nomadic migrant.

In France, there were two main political ideologies towards immigration after WWII; economists like Jean Monnet viewed immigrants as a remedy to temporary labor shortages, while demographers like Alfred Sauvy and Georges Mauco favored immigrant settlement to create a slow population growth (Hargreaves 2007). However, it was important for the government not to deliberate too much because there was a consensus that, “immigration was explicitly recognized at the end of the war as vital to securing economic recovery, both by supplementing the labour force and by aiding population growth” (Ogden 1991:297-298). Therefore, the government decided on a policy that was created by demographer Alfred Sauvey and his colleagues. They devised the “first plan” that proposed a recruitment of 1-1.5 million foreign workers during the 5 years after the end of the war (Ogden 1991). Crucial to this policy was to find groups that would assimilate into permanent settlement and the Italians were deemed the best choices given their long presence in France and cultural similarity. During the first phase of the plan from 1945-1950, Italians and neighboring European migrants were generally attracted to countries other than France, which then had to depend on the rapid rural-urban migration within France to meet some of the urban labor shortages (Ogden 1991:298). Before the second phase began, the government signed the Lamine Guèye Law in 1946 that theoretically would give French citizenship to overseas territorial residents in hopes of encouraging more colonial immigrant workers. However, the law was interpreted by Marius Moutet, the minister for overseas French territories, as giving those territories
equal rights to the French and giving their residents a citizenship, but not French
citizenship. This betrayal by the French government only fueled the anti-colonial rage
many in the colonies felt (Genova 2004). Additionally, this interpretation of the law
exacerbated the sense of alterity that many immigrants already living and working in
France felt.

**The Algerian War, Decolonization and Marseille**

The Algerian War for Independence (1954-1962) is one of the many conflicts that
emerged from anti-colonial rage. As Temime explains, Marseille had very close
attachments to the war given its location, use as a military port, and as a first destination
for French-Algerians fleeing war in Algeria (2006: 192-194). Even before the Algerian
War had begun, French-Algerians had already been shaping the city. Due to a need to
reconstruct the city and two million homes and apartments destroyed, France recruited
thousands of colonial Algerian workers, making their population rise to 15000 by 1946
(Nasiali 2014; Témime 2006:192). As a result of growing resentment between Algerian
colonial workers and their recruiters, there was a brief decline of Algerian recruitment
during the 1950s in favor of Tunisian and Moroccan laborers. One of my informants,
Lola, described how her father was constantly faced with racism and blamed for incidents
happening in the war; he decided to settle in one of the Algerian enclaves in northern
districts of Marseille where many of his compatriots lived (Lola 2014). Additionally,
terrorist attacks in Marseille by Algerian nationalists strengthened the anxiety many
Marseillais felt towards the immigration of French-Algerians (Nasiali 2010:1030).
Nonetheless, as the war came to an end, the emigration from Algeria to France grew
steadily (Ogden 1991:299).
During the late 1950s and early 60s, hundreds of thousands of *pied-noir*, single Algerian workers, and Algerian families re-joining their male relatives came to France, making Marseille their first destination (Dell’umbria 2012; Ogden 1991). However, the mayor, Gaston Deffere, was already faced with a housing crisis and initially refused to accept many of these new immigrants (Dell’umbria 2012:79). Eventually, more than 100,000 people fleeing war-torn Algeria settled in Marseille (Sayad, Jordi, and Témime 1991; Témime 2006:193). This massive immigration coincided with the French state’s second phase of their immigration policy (Ogden 1991:299), and was also when several of my informants’ families migrated to France. This was not an easy journey for many. Below is an excerpt from one of my informants, Samia, as she described her mother’s conflicted feelings about coming to France and her negative experiences once arriving there.

She liked France a lot. Like many, she wanted to raise her children in a good school system. She never went to school, neither my mother or my father. In one jump, she arrived with my father in the shantytown, the shantytown of the countryside Picon, in the northern districts, one of the largest shantytowns…she rejoined some of the other people who came from her village but the conditions were very poor, no water, no heating, it wasn’t great…They [her parents] said the conditions were horrible and they felt like second class citizens in a completely abandoned area…My mother felt like someone had lied to her about what awaited her in France. It is true that France was the colonial country and therefore there were complicated sentiments in relation to the colonial country. France was the enemy but at the same time it could make a better life for our children. (Samia 2014)

Clearly, Samia’s parents, and particularly her mother sacrificed their comfort to try to make a better life for their children. My informants’ parents’ experiences are important to highlight as they elaborate the earlier ways that structural violence has impacted their
families. In chapter five, I will explore the direct impacts of structural violence on my informants further.

As Marseille was already experiencing a housing crisis, many of these new immigrants, like Samia’s parents, were forced into makeshift homes, joining existing or establishing new *bidonvilles* (shantytowns) in the outskirts of the city (Nasiali 2012; Silverstein 2004:91). These shantytowns are where most of my informants’ parents initially settled and where several of my informants were raised. As I will discuss in greater detail in the next chapter, the homes built in the shantytowns were often very small, housed large families, and lacked material resources. In order to address the growing number of immigrants living in shantytowns and the perpetual housing crisis, mayor Deffere had to redesign the city and its approach to housing.

The mayoralty of Gaston Deffere from 1953 until his death in 1986 was noteworthy in how his and his associates’ agenda reinforced the status quo of separating the racialized as undesirable populations from the bourgeoisie. Deffere was a charming man who developed an alliance between the government and the local bourgeoisie who owned construction companies (Rochu 1983:90–92). In fact, Deffere established his municipality by dividing the power between the socialists and the liberal right bourgeoisie, giving the former power over municipal services and the latter over city planning. An early project in the Deffere era was to destroy the shantytowns that served as cultural enclaves and sanctuaries for many immigrant families (Nasiali 2014; Nasiali 2012; Rochu 1983; Silverstein 2004:120). Coupled with destroying the shantytowns, Deffere also had city inspectors assess those living in the shantytowns based on their perceived readiness to move into public housing (Nasiali 2014; Nasiali 2012). This
process of assessing and evaluating those living in the shantytowns was a clear example of the French governmentality engaging in what Fassin has called “politics of life” (2007). Fassin’s concept of the politics of life branches off from Foucault’s bio-power, but instead of regulating bodies, it describes of process of evaluating people based on their worthiness (Fassin 2007). Given the bloody Algerian War, racial tensions, and an already existing perception of otherness, city officials, including mayor Deffere, referred to the shantytowns as a North African or Algerian problem (Nasiali 2014:1029–1030). Therefore, the discourse around slum dwellers led to slum dwelling being a racialized characteristic of Algerians. Furthermore, this racialized characteristic caused city inspectors to evaluate Algerians living in the slums as not yet ready to live in normal social housing. Although individuals made these evaluations, these individuals are representative of the state and are the conduits of structural violence (this similar to Galtung’s (1969) example of police brutality). Therefore, these evaluations of those perceived as Algerian and perceived as ineligible for normal social housing, caused many to have to live in provisional housing and prove their “sociability” (Nasiali 2012; Sayad, Jordi, and Témime 1991). My informant, Fatimah, described these provisional housing as being very similar to the shantytowns as they lacked running water and were made out of poor materials (2014). Ultimately, this process of evaluation and segregation systemically enforced racism against the colonial and post-colonial French-Algerian population and reinforced the ideology in the common imaginary that North Africans were less evolved.

As slums were being assessed, a public works program, running from 1955 until 1965, created through the Deffere public-private partnership encouraged the middle classes to buy the newly built properties in the southern districts, where the middle and
upper class already existed and new development was a priority (Dell’umbria 2012). A suburbanization was in effect and the middle class flocked towards the south, abandoning the inner city. While public funds were spent on improving motorways for those privileged enough to use them, the city allowed the inner city public transportation to become dilapidated (Rochu 1983). The flight of the upper and middle classes from the inner city of Marseille is similar to occurrences in cities like New York and Detroit in the United States after WWII (Fusfeld and Bates 1984). Furthermore, the northern quarters, where many immigrants and working class people lived, did not have city sewage until the mid 1970s. However, as land speculation in the 1960s increased prices for construction, development shifted towards cheaper land in the north. This led to the construction of 90% of the city’s public housing projects in the northern 13th, 14th, 15th and 16th arrondissements (districts) (Dell’umbria 2012). The inter-war functionalist spatial segregation plans came to fruition through Deffere, as the working and immigrant classes were pushed further and further north (Rochu1983: 175-179). Additionally, Silverstein notes that this separation of space was a re-creation of colonial structures that sought to maintain, “certain socio-economic and cultural divisions” (Silverstein 2004:120). These new housing projects were roughly based on Le Corbusier’s communal living and working complex (Rochu 1983:179-181). However, what became of this idea was the construction of multi-story public housing projects arranged around a city block. These apartment complexes situated far from the city center then served to contain, isolate, and marginalize the immigrant working class. The role of Deffere’s

---

8 According to an informal conversation I had with a woman who grew up in one of the shantytowns, she remembers not having sewage until the late 1970s. Until then, they were required to place their house sewage in large barrels, to be taken away twice a month.
governmentality exacerbated the separation between the north and the south based on social, ethnic, national, and economic differences; this separation persists today.

*The 1970s Crisis in Marseille and the Deepening Racialization of North Africans and Those of North African Origins*

During the early 1970s, the inhabitants of Marseille witnessed several social and economic changes that led to the further marginalization of the North African immigrant population. To begin, the North African immigrant minority population continually grew until they represented 60% of the foreign population of Marseille in 1975 and 70% in 1982 (Sayad, Jordi, and Témime 1991:169). The increase of North Africans and the residual tension from the Algerian war created unprecedented interethic violence in the city. In 1973, a deranged Algerian man killed a bus driver and injured five civilians in broad daylight. The media took this incident as an opportunity to denounce the Algerian presence in Marseille. In particular, the popular right-wing newspaper, *Méridional*, claimed that Marseille had,

Assez de voleurs algériens, assez de trublions algériens, assez des voiliers algériens, assez de proxénètes algériens, assez de tueurs algériens. Nous en avons assez de cette immigration sauvage qui amène dans notre pays toute une racaille venue d’outre-mer.

(Peraldi, Duport, and Samson 2015:72)

[Enough of Algerian thieves, enough of Algerian troublemakers, enough of Algerian rapists, enough of Algerian pimps, enough of Algerian killers. We have had enough of this wild immigration that brings scum into our country from overseas]

This media frenzy worked to further the racialized image of Algerian immigrants as outsiders and dangerous to France. Furthermore, in response to the violence inflicted by a mentally-unstable Algerian man, at least thirteen North African workers were killed and a bomb was set off at the Algerian consulate, killing four and injuring thirty (Sayad, Jordi,

In addition to the physical violence, many North African immigrants and their French descendants experienced structural violence due to a technological revolution and an economic crisis in Marseille. As industries advanced in their technological abilities there became less of a demand for the traditional unskilled immigrant worker. Coupled with the economic crisis felt throughout France, Marseille’s North African working population witnessed substantial unemployment and underemployment (Sayad, Jordi, and Témime 1991). One of my informants, Samia, explicitly discussed this economic crisis when she described how her father who previously worked in the car company Renault did not have a job as she grew up in the 1980s. Below, she describes how it was difficult for her and people of her generation to see the exclusion of her parents from the working world.

I was born in 82, and I would say I am of the generation, like my classmates, of people from the neighborhood who never saw their parents work. (Samia 2014)

As the racialization of the North African immigrant continued to develop, the minority French autochthonous population in the densely North African populated northern districts of Marseille began to enroll their children in schools outside of the district to prevent the mixing of the groups (Sayad, Jordi, and Témime 1991:170). The social, cultural, and economic division between the north and the south was exacerbated by the economic crisis in the 1970s. As mentioned, Deffere used the cheap land in the
north to build large public housing projects during the 1960s and 1970s. By the mid 1970s, the underdeveloped northern quarters and districts housed the vast majority of the immigrant and unskilled workforce in shantytowns, transition apartments, and public housing apartments. These northern quarters and districts were virtually isolated from the city center, lacked cultural activities, and lacked touristic sites that would bring in money for the area (Hayot 1985:8-9). Citizens were marginalized from the broader Marseille society and began to internalize their status as second-class citizens (Bouamama 2009). The process of internalizing this status aided in solidifying the common imaginary and racialization of the North African immigrant. Clearly efforts made by the Deffere regime to house the undesirable populations away from the bourgeoisie were successful at containing the marginalized and racialized North African population.

**Summation of the relationship between the history of colonial migration and racialization in Marseille**

Throughout the history of Marseille, several mass migrations of various ethnic and national groups settled in Marseille. These waves of immigrants affected the social, economic, and cultural institutions of the city. Beginning around the “Italian invasion” of the late 19th century, the foreign immigrant labor force became integral to the industries of the city. However, at the same time, colonial scholars, who informed the governmentality and technologies of control, were fabricating racialized perceptions of the colonial populations and transferring those perceptions to the public. Therefore, in conjunction with the increase in foreigners and the public and scholarly discourse around the lesser-evolved colonial workers, an image and a discourse of the racialized foreign
immigrant emerged. Two more waves of immigrants would come to Marseille during the 20th century, bringing many North African colonial workers. By the mid 1960s, the demographics of the immigrant population had shifted to a majority being North African. Affected by racial tensions, an economic crisis, racist media discourse, and a governmentality aimed at separating those who did not fit into the (autochthonous) French mold, by the 1970s, the North African immigrants and their children had become racialized as a problem to French society. Therefore, despite the economic, social, and cultural benefits Marseille reaped from these various waves of immigrants, ultimately, they are marginalized and racialized to represent a homogenous group threatening social cohesion. Drawing from the quotation by Silverstein introducing this chapter, the racialization of the North African immigrant population in Marseille and France in general is directly related to France’s prior history of colonization in the region.
Chapter Five: The Experience and Consequences of Structural Violence

The research I conducted in Marseille, France was multigenerational and involved in-depth interviews with nine different French women of North African origins, ranging from eighteen to fifty-six. As discussed in the previous chapter, the history of governmentality and racialized characteristics has blighted their position in society. My informants, their family members, and their ancestors have been subjected to structural violence. Elucidated from my interviews were examples of the occurrence and adverse effects of structural violence. The consequences of their “low rank” position in the French society can be seen in their stories of poor living conditions, lack of resources, and experiences of racism. Overall, these three conditions can be seen in the literature on structural violence, if not emphasized. However, I will expand on the literature by also arguing how the combination of these three has led to an additional consequence of structural violence: a feeling of alterity within one’s natal country.

Living in Poverty: From the Shantytown to Public Housing

The structural violence in Marseille, from residing in the self-constructed shantytowns to residing in the state’s public housing projects, led my informants to experience difficult living conditions in several ways. From lacking basic human needs to being surrounded by drugs and violence, my informants have seen varied consequences of structural violence in relation to their housing conditions. The most striking examples of poor living conditions come from the stories of three of my informants who described their memories of growing up in the shantytowns in the northern districts of Marseille. As discussed earlier, as colonial and post-colonial workers from North Africa migrated to Marseille to help rebuild the economy after WWII, they
were faced with limited housing options as Marseille was experiencing a housing crisis. This housing crisis was further exacerbated during and directly after the French-Algerian War, when most of my informants’ parents or grandparents immigrated to France in search of work or safety. Ultimately, the parents of Farah, Lola, Karima, Zarah, Samia, and Fatimah all found themselves living in the precarious, self-built shantytowns in the northern districts of Marseille. These communities, virtually isolated from the rest of Marseille, are where Farah, Lola, Karima, and Zarah spent much or all of their childhood. However, all of these women eventually moved into public housing, where they and my other informants, Sara, Samia, Fatimah, Heba, and Myra, had experienced both similar and different consequences of their low rank status in the social structure. As a way to highlight these similarities and differences, I have separated the following section into sub sections. I will first talk about living conditions in the shantytowns and then compare them to what I observed and what my informants told me about living in the public housing units in the northern districts of Marseille.

The Shantytown

Crowded spaces

In my interviews with women who lived in the shantytowns, all spoke about living in very crowded conditions and the difficulties associated with this situation. All of these informants lived in very small homes that their fathers constructed with the materials they could obtain with very limited resources. In each interview, I specifically asked the informant to describe their home in the shantytown. In the following quotations

---

9 The time period for which these descriptions are relevant is between the late 1950’s until the early 1990s.
from my informants, it should be clear that they were living in very cramped living conditions.

Yes we had two rooms and a kitchen [that] my father built… our house was very small. There was a tiny hallway, a small kitchen and a kind of living room with bunk beds, and the other mattresses we left in my mother’s room, and during the evenings we put them [the mattresses] on the floor of the living room, we were nine so one had to find the space. And once we grew up, she [her mother] gave us her room. It was tiny. We had one armoire for everyone. Everyone had one shelf… We were nine in the one room where we slept. We ate all together in the small kitchen, very cramped. The shower was the same, in the kitchen. We couldn’t ever study, we were never alone…we never had privacy… …I remember, one time I arrived late to school because I couldn’t find my shoe because we slept on mattresses so tight next to each other, and that meant that looking for your things in the morning was very difficult. I didn’t want to wake up the others, so I couldn’t find my shoe and went to school. The teacher yelled at me asking why I was late and I told her the truth that I couldn’t find my shoe. She yelled ‘you are trying to make a fool of me! Go to the corner!’ (Farah 2014)

In the two- room home, there was me, Jamal, Jamilla, et Dalila. Afterwards my father constructed on top of it. It was a shack and not legal but he did it. There were two bedrooms, a toilet, and a shower. There you have it, the girls slept in the same room, the boys also in the same room. We had one, two, three bunk beds. It was terrible to sleep… And for me, there were too many people; when I wanted to pass my BAC, I had to get up at 4AM to do my homework… When I was a teenager, it was especially hard; there was no privacy. It was hellish. (Lola 2014)

There weren’t enough rooms…Three bedrooms for a family with ten children! (Zarah 2014)

“It was really difficult to live in a space that was only 30 square meters that comprised of a living room where my parents slept, a bedroom where all the children slept, and a small hallway that served as the kitchen and bathroom.” (Karima 2014)

---

10 The ellipses used here is not to indicate a pause but rather a continuation of her discussion. I will use ellipses in this sense throughout the quotations taken from my informants.

11…and her parents. She doesn’t mention this in this quotation, but she was talking about a certain period of time. Lola is a child of nine and this memory was from when there were only four children. However, as more children were born, the father constructed the second story.
In each of these excerpts, my informants describe very crowded and difficult living environments. All four of these informants only had a father who worked; the jobs their fathers occupied were all low wage, low skilled, working class jobs. Additionally, these stories are from the period of time in Marseille’s history where the city was experiencing an extreme housing crisis (see chapter four). Therefore, given their parents’ low social status as immigrants from the former colonies who were forced to live in areas isolated from autochthonous French, my informants also experienced this structural violence resulting in their position of low status and social inequality through the living environment in which they were raised.

Additionally, important in these excerpts are the negative consequences expressed explicitly by Lola and Farah regarding living in an overcrowded home. One example is seen in Farah’s anecdote about being late to school. Because all of the children slept on snugly placed mattresses on the floor, she often found it difficult to prepare her school affairs in the mornings. One morning, she arrived late due to her living situation and her teacher did not believe her explanation, so she was punished. However, critically examining this story from the lens of structural violence, one could argue that her parents’ impoverished position in society engendered a lack of physical space and thus influenced her lateness and subsequent punishment. Furthermore, Farah said this was often the case: cramped conditions made school preparation difficult, causing her to be late and resulting in school-based punishment, further causing her to miss class time. As such, her parents’ rank in society was preventing her from obtaining a full education.

Drawing from Galtung’s definition of violence as something that causes a difference between potential and actual ability (1969:168), this anecdote seems to show how living
in cramped conditions, a symptom of poverty, is also an adverse effect of structural violence as it theoretically prevented Farah from arriving to school in time and staying out of trouble. Moreover, the structures that separated her family from autochthonous French certainly led to prejudices that discounted her explanations, demonstrating the creeping effects of structural violence from governmentality into the popular consciousness. Other examples, expressed by both Lola and Farah, of consequences related to living in an overcrowded environment are a lack of privacy and nowhere to study. Following the same logic above, one could argue that the overcrowded homes my informants lived in interfered with their ability to study and to experience personal space. Although only two of my informants explicitly stated a lack of privacy and difficulties studying as issues living in the shantytown, one could assume that their experiences had been shared by many others (including their siblings). Therefore, the adverse effects from their parents’ low rank, led to a lack of resources, which led to a lack of space, which led to a hindered ability to study and experience personal space, all of which combined to interfere with reaching their full potentials.

*Lack of public works*

Furthermore, given the marginalized position of the population living in the shantytowns, the city seems to have neglected addressing their basic human needs such as access to a library, running water, and sewage. As already articulated, Lola found her cramped living conditions as an impediment to her ability to succeed in school. This sentiment was compounded by the fact that, “there was no library” (Lola 2014). Another example of a lack of public works projects is how several of my informants described not
having running water in their shantytown homes. Karima lamented about the lack of running water below.

We had to go to the fountain for water to drink, for the dishes, to clean clothes, to bathe; it was very difficult. (Karima 2014)

Farah also had lived several years without running water, but eventually her father installed a faucet and they were able to have cold water in their home. However, they did not have heated water and so every time they wanted to do the dishes or take a shower, they had to heat the water on the stove in their tiny kitchen. Still, the most shocking anecdote about the lack of basic resources these women experienced came from Lola as she was giving me a tour of her old neighborhood where the shantytown used to be. She was showing me where the fountain used to be that her family relied on for water, when suddenly she had a flashback about something else her family and those in the neighborhood did not have: sewage. She painfully described how they had to place their human waste in barrels on the streets. These barrels were only emptied twice a month. She, and others in this neighborhood, had to do this until the mid 1970s when finally their neighborhood was attached to city sewage. These instances of a lack of basic amenities that should have been provided by the state are clear examples of what Fassin describes as the, “diverse forms of denials of human and citizen’s rights” (Fassin 2011:293–294), resulting from structural violence.
Figure 2 Farah in the shantytown

This image of Farah was taken in the 1970s standing in front of her home in the shantytown. (Used with permission)

Figure 3 Women using the fountain in the shantytown

This image of women gathering at the fountain as they prepared for a holiday feast and was taken in the early 1990s. (Used with permission)
Negative health consequences

Similar to other researchers who have explored the negative consequences of structural violence, I also found that at least two of my informants discussed impacts to their own and their families’ health. Both Lola and Farah described illnesses that very well could have been a result of living in these poor environments (self built, poorly insulated, overcrowded homes that lacked access to some public services). After describing how the walls were moist when it rained, Farah said, “my father was asthmatic and suffered from that and my mother had rheumatism; we all suffered from that” (2014). She later described having cancer at the age of 40 and being in and out of the hospital for two years. Although she did not directly attribute the cancer to her living conditions, it is hard not to wonder if there was a causal relationship. On the other hand, Lola directly attributed her illness to living in poor conditions. She suffered from rheumatic heart disease. When talking about the living conditions, she added that, “we suffered a lot in the shantytown and I spent two years in the hospital because I had rheumatic heart disease” (Lola 2014).

Public Housing

Marseille had been experiencing a housing crisis since the 1950s (Nasiali 2010). Coupled with the existing housing crisis, Marseille also saw a dramatic population increase in the 1950s and 1960s due to decolonization (Nasiali 2010; Témime 2006). As outlined above, those coming from the former colonies (the families of my informants) were unable to afford “normal” housing and thus settled into shantytowns. However, as mentioned in chapter four, part of Deffere’s governmentality was to clear the slums that
had harbored cultural enclaves in order to rehouse these populations (Dell’umbria 2012). As a way to destroy the shantytowns and to save money, Deffere constructed what would be 90% of the public housing units in the northern districts of Marseille, where land was cheaper and where the shantytowns were to be dismantled (Hayot 1985; Rochu 1983; Nasiali 2010). The Société Nationale de Construction de Logements pour les Travailleurs (National Society for the Construction of Housing for Workers) and Fonds d’Action Social (Funding for Social Action), two governmental agencies in charge of housing those from the former colonies, viewed the densely populated HLMs in the outskirts of Marseille as a viable option to house the influx of immigrants (Nasiali 2010:224–225); this choice ultimately furthered the isolation of marginal populations (as highlighted below by my interviewees). Furthermore, because of the extreme demand for more housing along with Deffere’s plan to build public housing, plans for developments of schools and commercial shops in the northern districts were set aside to build more and denser housing (Nasiali 2010:225). In addition, the extreme demand led to building the public housing out of, “prefabricated materials, and of lesser quality than first intended” (Nasiali 2010:225). Granted, for some of my informants who lived in the shantytowns, moving into public housing usually meant an improvement regarding material goods; nonetheless, it did not change the status quo of their marginalized position in society.

Crowding, geographic isolation, and ethnic segregation

Similar to what the literature suggests, moving into public housing still meant exposure to crowded environments. Samia indirectly explained these crowded conditions as she described how “the neighbors heard us, we heard the neighbors, there was no privacy” (2014). In talking about her transition from the shantytown to public housing,
Zarah also, somewhat indirectly, addresses the density of the population and her shock at the environment of this housing,

It is true that the first time when I put my feet in the city and I found myself in front of this set of large buildings, it was not a lot of towers but bars\textsuperscript{12}, but high very tall and took up a lot of room. It is true that the height of these buildings was impressive. When I found myself facing these buildings, I fell upside down on the floor. (Zarah\textsuperscript{2014})

Zarah’s reaction, although not directly talking about crowding, illustrates a sense of shock to the new, large, densely populated public housing units where her family was placed after leaving the shantytown.

The geographic isolation was a direct result of Deffere’s governmentality to try to separate the impoverished populations from the city center. In Fatimah’s explanation of her transition from her cité de transit (transitional project) to public housing, she described how, “there was nothing there, just apartments and highways, nothing to do. But it was normal for us; we had nothing” (2014). Her comment about the normality of having nothing suggests a sort of fatalism to her racialized position in poverty. Later in our interview, she also lamented about a lack of agency about her choice to live in the public housing.

We didn’t choose to live in the quartiers (neighborhoods)\textsuperscript{13}, I don’t feel like we had the choice. We got placed where the state wanted us. We don’t live where we want when we are black or Arab. (Fatimah\textsuperscript{2014})

\textsuperscript{12} In describing the shape of the large public housing units, I found my informants used two terms: tours (towers) and barres (bars). After asking several of my key informants and other French people, the difference I can decipher is that towers tend to be high rise, square, and not necessarily in a conglomeration; whereas bars are also multi-story, they are shorter, long and thin, and often placed in a conglomeration that makes a square or a partial square.

\textsuperscript{13} Fatimah’s use of the term quartiers means more than just neighborhood. In colloquial French, the term quartiers often refers to disadvantaged neighborhoods that consist of public housing units.
Drawing from Galtung’s understanding of violence (1969), it seems that Fatimah experienced psychological violence and physical violence. The psychological violence lies in the fact that she has internalized the normality of having nothing. Another way to analyze this is that she is experiencing symbolic violence. As Fatimah recognizes that she has nothing, she is showing an internalization and normalization of this violence; therefore she is experiencing symbolic violence. The physical side of this structural violence relates to her feeling that because of her racial background, her ability to live where she wants is constrained. Her words describe the direct influence of manifest physical structural violence in that the state controls people’s bodies. Furthermore, this feeling of a lack of agency given her racial background relates directly to other consequences of structural violence that I will discuss later: racialized alterity and second-class citizenship. Her perception that people who are black or Arab do not have the same rights to choose where to live reflects a lack of full citizenship and a racialized alterity.

Even in housing projects where some development occurred beyond living structures, isolation from the larger French community remained. Karima explained how her project in the far north had, “its own primary school, elementary school, hairdressers, mall, medical center, pharmacy, bakery, all in the project; it was a village within the city that was completely isolated” (2014). Furthermore, she said that at the time it seemed like a great opportunity to have all of these amenities, but that these public housing units became “ghettos that are geographically isolated, isolated economically, and isolated in regards to access to education” (2014). As she explained, it was initially an improvement from the shantytown, but they became isolated ghettos and ensured segregation.
Furthermore, as Farmer (2004) and Fassin (2011) point out, we must look at the political and historical reasoning behind providing these amenities. Given that Deffere’s governmentality wanted to keep the undesired populations away from mixing with other residents, this decision to create a community within the city was directly informed by this mentality and ended up creating what Karima calls “ghettos.”

Another condition relating to the physical layout of the public housing was the way that people of different ethnic groups were housed. This segregation by ethnic and racial categories is one of the ways my informants experienced racism and I will discuss this more in a later section. When I asked Sara about the demographic population in her public housing and the greater neighborhood, she explained that in the building next to her, “there were just Romas,” and in her building there were, “many Comorians, Algerians, but not that many Tunisians.” Additionally, she said there was only one autochthonous French family (Sara 2014). In Sara’s description, we can see how the state divided people of different ethnic groups and that there were very few autochthonous French people living in her neighborhood. Furthermore, she described how the school she went to had autochthonous French people, but they all geographically separately and “outside of school, the autochthonous French never came to our neighborhoods and we never went there” (Sara 2014). Karima also explained this ethnic segregation.

The project was divided, three buildings of just blacks, 3 buildings of just Arabs and 3 buildings of just the Armenians. And the housing solution at the time was to group people of the same ethnic origin, which was very serious there because even though there were people of many different origins, they didn’t mix. In my family’s building, for example it had one French family, one black family, one Armenian family, and all the rest were Maghrebian. I consider that one of the few things the HLM did was to be complicit in the poor integration of certain populations. (2014)
Karima’s and Sara’s observations show the clear segregation: the government decided to group people together based on their ethnic backgrounds. Although this point is difficult to prove through hard statistics (as France does not gather race or ethnicity data in their statistics), other social scientific inquiries confirmed this practice of segregation by the government (Keaton 2006; Sala Pala 2006). Keaton’s (2006) ethnography of the lives of Muslim French women also showed how a certain project in the outskirts of Paris became overwhelmingly populated with families of African origin. After talking with several different city officials, she found that this racial concentration was due to the fact that public housing apartments in the center of the city “were usually not made available to low-income African families or others deemed undesirable” (Keaton 2006:64).

Furthermore, Sala Pala also explained how rampant structural racism informed the decisions of public housing officials to separate ethnic and racial minorities (2006). These observations from my informants coupled with scholarly research show clear examples of social technologies of governmentality that aimed at keeping the racialized other from mixing with the autochthonous French population. Furthermore, Karima very wisely speculated that this segregation among populations has lead to a poor integration of populations.

Unemployment, drugs and danger

Another consequence of segregated living in the impoverished shantytowns was exposure to illegal activities, drugs, and danger. The timing of the emergence of these phenomena is particularly noteworthy. These themes emerged from stories of my informants’ experiences in the northern districts after the 1970s. Coincidentally, between the 1960s and 1980s, Marseille’s ports and industries witnessed a huge decline in
business. This collapse of key industries was coupled with France’s economic crisis in the 1970s that had grave effects on vulnerable populations. Across Marseille, widespread unemployment exacerbated already high rates of poverty (Nasiali 2010; Dell’umbria 2012). One of my informants, Samia, described how widespread this issue was at the time.

I was born in 82, and I would say I am of the generation, like my classmates, of people from the neighborhood who never saw their parents work. (2014)

Furthermore, in recent sociological and anthropological explorations of the impacts of poverty and persistent joblessness, it has been found that the drug trade has often come in to fill the economic gap (Newman and Massengill 2006). This relationship between living amidst a pauperized population and drug dealers is exactly what Karima described about moving into a new project in the 1990s.

Soon after moving in, we realized that it was a neighborhood filled with drug traffic…it was a big project where 50 percent of the people come from poor neighborhoods. (2014)

In addition to the research correlating poverty and the drug trade, researchers have seen a, “prevalence of violence in neighborhoods blighted by concentrated poverty” (Newman and Massengill 2006:435). The connection of these two is seen in Heba’s interview as she talked about the current situation in the northern districts.

Me: What is your relationship with your neighbors?
Heba: They are very nice if we don’t make problems with them, they leave us alone. When traffickers do their business, they don’t hurt us.
Me: The traffickers of drugs?
Heba: Yes, they do their business in our neighborhoods, if you pass by and don’t do anything, they don’t care and you don’t care. You leave them,
they leave you. After all considering it is an illegal market; there are many murders resulting from the settling of accounts; it's sad.

Me: You know the young people who had problems like that?
H: Yes I know many that are in it, girls and boys, especially girls…
H: it is true that there are murders, but we have never been touched.
Everyone is used to it. For me, it is normal when I walk around in the neighborhood and see young people selling drugs. I know their faces, and they know mine. It is normal. (2014)

Her way of talking nonchalantly about the drug trade, the violence, and the normalness of living among these aspects is similar to what Fatimah said about the normality of her having nothing. Therefore, Heba is also experiencing symbolic violence as she has internalized the normality of living in marginalized conditions. Even though Heba expresses a lack of fear, there is clearly (at least some) danger that surrounds her. Sara also expressed that even though she grew up in a northern neighborhood, “so far, I’ve never been hurt” (2014), reflecting an underlying acknowledgment of danger. These two accounts of violence and expected violence suggest that these women have been acculturated to an environment where violence is a normal part of life. Although both had claimed that they have never personally been impacted by violence, the fact that they are exposed to this type of living environment is one of the many consequences of structural violence that impact their lives. Moreover, this habitual exposure to crime and danger has influenced their feelings of alterity that will be discussed further on.

Experiences of racism and discrimination across the decades

Racism is one of the many consequences of structural violence (Farmer 2004; Fassin 2011; Fleming 2011; Galtung 1969). As Fleming explains, representational violence

---

14 “Settling of accounts” is one way to translate the French expression, règlement de compte. According to my observations in France over the years, this expression is often used to describe violence between criminals as they settle disputes.
(which is one of the pieces of structural violence), including, “fixed ideas about gender roles, homophobia and racism” is structural in two ways (2011:24). Firstly, these fixed ideas or stereotypes are part of the collective social knowledge and are difficult to change even when they are confronted by actions trying to change them. Secondly, these fixed stereotypes that expose various groups to different levels of exploitation are helpful to capitalist accumulation. This can be seen in discriminations in the labor market (Fleming 2011:24–25). Additionally, racism can be exerted personally, as in the case of violence exerted between individuals, and structurally, as in the way that established forces in a society disadvantage groups perceived as lesser races (Galtung 1969). Similar to Fleming (2011) and Galtung’s beliefs, Sala Pala discusses how racism should be understood in relation to the interrelated instances of the individual racism and the racist policies and practices that work to (re)produce ethnic inequalities (Sala Pala 2006:2). Individual racism relates to individual actions that are overt and that perpetuate inequalities; however she points out that racism should be seen as a social fact with social origins (Sala Pala 2006). Her approach to racism exerted in the certain structures of society is more related to the institution, hence why she uses the term institutional racism. However, her description of how institutional racism is still very revenant demonstrates it is part of the greater apparatus of structural violence. In exploring institutional racism, she moves away from just looking at racism as an ideology, and contends that it is consists of: practices that ensure the reproduction of inequality; that these practices can be (but not always are) exerted by unconscious actors (i.e. if someone responsible for assigning public housing ignores an immigrant family’s request, it does not mean that he or she is carrying racial prejudices, but rather he or she is trying to anticipate constraints
to the institution); third and relating to the previous, it is a product of how the institution functions; and finally that it can not be eliminated by passing laws against individual acts of racism, but can only be eliminated by a radical change in the institution (Sala Pala 2006:3). Therefore, her description of institutional racism’s ability to continue inequalities and its (sometimes) unconscious manner are at least two themes that directly relate to how Galtung describes the functioning of structural violence (Sala Pala 2006; Galtung 1969).

In many ways, the negative consequences of structural violence discussed above could be interpreted through the lens of the combination of structural and individual racism (inadequate access to public resources, deliberate segregation in housing, widespread unemployment, just to name a few). Important to re-emphasize is Sala Pala’s (2006) point that individual racism is socially constructed and that aware and unaware actors are part of structural racism; therefore, the two are interrelated. An example of interrelatedness can be seen in how individual actors were part of the process of creating colonial rhetoric, which penetrated French politics and public rhetoric, and led to practices that reproduced social inequalities for over 100 years (Jugé and Perez 2006; Silverstein 2005; Silverstein 2004). Although France’s “color-blind” approach to gathering statistics makes statistically proving widespread racism a problem, many ethnographic and sociological studies have clearly documented racism and ethnic discrimination as issues that plague France (Emejulu and Bassel 2015; Jugé and Perez 2006; Keaton 2006; Mitchell 2011; Silverstein 2004; Silverstein 2005). I feel that given the demographics of my informants, their stories regarding personal, familial, and comrades’ experiences of racism can also supplement the literature on racism in France.
From my informants’ stories, I found that they were subjected to intermingled personal and structural violence in schools, in the employment sector, and in other aspects of daily life in Marseille.

**Discrimination and Racism in School**

Racism and class discrimination in school was a widely shared experience among my informants. These experiences reflect both direct individual exertions of racism as well as the broader structural racism and class discrimination that informs the functioning institution of education in Marseille that keep social inequalities in place. Instructors and administrators are not only individuals but also representatives of the school system and power structure whose mission is to “civilize” those perceived as other. The way that discrimination in French schools works to perpetuate social inequalities is exactly what Bourdieu and Champagne have explained (1992). In their analysis of the French school system, they show it systematically excludes those from the marginalized classes by placing them into less valorized courses of study (Bourdieu and Champagne 1992). By less valorized fields of study, they are talking about trade courses, like those taken in professional high schools. In turn, the students of families that are already socially marginalized and are likely already working in less valued positions, then get pushed into similar work positions as part of the functioning of the educational institution.

To begin this discussion of racism and discrimination in school, I draw attention to a form of overt racism that Lola experienced. Lola described a direct, individual form of racism from a teacher who was trying to keep Lola in her place of marginalization.
In CM2\textsuperscript{15} I was in a class with a really racist teacher. At the time when I had to fill out the paperwork to go into middle school, I asked my teacher for the paperwork and she laughed saying ‘You Arabs don’t go to middle school!’(2014)

This example clearly shows an individual perpetuating the unequal chances of people of Arab descent from moving forward in their schooling. However, according to Fleming (2011) and Galtung (1969), this could also be an example of structural violence as the teacher was informed by stereotypes that have been ingrained into the collective consciousness. Following this racist interaction, Lola’s mother went to the school director and asked for the paperwork directly. Although Lola was a good student, when she eventually turned in her paperwork, she was sent to a transitional middle school for those “with great difficulties” (2014). She described it as a school where children who hadn’t ever been to school went and that it was for “the classes that were thrown out” of society (2014). I feel that this is more of an example of structural racism in the way that the person (or persons) who decided Lola should go to a less advanced school was probably influenced by racial stereotypes of Arabs as being less capable in school. However, it could have also been due to what Sala Pala (2006) described as the unaware actor who perpetuates structural racism as a way to keep the system functioning. Regardless the interpretation, this is clearly an act of structural racism that aims at (re)producing social inequalities. In describing other women’s experiences in the neighborhood, Lola mentioned that many of them oriented towards trade schools.

There were these schools with a real colonial structure. They took in girls and gave them classes on how to be a good French housewife… In these schools there were only Arabs and Romas. It was really a colonial thing.

\textsuperscript{15} CM2, Cours Moyen 2ème Année (fifth year of elementary school), is the last grade of French elementary school before entering middle school. Children are usually between 9 and 11.
There, girls who didn’t go to school very much, learned sewing, how to serve food, traditional things for women. (2014)

Although Lola was not subjected to this type of school, Farah and her sisters were. Farah mentioned how she was forced to go to a school to learn sewing and lamented, “I didn’t like it at all” (2014). Lola’s point about the colonial aspect of these types of schools is quite poignant. The type of subjects taught in these schools was eerily similar to the educational aspect of the civilizing mission in France. Rogers describes how schools were established for Algerian girls to transform “native morals, prejudices and habits” (Rogers 2011:743). In these schools, girls were taught sewing and “good eating habits” (Rogers 2013:71). As mentioned in chapter four, the civilizing mission in Algeria was predicated on the belief that the colonial subjects were “lesser-evolved races” (Silverstein 2005:370). Therefore, the fact that Lola described these schools as mostly serving descendants of the former colonies (including Farah and her sister) shows that the colonial logic of needing to transform the “lesser-evolved races” continued to penetrate the school systems in France. Furthermore, several of my other informants expressed experiencing this negative evaluation in their scholarly careers.

In school, there were several teachers that made you understand that because you came from a working class neighborhood, you weren’t going to become a doctor. (Samia 2014)

I have experienced indirect racism. I had a teacher tell our class that since we were born where we were born, we would never succeed. She made us understand indirectly. (Heba 2014)

My sister’s main teacher was a racist. He made her understand that she couldn’t succeed in her first year [of general high school]. The idea was

---

16 In France, students are tracked into either a general high school (lycée général) or a professional high school (lycée professionnel). In the lycée général, students start to choose subject matters that they hope to follow in post-secondary schools, whereas in the lycée
that she must go to a professional high school...I didn’t understand, my sister was serious and her grades weren’t that bad. But both of us had this racist teacher. Early enough, we are made familiar with racism, and as we got older, we detected it even more. I did not appreciate it. (Zarah 2014)

Not only are these clear examples of the racist colonial logic, they illustrate ways that people who come from minority, working class neighborhoods are not given the same level of education as others in France. Several of my informants described how most of their friends went to professional high schools. Undoubtedly, this was at least partially due to teachers’ beliefs that these students could not succeed in school. In fact, I believe that Heba’s racist teacher caused her to internalize her perceived inability. When I asked her why she went to a professional high school, she said, “I didn’t have much of a choice” and “I didn’t think I could succeed in a general high school” (Heba 2014). This internalization and self-subjection to a less promising career path is yet another example of structural violence at work, eclipsing achievement opportunities for my informants.

**Racial discrimination in employment**

Although racial discrimination in regards to employment was not articulated by many of my informants, research studies have shown that the children of immigrants from the former colonies experience discrimination while they search for employment (Fauroux 2005; Jugé and Perez 2006; Keaton 2006). It was clearly the experience of some of my informants as Samia discusses her issues finding employment.

Regarding work, we know very well that four out of five employers in France recruit employees by first looking at their first name. So that has a huge impact in the way that you are positioned in relation to the type of work you can have or your life trajectory. Often employment choices are made based on that. Given that my name is Samia, people put me into a *professionnel*, students follow courses for a shorter amount of time and are trained to work in working-class jobs.
homogenous category that implies my life is a certain way, with a certain religion, and all that. We are more complex than that. (2014)

In Samia’s interview, she expressed that she feels that she has been exposed to the systemic racism that interferes with her and others of the same ethnic and religious category from getting a job. These racialized stereotypes are also expressed by Sara’s experiences with her boss.

It was recently [that she experienced racism]. It was from a man that I worked with. I was a director of organization [of a camp], so I had teams of other camp organizers. I was working with the General Council to take kids skiing. And recently, I had done a kid’s camp with a team of very mixed all autochthonous French people. But this time here, it was me who got to choose, and I had friends who were at school, mostly with Arab first names and one day I went to see my boss to sign some things, and he told me that my team had too many people with first names of Maghrebi origin. That really pissed me off. It was at 7am and I was shocked and then he said, ‘the general consultant is not ok with this and blah blah.’ With the children that we receive, we must have a mix [of races/names], we receive only blacks and Arabs, so it is logical that in my team there are blacks and Arabs. The fact that he talked about that! He said when you pray, don’t do it in front of the children, nor eat halal, or things like that. So I told my team that we will do very good work to show that blacks and Arabs can do very good work! (Sara 2014)

Sara’s experience with her boss clearly depicts how the actions of her boss made her feel discriminated against because of her socially constructed racial category. Critically examining how Sara reacted to her boss’s desire for her to hire people with French sounding names highlights that she believed her boss thought that people of Arab or African descent were not adequate for the job. This shows that her boss had a negative racial bias and did not want Sara to hire a team that consisted non-white people.

Additionally, this story also highlights how her boss racialized her and her Islamic faith
given that he assumed she would practice her faith in front of the children and that he did not want her to do that.

**Discrimination and racism in daily life**

Because of the systemic nature of structural racism and personal racism, several of my informants expressed how others’ perceptions of their race have impacted their lives. After Lola had explained the racism she experienced at school, she went on to say that in Marseille she felt the forces of racism, “on the street, in the bus, with administration, in stores” (2014). Therefore, she felt that racism was all around her and it was something that she was constantly confronting.

In a very concrete example, Myra described a circumstance when she felt that she was negatively judged by the color of her skin.

This one time I was really shocked. There was a lady on the bus who wanted to validate her bus ticket and I was next to her and told her ‘give it to me and I can validate it’, and since I have dark skin, she thought that I was thief. Therefore she did not give me her ticket and she said ‘you, no, no way.’ (Myra 2014)

In Myra’s story, one can see an example of racism in daily life. Myra was just trying to be helpful but this woman assumed that Myra would take her ticket because of her skin tone. What is powerful about this story is how the woman did not directly say that she did not want to giver Myra her ticket because of her race, but rather Myra just knew that that was the reason.

In my interview with Karima, she chose to describe her experiences of racism through the lens of white supremacy.

There exists a type of white supremacy in how history the history of the world was written by them and that they have the absolute truth. We are not white, our parents aren’t white, but we are not sheep, we know how to
think, to write, to express ourselves and more and more people are angry with this practice, and that our children are still the most vulnerable population...because we are different and we don’t fit the mold, the society throws us out. (Karima 2014)

In her response, Karima specifically highlights the white supremacy that she and other non-whites are exposed to. As a reminder, white supremacy is,

political, economic and cultural system in which whites overwhelmingly control power and material resources, conscious and unconscious ideas of white superiority and entitlement are widespread, and relations of white dominance and non-white subordination are daily reenacted across a broad array of institutions and social settings. (Ansley 1989:1024)

Therefore, her specific use of this term shows how she has felt subordinate to white people at a structural level. Additionally, the fact that she describes how her and others like her are not sheep and have abilities to think, write, and express themselves, suggests that she has felt that this structural racism has racialized non-whites as unintelligent animals. This subordination has caused her non-white children to be in vulnerable positions. She feels that because she is not white, and thus does not fit the mold, her society discards her and others who are different. This point also relates to what I will talk about in the next section on how my informants feel otherness in relation to other French citizens.

This everyday, structuralized racism also had concrete examples in how public housing was allocated in Marseille. As discussed earlier, in Karima’s, Fatima’s, and Sara’s interviews, they described ways that people of different ethnic and racial categories were segregated away from the autochthonous French (2014). In Sala Pala’s (2006) article exploring the question of if politics of public housing were informed by racism, she found through interviews with officials in the industry that the answer was
yes. She found that although officially those in charge of allocating public housing units were supposed to integrate people of different ethnic and class backgrounds, their attitudes expressed in interviews showed a different practice.

**Racialized Alterity**

There are multiple effects of structural violence that have been explored by previous researchers. Some of these include general marginalization, poverty, racism, and the negative consequences that come from these experiences (Farmer 2004; Fassin 2011; Fleming 2011). These negative effects are interrelated and cyclical. For example, marginalization leads to poverty; poverty can lead to marginalization; racism can lead to both marginalization and more racism. This cyclical nature is what I have attempted to show in the text above through my informants’ experiences with poverty, crowded spaces, a lack of public works, negative health effects, geographic and ethnic segregation, unemployment, drugs and danger. However, as I have mentioned, I would like to expand the literature on the negative effects of structural violence. I want to expand this literature by suggesting that experiencing alterity is also a negative consequence of structural violence. I define alterity in this case as experiencing isolation and second-class citizenship to the point where it makes Franco-Maghrebian feel that they are not 100% French. Although all of my informants were French citizens, (most of them acquiring this status by being born in France) they all had stories that described their feelings of (racialized) alterity, explicitly or implicitly.

My informants experienced racialized alterity in several ways. For example, Samia felt this alterity from early on in her life as she watched her parents be rejected by French institutions.
As you are a child and you see that this society does not open its doors to your parents. You really feel a gap between how your parents live and how they are perceived. Whether at school, or taking a simple paper city all or the prefecture, no matter what! You see all the institutions that surround you in some way, do not recognize the journey of your parents. (Samia 2014)

She is expressing racialized alterity as the people cast racialized stereotypes on her parents. Additionally, when she says that the institutions don’t recognize the journey of her parents, she is talking about their history as a part of the common French history.

Another example comes from Fatimah as she recalls her experience of going to school in a different neighborhood than where she lived. She described how mixing with the other students made her realize that she was different.

There were several situations that made me realize that we were different. First, given that we came from a different neighborhood, the people looked at us poorly. In middle school we mixed with other neighborhoods that were very closed off and people looked at us like we were foreigners from the working-class neighborhoods… We were confronted during those years with a racist regard. (Fatimah 2014)

Fatimah’s description of her feeling of difference at school shows that she was exposed to racialized alterity. As she said, she felt a confronted by a “racist regard” when going to school with children from other neighborhoods. Although she is a French citizen, her perceived race caused her fellow French compatriots to view her as foreign. Furthermore, in describing how she felt in France, Karima also shows how her alterity is related to her race. Karima utilized the term “white supremacy” as a way to describe what she feels in France, and that, “because we are different and we don’t fit the mold, the society throws us out” (Karima 2014). This “mold” that Karima has described reflects how in France, “racialized conceptions of membership exclude people in part because of their social (racial, cultural, religious) characteristics” (Jugé and Perez 2006:190). Because she doesn’t fit this mold, Karima articulated the frustrating consequences.
Today, in France, the dominators make me suffer, with all the glaring eyes on me, even though it is my country, where I was born, where I was raised, where I educated my children. I feel like there are aggressive looks towards me. And I feel like every second of my life, whether direct or indirect, we see that we are not like the others and that I am required to integrate myself. I am required to remember that I am not like the others. It is tiring and really aggressive. [However] during every second of my life I don’t have to integrate because France is my country. I was born here and Marseille is my city and is where I will die one day. (Karima 2014)

Karima is clearly expressing how the racialized alterity that she experiences causes her to feel the need to integrate (because she is an outsider), regardless of the fact that she is French. Moreover, their experiences of ethnic and racial segregation in the public housing units also show how these diacritic qualities of personhood set them apart as other. Zarah explained that living in the public housing units among other ethnic minorities, she felt like, “we were a separate population. Given that we were there, we were not accepted” (2014). In fact, all of my informants’ experiences with racism and discrimination (in schools, employment, and daily life) illustrate how their perceived otherness is related to their diacritic qualities.

The examples provided above show how my informants experienced “racialized alterity.” My specific choice in describing their alterity as racialized is due to how Silverstein (2005) defines the process of racialization. According to Silverstein, racialization is “the processes through which any diacritic of social personhood—including class, ethnicity, generation, kinship/affinity, and positions within fields of power—come to be essentialized, naturalized, and/or biologized” (Silverstein 2005:364). By racialized alterity, I mean to express how one’s (socially assigned) race is correlated to being placed in the position of other. This point was also articulated by Reiter (2012)
and Jugé and Perez (2006). If a person is a French citizen of color, then the presence of a racialized alterity signifies that they are ‘other’ to white French citizens. This otherness, or alterity, has become naturalized due to a history of how people are included and excluded as citizens in France.

In theory, the French state’s approach to citizenship is through universality: once one holds French citizenship, one is equal to other French citizens (Reiter 2012; Jugé and Perez 2006). However, this universal approach “does not take into account of group specific characteristics that de facto set the citizenry apart” (Reiter 2012:1071). Moreover, in practice, “the distinction of insider/outsider that regulates national belonging and the distribution of rights is negotiated through the construction of a racialized conception of community” (Reiter 2012:1071). This racialized perception of community has its roots in colonial logic that still penetrates the practice of inclusion and exclusion today (Jugé and Perez 2006; Reiter 2012). Early colonial scholarship racialized the peoples of France’s North African colonies as being lesser to the European French and a threat to the French community (Silverstein 2005; Jugé and Perez 2006). This colonial logic that distinguished the racially different colonized from the colonizer has persisted throughout time and has impacted assessment as citizens whose ancestors came from the former colonies (Jugé and Perez 2006). Therefore, the remnants of this colonial logic have influenced racialized alterity. As Reiter (2012) and Jugé and Perez (2006) have noted, French citizens who are not white do not experience the same type of citizenship as their white compatriots. Reiter (2012) describes the experiences this altered citizenship as second-class citizenship. The myriad of consequences of structural violence that have been discussed above describe ways that they have lived as second-
class citizens. The structural violence that has led to segregation and differentiation of generations of those of North African ancestry has relegated my informants to being French citizens only as a legal construct. These structures have ensured that full French citizenship will not be their lived experiences.

My informants everyday lived experiences continuously reinforce their otherness, causing them to experience the second-class French citizenry and shaping their identities as not quite fully French. When asked how my informants identify, none of them described themselves as just French.

I feel conflicted in France, on the one hand, proud, and on the other, sad. I have always felt French but with something in addition. (Farah 2014)

I feel French, but with a bit restricted. However, I am not just limited to by French nationality. (Zarah 2014)

I feel in some ways French, but with different origins. (Fatimah 2014)

When I pried further about what identity Fatimah identified with the most, she responded, “I would say Marseillaise” (Fatimah 2014). When I asked Heba how she identified, she described attachments to Algeria, La Bus (a colloquial name for her neighborhood), Spain, and Marseille (Heba 2014).

What is striking about these quotations concerning personal identity is how ambivalent they are. Many of my informants want to be French. They were born in France and they know it is their right as citizens to be treated as such. They want to walk down the streets shopping or going to school or interacting with bureaucrats as if nothing separated them from any other French citizen. And yet something does. Their comments about their French identities range along a continuum from pride mixed with frustration
at being somewhat marginalized and perceived as suspicious to a sense of full-blown powerlessness.

How my informants seek to deal with racial alterity and its consequence, second-class citizenship, also differs from one individual to the next. Zarah seeks to cope by expanding her horizons beyond her city or nation. She takes pride in the range of popular culture she consumes. On the other hand, Heba copes by restricting her horizons. She imagines herself as fully participating only in her city. She identifies first and foremost as a daughter of Marseille, but nothing more.

How my informants seek to explain the isolation and discrimination they experience is also interesting in its diversity. As noted earlier in a quote, Fatimah speculated that class origins and minority cultural practices and appearances caused the discrimination she faced. She thought her residence in a working class district led to some discrimination, which was increased, by her ‘ethnic’ appearance and minority—presumably Algerian/Islamic—customs. Samia on the other hand explains her feelings of estrangement as dating from her childhood. She remembers vividly undergoing the marginalization of her parents at the hands of authority figures. She grew up internalizing her second-class citizen place in society. Her explanation of the racial alterity she experiences thus springs more from a sense of the history of isolation and discrimination that has plagued Franco-Maghrebians for generations.

**Concluding Statements**

Structural violence enacted through governmentality that separates these people from the French who meet the prescribed French identity others them. This otherness leads to further violence because it justifies differential treatment that leaves them
without fundamental services and facilities. Racializing their identity makes categorizing them easy, further contributing to the violence. These processes reinforce social perceptions of their difference and justify treating them as lesser (in society and by government). That leads to discrimination, which then justifies further structural violence (a never-ending cycle). In the process the victims internalize their otherness and so both French society and the individuals themselves see them as other (not French, lesser).
Chapter Six: Conclusion

Concluding Remarks of this Study

This study began with a chance encounter with a Frenchman who vocally expressed disdain for Muslims in France. That led me to wonder about how Muslims felt living in France. Ultimately, an internship with ACT allowed me to solidify a research focus specifically to consider the lived experiences of women in Marseille whose parents or grandparents had emigrated to France from North Africa. Ethnographic interviews of nine such women and field experiences in Marseille provided the data to paint the picture of their experiences in France.

The results of my research have shown the way that structural violence has interfered with their abilities to achieve in ways expected by the autochthonous French. Government policies forced them to live segregated from general French society in crowded shanties and public housing without the benefits of many services, and with little opportunity for family income and educational achievement or advancement. This structural violence was also reflected in the way they have been treated by other people in France: suffering racialization, discrimination, and opportunity limitations. Further, they are continuously experiencing reminders that they are the other in France causing them to feel not fully French, and, in fact, not to be (socially) fully French. If France were a country that celebrated cultural differences, their experiences might have been quite different. However, since France celebrates the ideal (white/European) French citizen, governmental and social structures ensure that they (and probably hundreds of thousands of descendants of North African immigrants) will be continuously reminded of their alterity and eclipsed from achieving potential granted to other French citizens, the
autochthonous French. As Karima (2012) said, “I feel like every second of my life, whether direct or indirect, we see that we are not like the others.”

The findings of this research confirm, expand and complicate the understanding of structural violence. Tracing the historical, political, and economic underpinnings of structural violence in Marseille, I have examined how my informants lived experiences reflect the occurrence of structural violence from residing in poorly constructed, small, crowded shantytowns to moving into isolated dense public housing based on the governmentality practices in Marseille. Further, this study is consistent with other research finding the consequences of such violence as including restricted opportunities, negative health consequences, segregation and isolation, as well as racism and discrimination. However, this study expands and complicates the understanding of structural violence by showing how the process and consequences of this violence have led to alterity for these informants. French society perceives and treats them as “the other” and they have internalized that otherness such that they do not identify as French even though they are French citizens. Clearly a consequence of structural violence for these informants then is their racialized alterity.

**Future Research**

Further exploration of the negative consequences of structural violence provides a number of opportunities for future research. First, a limit in this study was the number of participants. Given the short time amount of time I could have for fieldwork, I was only able to conduct in-depth interviews with nine women in Marseille, France. Research expanding on my own could conduct more interviews with the Marseillaises to see if what I have discovered rings true on a broader scale. Additionally, future research could
include men or different ethnic-minorities to see how their experiences are similar and or
different from those of my informants. Examining the experiences and consequences of
structural violence is important to develop ways to prevent this in the future in France
and other locales, especially given current immigration experiences. Although my
informants felt a lack of agency to fight the forces of structural violence, they also, as
Karima said, “are not sheep, we know how to think, to write, to express ourselves”
(2014). Consequently, one might expect that they have developed methods to cope with
their experiences. As a result, future research could explore strategies marginalized
populations in Marseille use in order to cope with the experiences and consequences of
structural violence. Finally, one could explore the impacts from the Marche Pour
l’Égalité/Marche des Beurs (March for Equality/Beur’s March) upon the lives of
marginalized Franco-Maghrebians. This march started in Marseille in October of 1983
and ended in Paris on December 3rd, 1983, drawing a diverse crowd over 100,000.
Researchers, such as Dr. Hajjat, describe this march as the first time children of post-
colonial immigrants were recognized in public space (Cohen 2013). Therefore, this
march could have had an important impact on the way my informants experienced
belonging in France and solidarity among other children of post-colonial immigrants.
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Appendix: Profiles of Informants
Appendix: Profiles of Informants

Throughout this thesis, I have written extensively about how my informants have experienced the consequences of structural violence. However, in this appendix I would like to provide a brief description of each of my informants as a way to contextualize further what has become of their lives. Some informants will have slightly longer descriptions given that they provided more information. These descriptions will address information including: the informant’s date and place of birth, the number of siblings they have, their educational background, and their past and current professions.

Lola

Lola is an extraordinary woman who was a key informant in this project. She was born in a shantytown in the 16th district of Marseille in 1958. She is one of nine children. Her path in the educational system was fraught with several experiences of overt racism and difficulties regarding a lack of resources. She described how her neighborhood did not have a library and that she lacked books and a place to study at home. Additionally, her parents were uneducated and illiterate. However, despite her lack of material and intellectual support, she was able to complete a bachelor’s degree in English, a master’s degree in sociology, and reached the all but dissertation phase in her doctorate. She was unable to finish her dissertation due to health complications that she attributes to living in precarious housing while in the shantytown. She was also a teacher in a professional high school until she was hospitalized due to rheumatic heart disease. Other professions she occupied throughout her life included: camp counselor, maid, salesperson, census taker,
grape harvester, job trainer, and sociologist. She now works part-time for ACT as a researcher and spends most of her time engaged with local non-profit organizations.

**Farah**

Farah was also a key informant in this study. Not only did we engage in a formal interview that lasted several hours, we met on several occasions just to talk, drink coffee, and eat cookies. She was born in a shantytown in the 16\textsuperscript{th} district of Marseille in 1963. She is one of nine children. Farah had a difficult time in school as she struggled with racist teachers and finding enough space to study. She was sent to a professional high school where she was trained in sewing. However, she did not become a professional seamstress. After graduating high school, she worked for several years in a factory that processed dates. Later, she became a dance teacher. She now works as a dance teacher and volunteers for the local community center.

**Karima**

Karima was born in one of the shantytowns in the 16\textsuperscript{th} in 1977. She is the oldest of seven brothers and sisters. She spent much of her childhood in the shantytown and eventually moved into public housing. Unfortunately, we did not discuss her educational path nor her employment path in depth. At one point, she managed a gym, but at the time that we met for an interview, she was unemployed.

**Fatimah**
Fatimah was born in Marseille in 1966. She is one of fifteen children. She first lived in the transitional housing units in the northern districts and then moved into the public housing. Fatimah finished high school and received a degree in social work. She works as a social worker.

**Zeina**

Zeina was born in a suburb of Marseille called Les Pennes Mirabeau in 1965. She is one of ten children. She lived in Les Pennes Mirabeau during her childhood and then moved to a public housing unit in Marseille during her adolescence. Zeina was always fascinated with theater and followed her passion to a two-year post-secondary program in theater. She has worked in theaters, in community centers, and as an artist. At the time we interviewed, she was unemployed.

**Samia**

Samia was born in Marseille in 1982. She is one of seven children. Samia was a very determined student who, despite her racist teachers, succeeded in a general high school and eventually received a master’s degree in educational science. She has worked as a counselor, a teacher’s assistant, and a festival producer. Her current work is with ACT as a project leader.

**Sara**

Sara is the only participant in my study who was not born in France. She was born in Tunisia in the early 1980s. At a young age, she moved to a shantytown in the 16th district
of Marseille with her mother Farah (who also participated in this study). Sara worked very diligently in school and attended a well renowned high school in Marseille where she was one of the only Maghrebian students. After high school, she attained a bachelor’s degree in physical therapy. She currently works as a physical therapist.

**Heba**

Heba was born in Marseille in 1996. She grew up in a public housing unit in a northern district of Marseille. School was never of very much interest to Heba and she described how she had teachers tell her that she wouldn’t succeed because she was a child from the ghetto. At the time of our interview, she had graduated from professional high school and was not sure what she was going to do for a career.

**Myra**

Myra was born in Marseille in 1996. She grew up in a public housing unit in Marseille but also spent two years in a youth care home in Briançon, France. She explained that her sister and she moved to Briançon because her sister had issues with asthma in Marseille. Before her short stay in Briançon, Myra said that she wasn’t serious about school and that her lack of effort early in life impacted her educational path. She returned to Marseille for high school and graduated from professional high school. She hoped to work in a childcare center.