

The Rebirth of Laïcité in The Context of Terrorism

*A constitutive rhetorical analysis of Emmanuel Macron's response to
jihadist terror attacks*

Katja Busuttil

Political Science
45 credits
Word count: 31 835

Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Sciences



The Rebirth of Laïcité in The Context of Terrorism
*A constitutive rhetorical analysis of Emmanuel Macron's response to
jihadist terror attacks*

Katja Busuttil

© Katja Busuttil
2023
The Rebirth of Laïcité in The Context of Terrorism
Katja Busuttil
<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Abstract

Over the past decades, France has faced a significant challenge concerning radical Islam and a surge in domestic religious-motivated terrorist attacks. This study investigates President Emmanuel Macron's responses to jihadi-motivated terrorism in France, by examining the complex interplay between national identity constitution, terrorism, and the French model of secularism, *laïcité*. The analysis explores how Macron navigates the reconstruction of national identity in response to terrorist acts. Through an analysis of four of Macron's speeches delivered in 2018 and 2020, this study investigates the rhetorical reconstitution of *laïcité* as a pillar of French national identity.

In this thesis, I develop an analytical model which draws on the works of Kenneth Burke (1969), Maurice Charland (1987), and newer textual approaches. The model brings together textual tools that help examine national identity-building in times of crisis. Constitutive rhetoric holds significant importance in understanding the constitution of identities, narratives, and social realities through the use of language. However, unlike most recent applications of constitutive rhetoric, I employ the basic premises of constitutive rhetoric defined by Burke (1969) which is concerned with the process of identification in rhetoric.

This research contributes theoretically and methodologically to the field by bringing the constitutive rhetoric literature to the political science discipline. It enriches the understanding of how political leaders employ rhetoric to shape and construct national identity in the context of terrorism. At the same time, the findings can provide a better understanding of how Western countries, in similar situations as France constitutes national narratives.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have contributed to the completion of this thesis. Their support, guidance, and encouragement have been invaluable throughout this journey.

First and foremost, I am deeply thankful to my main supervisor, Tor Gaute Syrstad, for his exceptional guidance and unwavering support. Your valuable feedback and dedication have been instrumental in shaping this research. I am grateful for your introduction to the world of constitutive rhetoric and for encouraging me to explore new perspectives. I would also like to extend my gratitude to my co-supervisor, Øivind Bratberg, for his optimism and insightful advice. Thank you both for thought-provoking classes in document-based analysis, which inspired this thesis. Your expertise and encouragement have been invaluable in enriching the depth of my analysis.

I am profoundly grateful to my parents for their unwavering love, patience, and belief in my abilities. Their constant support and engagement have been a driving force behind my academic pursuits. I am also grateful for their efforts in teaching me French, which has been essential in analyzing French texts and understanding French politics. Special thanks to Fabian and Laura for their unconditional support and encouragement.

I would like to extend my appreciation to my fellow students and friends for their motivation, laughter, and engaging discussions. Our shared experience at Blindern has been truly remarkable, and I am honored to have been a part of such a supportive and inspiring community.

I would also like to acknowledge Jiyan, Halvor and Christiane for their excellent proofreading and endless comfort.

Merci encore pour tout.

Finally, I take full responsibility for any remaining flaws or shortcomings in this thesis.

Katja Busuttil

Oslo, May 2023

Table of contents

ABSTRACT	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS	3
2. LAÏCITÉ, AN IDEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLE FOR THE FRENCH REPUBLIC	5
2.1 TERRORISM IN FRANCE	6
2.2 THE RHETORICAL DILEMMA	8
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	11
3.1 CONSTITUTIVE RHETORIC	12
3.2 IDENTITY THROUGH RHETORIC	15
3.2.1 <i>Identification and Consubstantiality</i>	18
3.2.2 <i>Identification and Property</i>	18
3.2.3 <i>Identification and Autonomy</i>	19
3.2.4 <i>Cunning Identification</i>	20
3.3 THE SECOND AND THE THIRD PERSONA	21
3.4 IDEOGRAPH: THE LINK BETWEEN RHETORIC AND IDEOLOGY	25
3.5 RECENT APPLICATIONS OF CONSTITUTIVE RHETORIC	28
4. METHOD AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK	31
4.1 ANALYTICAL MODEL	31
4.2 FROM TEXT TO ANALYSIS: THE ANALYTICAL PROCESS	34
4.3 MATERIAL	36
5. THE RHETORICAL SITUATIONS	38
5.1 THE ROLE OF THE FRENCH PRESIDENT AND THE CONTEXT OF TERRORISM	38
5.2 THREE TERRORIST ATTACKS AND FOUR SPEECHES	39
6. ANALYSIS	42
6.1 CONSUBSTANTIALITY	42
6.2 PROPERTY	49
6.3 AUTONOMY	53
6.4 CUNNING	58
6.5 THE NATIONAL NARRATIVES OF EMMANUEL MACRON	63
6.6 ANALYTICAL MODEL WITH THE RESULTS	68
7. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	70
7.1 RECONSTITUTION OF LAÏCITÉ AS A FOUNDATION FOR NATIONAL IDENTITY	70
7.2 BROADER IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	73
LITERATURE	76
ATTACHEMENTS	84
A) DECLARATION DU PRÉSIDENT DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE SUITE À L'ATTAQUE TERRORISTE DE CARCASSONNE ET TREBES	84
B) DECLARATION DU PRÉSIDENT DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE SUITE À L'ATTENTAT DE CONFLANS-SAINTE-HONORINE	85
C) DISCOURS DU PRÉSIDENT DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE LORS DE L'HOMMAGE NATIONAL À LA MÉMOIRE DE SAMUEL PATY	86
D) DECLARATION DU PRÉSIDENT DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE APRES L'ATTAQUE TERRORISTE DE NICE	90

List of tables:

TABLE 1: PRELIMINARY ANALYTICAL MODEL 34
TABLE 2: LIST OF SPEECHES 37
TABLE 3 ANALYTICAL MODEL, INCLUDING RESULTS 68

1. Introduction

Over the past two decades, the issue of radical Islam and the proliferation of domestic religious-motivated terrorist attacks in France has reached alarming levels. France has been identified as a primary target of jihadist terrorism due to the rising threat posed by such attacks (Europol, 2022, p. 15) Against this backdrop, the French model of secularism, *laïcité*, has emerged as a crucial element in discussions about how to tackle radicalism. While *laïcité* has been lauded for promoting equal treatment and inclusion of religious minorities, critics argue that politicians' interpretations of this model disproportionately target Muslims, exacerbating an identity crisis and a sense of disillusionment (Maurot, 2012). In France, the challenge of addressing religious-motivated terrorism and radicalism is intertwined with both external and internal complexities.

Rebuilding the national identity after terrorist attacks in France goes beyond political measures such as anti-terrorism law projects (Vie Publique, 2021). The president's rhetoric in responses to terrorism and competing narratives from political oppositions can play a crucial role in the reconstruction of national identity. At the same time, defending and developing a national identity ensures legitimacy for the institutions within a country (Campbell, 1998, p. 12). However, since «[p]eople struggle over power [...] they struggle over the words that express power» (Brummett, 2014, p. 4). Rhetorical responses to terrorism, under the presidency of Emmanuel Macron, have often occurred subsequently and intended to restore the French national narrative by emphasizing the values of the French Republic. By analyzing how Macron addresses a heterogeneous and multi-religious population, this study explores the effort to reconstruct the concept of *laïcité* as the foundational principle of the Republic.

This thesis studies terrorism from a rhetorical angle and through the perspective of constitutive rhetoric (Charland, 1987). This literature is built on varying disciplines, ranging from philosophy, and linguistics, to the study of political communication. However, though there are many successful attempts in creating analytical frameworks for the analysis of constitutive rhetoric, few, if any structured analytical frameworks are actively employing the basic premises of constitutive rhetoric as defined by the philosopher and rhetorician, Kenneth Burke (1969). Insufficient comprehension of how language shapes identity and how political leaders use it to unite a population through shared values can have significant implications for understanding the complex dynamics at play within the realm of politics. By going in-depth into the literature on constitutive rhetoric, and the Burkean literature that emphasizes identification, a better understanding can be gained regarding how identity is rhetorically reconstructed through the lens of values. Especially in cases where values are contested and

may imply division. This, in turn, enhances our knowledge and comprehension of how politics is founded in shared narratives about the most significant political entity of our time: The nation. A detailed analytical model not only unites different pieces of remarkable literature, but it may also allow the researcher to analyze in a more consistent way. Such an approach is well-suited for the analysis of constructions of identity in the aftermath of terrorist attacks.

Studying constitutive rhetoric is relevant in Social Sciences because rhetoric is central in politics. For the field of Political Science, there is a growing body of research related to the state leaders' primary tasks. Namely to unite the nation around a common political project, thereby constructing a rhetorical narrative (Brummett, 2008, p. 118; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). An analysis of constitutive rhetoric can reveal how Emmanuel Macron through identification shapes identities and national narratives like "we" and "the other" after an act of terrorism. By condemning terrorism through speeches, Macron responds to the ideas that he considers national threats. More importantly, the speeches allow the president to unite the French people around a common set of values widely shared within French society and partly fill the respective values with new content. Considering that French secularism is frequently questioned in debates regarding Islamism and radicalism, this thesis is concerned with analyzing *laïcité*. Understanding how core values, such as *laïcité*, lies behind the French «we» will allow us to understand the kind of national identity that is expressed and reconstituted in times of crisis.

The friction between the core values of the French Republic and the need to confront Islamic terrorism raises a rhetorical dilemma about how such a crisis should be addressed. The tension in a self-claimed non-religious state that needs to quickly respond to a serial of attacks linked to one specific religion invokes the reconstitution of French national identity. This raises the question:

How does Emmanuel Macron reconstitute laïcité as a foundation for a national identity through his speeches delivered as responses to terrorist attacks in France between March 2018 and October 2020?

This thesis aims to explore the interaction between the national identity constituted Emmanuel Macron within context of terrorism in France. Additionally, this thesis can give a broader understanding of cases of national identity-building in Western countries that are confronted with terrorism. Examining the French case can also foster a broader understanding of similar rhetorical situations of terrorism and its impact on the construction of national identity.

My second contribution is to enrich the body of research theoretically and methodologically. The framework employed in this thesis draws on Kenneth Burke's concepts while incorporating newer theoretical perspectives. By applying this framework to analyze political leaders, the thesis contributes to the bridging of constitutive rhetoric and political science disciplines. This interdisciplinary approach allows for a comprehensive examination of how political leaders utilize rhetoric to shape and construct national identity in the face of terrorism. More broadly having insight into how rhetorical responses contribute to national identity-building can help national political leaders become more aware of the impact of rhetoric on national narrative-building. More importantly, it helps us as political scientists to gain more knowledge about the constitutive function of rhetoric in politics, and to develop new analytical tools for the study of political communication and narratives in national identity-building.

1.1 Structure of the thesis

The research question implies an analysis of how *laïcité* is represented through rhetoric and as a foundation for the national identity Macron constitutes. In order to conduct the analysis, this thesis aims at building a comprehensive analytical model based on constitutive rhetorical theory. Maurice Charland's theoretical concept of constitutive rhetoric builds on the principles of Kenneth Burke's literature. Charland proposes an analytical framework that is especially useful for the analysis of national narratives in rhetoric. However, the research question of this thesis requires tools that allow us to delve into how particular values, such as *laïcité*, have a central and influential role in different identification processes. Burke's identification theory (1969) proposes four analytical terms that are not only useful, but necessary for analyzing how identification occurs, and how it contributes to the construction of national narratives. Since Burke does not present his analytical terms as concrete analytical tools, the theoretical framework chapter will go in-depth into the literature, and extract the theoretical elements that are needed to answer the respective research question.

The next chapter introduces us to certain specific attributes of the French case, highlighting the important role of *laïcité* in France, terrorism in France, and the rhetorical dilemma addressed in this thesis. The third chapter draws on Maurice Charland (1987), Kenneth Burke (1969), Michael McGee (1975), Edwin Black (1970), Philip Wander (1999), and important recent applications of constitutive rhetoric. The chapter illustrates each analytical trajectory and serves as an important device to understand the analytical framework presented

in the fourth chapter. The fifth chapter sheds light on the role of the French president and, outlines the context of the three terrorist attacks and provides descriptive information to understand what Macron is responding to in his four speeches and the analysis in chapter six. The results displayed in the analysis chapter serve as a basis for the discussion in chapter seven. The most significant findings and the answer to the research question raised in this thesis are presented in chapter seven together with discussion and concluding remarks.

2. Laïcité, an Ideological Principle for the French Republic

The secular value, *laïcité*, was born during the Age of Enlightenment, under the French Revolution and later codified as a principle through the 1905 law, separating the church from the state. The law became part of the French constitution in 1946 and continued in the Fifth Republic, formed by Charles de Gaulle in 1958 (Baubérot & Poulat, 2017, p. 5). Though the term “*Laïcité*” is often translated into secularism, there is still no vernacular translation of the term in English. However, one can interpret *laïcité* through Isaiah Berlin’s developed terms “negative” and “positive” freedom, to understand the mechanism of French secularism. While negative freedom implies the absence of external rules and barriers for the individual, positive freedom implies opportunities for autonomy and self-realization (Kis, 2012, p. 35). The negative understanding can be used as a basis to understand the French interpretation of the secular principle. The historian and sociologist Jean Baubérot is referred to as the founder of the *sociology of laïcité* and is probably one of the most relevant theorists for clarifying what *laïcité* entails. By emphasizing freedom *from* religion, Baubérot explains that the purpose is for individuals to be able to reason freely and be detached from dominant cultural or biological contexts.

Laïcité can be both interpreted as a judicial matter and as a matter of narrative. The 1905 law is a result of political work to establish *laïcité* as a principle for the French Republic, and both interpretations may be disconnected and may interact with each other. According to Jean Baubérot, different views claim to be the true heirs of the 1905 law. For him, the most faithful defenders of pure Republican *laïcité* tend to have a broader conception of neutrality than what the law intended originally. Baubérot explains that a neo-Jacobin conception of *laïcité* intends to promote the idea of the “abstract citizen” which may be religious, but who is religiously neutral in the public sphere (Horvilleur, 2014, p. 127). The view reflects a protective and defensive perspective of *laïcité* against religious practices in public. The development of the narrative of *laïcité* has proved that it is not concerned with the relationship between the church and the state anymore (Baubérot, 2009, p. 13). While the 1905 law was originally presented as an ideological basis for the secular state, it has developed to become an integrated norm within the France society, that is both political and social. The law was meant to ensure freedom of conscience and exercise religion and respect the self-organization of each religion (Horvilleur, 2014, p. 129). According to Baubérot, *laïcité* exists through concrete interpretations that are more or less consistent depending on the given historical and social context. Thus, «[n]owhere you find absolute forms of *laïcité*, but rather concrete forms of *laïcité*, which are consistent and

different based on the historical and social context» (Baubérot, 2009, p. 10). Baubérot here distinguishes between the concept and the social reality *laïcité* entails. However, politicians in France have insisted on treating *laïcité* as an absolute, unchangeable nature, instead of considering the principle as dynamic.

In France *laïcité* is the ground for many debates regarding the role of religion, and conflicts within the French society have since 1905 raised questions on how *laïcité* should be interpreted. Especially with the arrival of immigrants to France, during the era of *Trente Glorieuses* (1945-1974) and in the time after (Baubérot, 2009, p 15). Though the law, the judicial interpretation of *laïcité* seems clear, with a set of criteria that are equal for all religions, and though the judicial process is supposed to treat all citizens in an efficiently equal way, interpretations of *laïcité* seem to treat Islam as an outsider. On top of that, the French approach to identity is also questioned. While the French citizenship law, defines nationality as awarded based on birth on French soil, rather than ethnic origin, the concept of identity is grounded in a state-centered approach. The inconsistency between identity and nationality has been speculated by Islamist propaganda, giving birth to extremist views. The principle of *laïcité* has a central role in the nature of the French society, and the approach toward religion. Meanwhile, questions about national identity actualize the interpretation and role of *laïcité*. Similarly, to previous presidents, Macron has been put in a position where he must also interpret the secular value. This has been crucial in his communication when facing religious-motivated terrorism. This brings us over to the next section which outlines the main lines regarding terrorism in France.

2.1 Terrorism in France

The word *terrorism* appeared for the first time in the *Dictionnaire de l'academie française* in 1798, only a few years after the fall of Maximilien de Robespierre, and was then defined as «system, a regime of terror» (Bauer & Bruguière, 2010, p. 3). In other words, the phenomenon became an operationalized and a “commonly used” term with the French Revolution. However, the semantic meaning of the term has drastically changed. While Robespierre and his allies would proudly use the term to describe their ideal regime, it has become a term to describe the opposite. 179 years after the word entered the dictionary, France signed The European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism (1977) and adopted an institutional infrastructure including political and judicial measures to face and respond to the threats coming from terrorism (UNTS, 1977).

An analysis of terrorism and the tendencies and changes in terrorism in France finds that the jihadist movement remains the main threat, due to its prevalence, its sophistication, and its lethality (Europol, 2022), and the frequency of radical Islamic terrorism in France, outpaces the neighboring countries. Several scholars have observed three interconnected main phases of jihadi terrorism in Europe, in modern times which sheds light on the current threat. The first phase started when France was the target of the Algerian Armed Islamic Group (GIA) in the mid-1990s. The second phase was the attacks across Europe, plotted by al-Qaida, in mid-2000. The third phase is considered to be the ISIS threat (Nesser et al., 2016, p. 6). The intensity of the threat to France is affected by the large foreign fighter contingents in Syria and Iran. Moreover, evidence has shown that French foreign fighters have taken on a special role in ISIS' international operations, especially in Europe (Nesser et al., 2016, p. 8).

Jihadi-motivated terrorism in France has caused the death of 271 people since 2012 (DGSI, 2023). Since the beginning of the first presidential mandate of Emmanuel Macron in 2017, more than ten deadly Jihadi-motivated terrorist attacks have taken place on French soil. This thesis will analyze speeches held after three of the terrorist incidences which attracted worldwide attention: The Carcassonne and Trèbes attacks (March 23rd, 2018), the Notre Dame de Nice attack (October 20th, 2020), and the beheading of the French school teacher Samuel Paty, on October 16th, 2020.

While the president is the central pillar of the French institutional architecture, with a high level of institutional flexibility through the reserved domain of security, defense, and foreign policy. The responsibility also highlights the role of the president in tackling and addressing the threats of terrorism toward his people (Pannier & Schmitt, 2019, p. 898). When the French president for instance describes the murder of a specific target as an attack against French values and the national identity, he voices the security policy of the country while constructing a narrative based on the central pillars of the French Republic, constituting the French subject.

Since this thesis is concerned with terrorism, a type of national crisis, it is important to understand the controversies in crisis communication. «A crisis is typically defined as an untimely but predictable event that has actual or potential consequences for stakeholders' interests as well as the reputation of the organization suffering the crisis» (Millar & Heath, 2003, p. 6). This definition focuses on the consequences for the relationships within a country and its reputation. However, a rhetorical approach to a crisis acknowledges that the responsibility for a crisis is contestable, and rather points out the message development through the response to the crisis. It further emphasizes the role of information, framing, and

interpretation in crisis response (Millar & Heath, 2003, p. 6). This approach seeks to co-define meanings that assist individuals who are or think they are affected by a crisis. The comprehension and interpretation of an event emerge as a pivotal rhetorical theme.

In accordance with crisis communication theory, establishing a national identity is deemed critical when a country undergoes a national crisis such as a terrorist attack. The necessity of a comprehension of how speeches and discourse serve as a means to unite a population in times of crisis, demands an in-depth theoretical framework that allows us to analyze the rhetoric in the respective speeches.

2.2 The rhetorical dilemma

Taking a rhetorical view of crisis events in France, this thesis is devoted to adding insights into the discussion of the constitution of identity. The first of the two previous sections provided information about the development and implications of the 1905 law concerning the separation of the church and the state, and the second section served as an introduction to the context of jihadi-motivated terrorism in France. The latter challenges what is referred to as the foundation of the current French *laïcité* model (Baubérot, 2009, p. 12), which brings us over to the rhetorical dilemma and the perplexity and friction between the values of a secular state that needs to confront ideological Islamic terrorism.

There are tensions between the understanding of the attacks as religious-motivated attacks on French secularism; as religious attacks on the French people from a foreign religion; and as a criminal offense that first and foremost targets the French state. An ongoing challenge during the last decade is religious groups' attempts to live "separately" from the French society, giving their primary loyalty to their religious community, instead of the Republic (Introvigne et al., 2020, p. 4). However, *laïcité* aims at protecting society from the intrusiveness of religions, ensuring that the loyalty of the citizens primarily goes to the Republic. The way in which Macron uses and reformulates *laïcité* rhetorically, expresses and forms contrasts, and draws conflict that challenges the goal of reuniting the people after a national crisis. In the attempt to unify the French subject, and address terrorism there is a probability of strengthening the contrasts between Muslims and Catholics, extremists and moderates, foreign and French, religious, and secular, criminal and law-abiding, external threat and national harmony. The terrorist incidents allow Macron to reconstruct a new understanding of *laïcité*. However, the wavering line between the aspect of *laïcité* that proposes openness by treating all religions equally, allowing everyone to choose freely to believe or not to believe, and the opposite

“closed” perspective that values freedom from religious influence, seem to imply different rules to different religious groups.

The French president, as a head of state, has a responsibility when it comes to communication in times of crisis. The threats from religious-motivated terrorist groups force a response from the president to unite the French people that have suffered from national trauma. While the dilemma requires that the French secular principle is being addressed, the confrontation toward a heterogeneous and fragmented society risks contributing to a ‘state-led identity politics’, creating further division of the society (Akan, 2009, p. 253). The terrorist incidences in France during the last decade have illustrated the vulnerability of the French Republic’s principles. By emphasizing freedom *from* religion, Baubérot has explained that the purpose of the principle was to give all individuals the opportunity to reason freely and detach from dominant cultural or biological contexts. However, the principle is also supposed to set a standard of equality and religious non-discrimination within the state. Furthermore, the terrorist incidents which *conflict with* religious identities show that the structure of laïcité creates a French identity that conflicts with religious identities, amongst Muslim communities (Baubérot et al., 2003, p. 145,165). The position of laïcité as an integrated part of the national ideology has forced previous presidents to recall its content to preserve the legitimacy and credibility of the principle, in the aftermath of terrorist attacks. Understanding the meaning and implication of the value and principle in the identification process is elementary to be able to understand how laïcité is reconstructed by Emmanuel Macron.

While previous presidents in France may represent more predictable discourses, due to belonging to parties with longer history and ideological traditions, Emmanuel Macron, and his then “newborn” party *République En Marche!* (*Renaissance* since September 2022) represents a new phenomenon in the French political landscape. Throughout his campaigns, he has exhausted the traditional left-right cleavage in French politics by contesting the validity of the left-right cleavage (Cole, 2019, p. 83). *In Macron: Miracle ou mirage?* The French political philosopher, Pierre-André Taguieff, described Macron’s success during the first electoral campaign as lying in the capacity to embody opposites. That is being centrist and radical, courteous, and ruthless, and specially appearing both politically correct and anti-system (Taguieff, 2017). The latter can be understood as a way of neglecting established institutions, which makes the case of Macron especially interesting in terms of analyzing how he responds to a crisis. While his role as a president forces him to take practical actions when a national crisis occurs, his legitimacy as a president is also dependent on how he responds to national crises. The way Macron reconstitutes laïcité as part of a broader aspect of national identity

building is crucial to understand how the rhetorical dilemma is tackled during a crisis. Besides, his “innovative” approach to laïcité, and his project as a president, create a larger space for communication.

Analyzing how different types of “identifications” results in a unified narrative of the French people, and how Emmanuel Macron juggles with the principles of the French Republic as an opposition to the external Islamist threats, will allow us to gain unique insight. Furthermore, the experience can help us understand how other Western secular countries deal with crisis communication when a terrorist attack occurs. Since most European and Western countries have adopted a certain interpretation of secularism, the tension described earlier in this section exists everywhere. While Islamic-inspired terrorism is commonly understood as a threat to the country’s respective values and principles by Western leaders. The tension is often treated as a conflict between religions or as a battle between the religious and secularism

The next chapter delves into the theoretical literature that this thesis builds on. Since the methodological framework is built on several abstract conceptions, the following chapter will serve to go in-depth into the ideas and develop the different analytical concepts that will be used in the analytical model and describe how they are applied in the analysis.

3. Theoretical framework

«Identification in itself is a kind of transcendence»
-Kenneth Burke, 1969¹

This chapter consists of a collection of theoretical pieces of literature from the research field of constitutive rhetoric, and Burkean literature on identification. This chapter also serves as an expansion of already existing analytical tools and frameworks of constitutive rhetoric and the analysis of audiences. A detailed review of the literature is necessary to understand how each contribution serves as an analytical tool to analyze how an audience is constituted through rhetoric. An analysis of the audience implies the examination of the narratives and representations constituted in speech, such as the model of the auditor which can emerge in the process of identification (Burke, 1969). The literature is further concretized and explained in the analytical model (see Chapter 4.1).

The analysis is based on Kenneth Burke's (1969) rhetorical theory on identification, and Maurice Charland's (1987) constitutive rhetoric theory. The latter draws upon Burke's literature. Both scholars focus on how identity is created in the intersubjective meeting between the rhetors and the audience (Brummett, 1976, p. 30). These overarching theories are complemented with analytical tools developed by Edwin Black (1970) and Philip Wanders (1999) about the *second persona* and *third persona* which emphasizes linguistic representations in rhetoric. Finally, this thesis employs the theoretical concept of "ideograph" introduced by Michael McGee (1975) to examine how ideology is manifested in text and how it is established and upheld through language. These theoretical contributions share features extracted from the research tradition of intersubjective rhetorical analysis (Brummett, 1976), and serve to get enhance our understanding of how rhetoric can induce the formation of identities.

Intersubjective rhetorical analysis builds on the understanding of the language as reflecting a reality, and that collective identity emerges through the language. According to Barry Brummett, «[i]ntersubjectivity holds that the discovery of reality and the testing of it is never independent of people but takes place through people» (1976, p. 30). This implies that the understanding and experience of reality is something shared by a group of people. Thus, since "truth" is created and discovered, a greater responsibility is put on the rhetor. For they are part of the context that to some extent determines how the audience will view reality (Brummett, 1976, p. 40). However, from that perspective, the primary subject is not the rhetor.

¹ Burke, 1969, p. 326

Instead, the focus is switched over to the audience. Since the rhetorical positioning of an audience constituency can have political force, the audience is a subject of interest.

Hence, it breaks with the tradition of the neo-Aristotelian and classical rhetorical theory which primarily focuses on the rhetor as the main subject and how the success of the rhetor is dependent on the ability to persuade the audience (Burke, 1969, p. 38). The contemporary rhetorical theory represents an alternative to the dominant understanding of rhetoric as strategic responses. Intersubjective rhetoric instead looks at the audience as constituted entities and emphasizes the role of interpretation in the analysis of rhetoric. It recognizes the interpretation process as intuitive and based on the individual experience and knowledge of each analyst. Within the tradition, there are theoretical and ontological assumptions about representation and policy being mutually constitutively linked to each other (Black, 1970, p. 130).

Following the principle of intersubjectivity, Maurice Charland (1987) has developed the notion of constitutive rhetoric. For him, rhetoric is crucial when calling a common collective identity into existence. He proposes that a “people” is brought up to existence as a political subject through the identification process of rhetorical narratives (p. 134). Before delving into Burke's literature on identification, it is crucial present Charland's constitutive rhetoric literature, which serves as the overarching theoretical framework for the analytical model developed in this thesis. The next section will therefore delve into how constitutive rhetoric creates a possibility for a rhetor to construct a national narrative, creating new or keeping a live a specific national subject.

3.1 Constitutive Rhetoric

The previous section gave a brief introduction to intersubjectivity as a basic premise for the theoretical contributions which are part of the analytical model used to analyze Emmanuel Macron's speeches. For this thesis, Maurice Charland's literature on constitutive rhetoric is particularly important. Charland's literature, rooted in Burke's (1969) conception of rhetoric as identification, proposes a new perspective to the literature of rhetoric, by focusing on national narratives. Based on contemporary theoretical traditions, including language philosophy, philosophical deconstruction, and poststructuralism, one can contend that Charland's version of constitutive rhetoric is based on a social constructionist assumption about the contingency of human beliefs and the potential of discursive action (Jasinski & Merecieca, 2010, p. 314). Charland understands interpellation as the result of the act of addressing. That happens when

one enters a rhetorical situation, and as soon as the audience recognizes being spoken to. Rhetorical interpellation and the «[...] process of constituting a collective subject is the first ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric» (Charland, 1987, p. 139). Charland understands ideology as a political identity constructed through rhetoric. This understanding focuses on how ideology operates through language and as a dynamic force that is continually produced and reproduced through rhetorical practices. Through the analysis of the French-speaking part of Canada, Quebec, Charland argues that subjective identities are called into being by ideological positions in the rhetorical process of identification. The narrative of the people Quebecois is ideological because it suppresses the fact that the world can be interpreted differently throughout time and occults the meaning of culture and discourse. Collective identities, thus, only exist through an ideological discourse that constitutes an illusion of a unified subjectivity.

In characterizing personae, the important factor of analysis is ideology: «The persona or subject "people quebecois" exists only as a series of narrative ideological effects». (Charland, 1987, p. 139). According to Charland, the constitutive function is often neglected because discourse often tends to create an illusion of revealing a pre-constituted identity, which occults the importance of discourse, culture, and history (Charland, 1987, p. 139). An ultimate identification, however, permits going beyond class and divisive interests. Identity thus, transcendent limitations linked to the individual's body and will. Charland highlights three characteristics of constitutive rhetoric that have an impact on the constituents. 1) through constitutive rhetoric a collective subject is constituted; 2) the subject is put in a transhistorical context through constitutive rhetoric; 3) constitutive discourse creates the illusion of being free for those identifying with the constituency.

The network of interconnected convictions in a human epistemically shapes the identity by determining how to view the world. In *Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Quebecois* (1987), Charland uses the case of the Quebecois liberty movement to analyze how identity is constituted. For Charland, it is not enough to analyze how an orator convinces the audience (Charland, 1987, p. 134). The orator is not the fixed primary subject. Instead, the subject of analysis is the audience and the shared identity that is constituted through a speech (Charland, 1987, p. 147). Likewise, Emmanuel Macron's rhetorical strategy of intended persuasion is beside the point of the main focus of this thesis. The analysis rather focuses on the intersubjective meeting between Emmanuel Macron as the highest authority of the French state and the audience.

According to Charland, politicians, like Emmanuel Macron, do not talk to an audience. Instead, through political discourse they constitute the people (Charland, 1987, p. 137). In

Charland's analysis of Quebec, he explains how the term used for citizens of Quebec is moving from "French-speaking Canadians" to "Quebecers". Through rhetorical constitutive analysis, Charland demonstrates how ideas about a distinctive identity emerge through communication. The means of action is to a certain extent caused by how politicians portrayed «identity» as innate and natural, not as something that is constituted. In the analysis of constitutive rhetoric, Charland emphasizes the orator's use of narratives. When politicians constitute narratives about a group of people or an identity, they create conceptions based on features. Through the example of Quebec, Charland demonstrates how narratives are ideological, because they occult the importance of discourse, culture, and history to give rise to subjects, and because subjectivity is social, constituted in language (Charland, 1987, p. 139). Thus, the term "Quebecers" exists because it is maintained through a collective identity, shaped by the narrative and ideological effects.

What is important to keep in mind when addressing constitutive rhetoric is that it positions the audience toward political, economic, and social action in the material world, and it is in this positioning that the ideological character becomes important (Charland, 1987, p. 141). Members of an audience must be successfully interpellated, which means that constitutive rhetoric also can fail. Another important factor is the concept of tautological logic in constitutive rhetoric, which refers to the idea that individuals must act freely within the social world in order to validate or confirm their position as a subject. Tautological logic suggests that one's actions and behaviors align with their self-identified role or identity. By acting in accordance with their perceived identity or position, individuals validate and strengthen their sense of self. Charland (1987) further explains that to be embodied as a subject is to experience and act in a textualized world. However, since the world is not seamless the understanding of a subject can be characterized by contradictions. New constitutive rhetoric can resolve such contradictions by providing the subject with new motives and perspectives of the world. "Quebecois" resolves the contradiction at the discursive level by identifying through the image of a population within a territory, and not an ethnic minority.

In the case of France, reconstituting the French national identity after terrorist attacks happens not only through political measures such as the law projects to combat terrorism (Vie Publique, 2021). Rather, national identity may be reconstructed through the president's way of addressing the nation and responding rhetorically to terrorism and competing constitutive rhetoric from terrorists or adversary politicians. The ideological aspect is important in that respect. Instead of understanding ideology as something static, this thesis adopts Charland's interpretation of ideology as something that is constituted and reconstituted through language.

In this case, the reconstruction of *laïcité* will be analyzed as a central factor for the constitution of Macron's audience. Hence, this thesis conceptualizes the audience as rhetorically constructed through narratives that act on audiences to constitute a people.

This section proposed that constitutive rhetoric creates a possibility for a rhetor to construct a national narrative, creating new or keeping alive a specific national subject. The following section brings us over to the basic premises of constitutive rhetoric and Burke's literature which offer valuable insights into the philosophical concept of identification and the process of identification itself. These insights allow the extraction of analytical tools that aid in the analysis of the subjects that are constituted through identification. Understanding how identification occurs through rhetoric is central to comprehending how the audience as a participant, co-constitutes the national narrative. Burke's concepts can be used to analyze how the audience participates in the construction of the national narrative through identification.

3.2 Identity through Rhetoric

Kenneth Burke proposes *identification* as the key element of the rhetorical process. In *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1969), Burke proposes that the construction of identity and identification should be the material of analysis. In doing so, he seeks to delineate the areas of rhetoric, by revealing how rhetorical motives are present where it is not commonly recognized. The audience is not analyzed apart or prior to a speech. Instead, the audience is analyzed as a participant in the discourse that is being built, in line with intersubjective theory which understands the rhetorical situation as a mutual process.

Burke replaces "persuasion" with "identification" as the key term of rhetoric. According to Burke "persuasion" is linked to "identification" in contexts of communication. Persuasion happens *through* identification and the relation between persuasion and identification can be characterized by a stylistic use of identification. That is the act of identifying with an audience, to cause them to identify with the rhetor's interests (Burke, 1969, p. 46). Burke further writes that «You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his» (Burke, 1969, p. 55). In other terms one is more likely to go along with rhetoric that makes them feel consubstantial, and flattery can help in that respect. By creating a connection between the rhetor and the audience, the rhetors may try to display the right "rhetoric". When there is an already established connection between the rhetor and the audience, the rhetors can use their positions to encourage the audience to accept what is being said. The persuasiveness of a rhetor

is, thus, strengthened by intersubjective identification. Consequently, Burke proposes to shift the focus from analyzing how rhetoric is used to persuade, to analyzing the audience as the principal subject.

According to Burke, rhetoric induces actions, therefore we should view opinions as related to certain conduct. For instance, when a given audience has a strong opinion of what they consider an admirable behavior, the rhetor is given the possibility to use signs that identify with the behavior (Burke, 1969, p. 53). Though opinions can be contrasted with the truth, rhetoricians do not operate with opinions as true or false in a strictly scientific way. Instead, they operate with opinions in a moral order of action when they try to persuade to a certain conduct. While persuasion is focused on action and outcome, identification is focused on perceived commonalities. That can be explained as a mutual process in someone's mind that happens before they take a decision. The identity of a person is based on specific values, opinions, perceptions, and other factors that shape the decision and actions. However, decisions and actions also shape the identity and how the world is perceived. In other terms, there is a mutual process between the identification that exists prior to a speech and the effect it has on the audience when they are exposed to rhetoric. For instance, Burke explains that when a politician says, "I was a farm boy myself", that can lead farmers to believe that the politician will favor policies that benefit farmers (Burke, 1969, p. xiv). For Burke, rhetoric is not necessarily about convincing, turning opinions around, or beating opinions. Instead, it is about presenting ideas, not by challenging but rather by connecting with the audience. He demonstrates how appealing to an audience through identification results in persuasion.

Processes of socialization within societies imply identification as well as faction and division. Since most societies consist of individuals of different ages, social classes, backgrounds, political opinions, and values, identification implies division between the respective people within a society. There is no need for rhetoric where all people agree, or as Burke states, «[i]f men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity» (Burke, 1969, p. 22). Since the language creates divisions and separates people into groups based on commonalities, people seek to identify with one another to confront or bridge divisions. Thus, according to Burke, it is at the heart of rhetoric's usefulness to resolve division (Burke, 1969, p. 45). He also explains that there is no strife in absolute separateness, since opponents or enemies will only be able to confront each other if there is a mediatory ground that makes communication possible (Burke, 1969, p. 25). Common grounds are therefore required for division and identification to occur. Since individuals identify with one another based on shared properties or qualities, any conscious or non-

conscious commonalities can serve as an opportunity for identification. Believing to have something in common with an orator is sufficient. During a national crisis, political rivals may be compelled to collaborate based on shared common interests, such as problem-solving, which holds moral and strategic significance within the context of the crisis. However, overlapping characteristics cannot necessarily be identified strategically, because of the wavering line in between. Dependent on what is considered strategic, based on position, resource, and interest, the rival rhetoricians choose where to draw the line. Burke explains that great rhetoric, which is neglected by the press, will for instance not have the same possibility to reach out, as poor rhetoric backed by national headlines. This illustrates how the wavering line can become problematic.

Instead of thinking of rhetoric in terms of addresses, one should, according to Burke treat rhetoric as a general body of identification. However, an action can become rhetorically framed for the effect. Regardless of how pure the motives of the rhetors may be, impurities of identification in different situations can induce a rhetorical wrangle (Burke 1969, p. 26). That may occur when a speaker has perverse motives when identifying favorably with the audience. This idea was developed by Lawrence Rosenfeld, who explains that «[t]he identification is cunning because it does not actually exist, but is only created to achieve a desired end» (Rosenfeld, 1969, p. 182). Also, “ingenious” identification can occur without people realizing it, and “there is a wide range of ways whereby the rhetorical motive, through the resources of identification, can operate without conscious direction by any particular agent” (Burke, 1969, p. 35). That explains how identification can occur subconsciously, proving that it is enough and effective if the audience thinks of the identification as real.

From that reasoning, one can assume that the leader of a country, for instance, Emmanuel Macron, is given the possibility to unite a socially and politically heterogeneous society, after a national crisis such as a terrorist attack.

In the discussion of identification, Burke identifies four categories that can help understand how identification works, and how it is used to persuade an audience. Though the categories have an overlapping character, *consubstantiality*, *property*, *autonomy*, and *cunning* are terms that perfectly serve as analytical tools to analyze identification from different focuses and perspectives.

3.2.1 Identification and Consubstantiality

Identification in rhetoric involves the alignment of one's interests with those of others and the establishment of a connection between the rhetor and the audience. This connection can be facilitated through the concept of consubstantiality. The concept is based on stylistic identification and symbolic structures. When two persons are consubstantial, they are persuaded that they share a commonality which produces acceptance in a common context, which allows them to identify. However, when someone experiences consubstantiality, associate, and identify with someone, they are still different from what they identify with. «To call a man a friend or brother is to proclaim him consubstantial with oneself, one's values or purposes» (Burke, 1969, p. 57). This illustrates that when someone (A) identifies with another person (B), A is consubstantial with B (Burke, 1969, p. 20). However, A may identify with B, even if their interests are not joined. Cause person A may be persuaded or assume that they are joined, even if it is not the case. Thus, they are both joined and separate.

Burke emphasizes the term “substance” in his understanding of consubstantiality. He describes how «[...] substance, in the old philosophies, was an act [...]» (Burke, 1969, p. 21). By that, he explains that in acting together, people have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, and attitudes that make them consubstantial. In that way, rhetoric deals with the possibility to classify individuals in its partisan aspects. Thus, analyzing which words, and terms the rhetor uses to address an audience, allows us to understand how consubstantiality is used rhetorically in the context of identification. Since the speeches, in this thesis, operate in the context of terrorism, epideictic terms and formulations are especially relevant, when looking at the consubstantial aspect of the text. That is, the use of pronouns such as “we”, “us”, and “our”, and terms such as “French”, “citizen” and “people”, and general values and ideas brought up in a way characterized by the creation of a common understanding of the contexts of the speech. Analyzing how Macron’s rhetoric constructs the illusions of commonalities allows us to understand how the audience identifies through consubstantiality.

3.2.2 Identification and Property

Identification revolves around a rhetor *identifying* with an audience and vice versa. Thus, identification involves finding properties and substances which a person or an object is composed of, that they have or assume to have in common. To understand rhetoric, it is therefore important to understand the role of property in the process of identification. A rhetorical identification of property refers to material and economic goods such as physical and

non-physical goods (Burke, 1969, p. 24). Burke highlights status, positions, citizenship, and reputation as examples of properties that are forming identities. He explains that «[i]n the surrounding of himself with properties that name his number or establish his identity, man is ethical» (Burke, 1969, p. 24). Someone (A) may identify with someone (B) based on where they live, academic background, or social status. However, even if they identify in some issues, disaccord can occur. For instance, identifications established through the property can come into relation with another instant that is forming the identity, such as property in terms of job position and social status. Identifying with an audience based on properties implies that material goods such as money, house, and other visible properties, and non-material goods such as language, status, nationality, and other more abstract properties, can work as a vector in the intersubjective meeting between the orator and audience more generally. Thus, the properties highlighted in a speech allow us to understand who the rhetor intent to reach out to. Based on the rhetorical analysis of properties, we can classify groups and discover who constitutes desired audience of the rhetors. When individuals associate with others based on shared properties or characteristics, it is important to recognize that these very same properties can also create moments of disassociation or separation between them. When a rhetor speaks to the desired audience, identification will also mark out the group which is not part of the speakers desired audience. This is relevant in crisis communication because it often implies uniting a population against a common threat.

Uniting a people can be done by identifying through properties such as citizenship and being part of a specific community or population. In the context of the French case, where terrorist incidences have been led out by religious extremists, it is relevant to look at how Macron addresses the religious dimension. This is especially important since this thesis addresses the reconstruction of the secular principle. Examining the way framing certain properties as unifying can facilitate identification is particularly significant in the context of crisis communication, as it sheds light on how audiences attribute importance to their properties, and how these attributes contribute to the process of identification with others.

3.2.3 Identification and Autonomy

Societies are based on different groups that often are defined and categorized according to the specialized activity that they perform or represent. Burke explains that «[t]he fact that an activity is capable of reduction to intrinsic, autonomous principles does not argue that it is free

from identification with other orders of motivation extrinsic to it» (Burke, 1969, p. 27). That means that different groups within a society should be able to identify based on other qualities than specialized activity. Burke argues that “[i]dentification is a word for the autonomous activity’s place in this wider context.” (Burke, 1969, p. 27). Nonetheless, activities such as education or profession can significantly influence an individual's character and subsequently lead to categorization into social and economic classes. However, it does not mean that for instance two students sitting next to each other identify differently or similarly with the subject which is being taught in the classroom.

The complexity of identification proves that “*belonging*” is something rhetorically constructed, and sometimes unacknowledged or hidden. Burke explains that one may think that a shepherd acts for the good of the sheep. Yet, the shepherd may identify with different motives, like the profit of selling the sheep. Two persons in the same context, as well as two persons in different contexts, may interpret a situation differently. Analyzing an individual’s specialized activities, allow the researcher to rhetorically identify what makes an individual participant of a group. Instead of looking at how the shepherd treats his animals, one should rather look at the role of a shepherd and how it influences the character of a shepherd. When analyzing Macron's speeches, it is important to consider the relevance of identifying with specialized groups, particularly during and after terrorist attacks, as crisis communication accentuates the significance of these groups in addressing a national crisis. By analyzing how the French president addresses and discusses security forces, emergency forces, and teachers in his speeches, we can gain insights into how Macron uses specific societal roles to foster a sense of belonging and constitute national narratives. This analysis enables us to understand the narrative and perception of these groups within the context of his speeches.

3.2.4 Cunning Identification

Burke points to expanding the realm of rhetoric to also include the way that individuals operate rhetorically upon themselves, constructing identifications through motives that are either nonconscious or unexamined. Burke explains that if a social class does not pay enough attention to the scrutiny of identifications that flatter their interest, the identification is profitable because the rhetor may have different interests than the audience. «This aspect of identification, whereby one can protect an interest merely by not using terms incisive enough to criticize it properly, often brings rhetoric to the edge of cunning» (Burke, 1969, p. 36). Identification of rhetoric that is directly designed for use, puts us in a problem of consciousness. Since

individuals are not fully aware of the identification they do, identification occurs subconsciously. Cunning identification occurs when people try to identify falsely and can for instance be done to build up false identifications in the mind of an audience (Burke, 1969, p. 37). For instance, in a conservative society, liberal politicians may still consider themselves rhetorically honest, even if they adapt their language and rhetoric to suit the audience, as long as their intentions are rooted in goodwill. Overplaying a role can be understood as a way of amplifying a statement. Though it is not possible to explicitly know the intention of a rhetor, one can still analyze how words create an image, and how that in return creates illusions of a phenomenon, for instance, a common “we” or a “people”. This aspect can also be revealed through the analysis of metaphors, exaggerations, contrasts, and generalizations. Since this thesis analyzes speeches, it is relevant to examine how identification can create false identifications. This is especially relevant since this thesis addresses the constitution of national identity during a crisis, where the president aims to reconstruct a narrative based on particular values.

Burke’s analytical terms create the possibility to receive detailed insight and an in-depth and structured understanding of how identification occurs through rhetoric. It is noteworthy that the concepts of identification were not fully crystallized in the corpus of Kenneth Burke’s work. Rather than reducing Burke’s conception to a single source, his understanding of identification should be understood as evolving over time. Burke acknowledges the importance of a sense of community in rhetorical argumentation while pointing out that the classical rhetoric tradition did not fully recognize the social function of discourse (Graff & Winn, 2011, p. 108).

The next section introduces us to the notions of the *Second Persona* (1970) and the *Third Persona* (1984) within the study of rhetoric. Through Burke’s identification theory, the notions can further serve to understand how the implied auditor and the negated audience are shaped through identification.

3.3 The second and the third persona

The previous paragraphs introduced us to the link between argumentation and the constitution of an audience. Following the notions of section 3.1, where *identification theory* and its principles were narrowed into four analytical terms, this section aims at providing two analytical tools for the analysis which suit well with the identification approach. The insight from the previous section serves as a foundation for the analysis of *The Second Persona*

developed by Edwin Black (1970) and *The Third Persona* developed by Phillip Wander (1999). Given the central theme of this thesis, which revolves around the reconstruction of laïcité and the French national identity, comprehending how Macron navigates the context of terrorism within a multicultural and multireligious society renders the analysis of the second persona and third persona perspectives vital in grasping the narratives constructed by Macron. This section will therefore elaborate on how the textual tools, namely the second persona and the third persona, can be used to analyze the intersubjective dynamics between the rhetor (Macron) and the audience. It aims to elucidate how Macron unifies the second persona by emphasizing the principle of laïcité, while simultaneously creating a distinction between his desired audience and the third persona.

As noted earlier, traditional rhetoric emphasizes strategic analysis of speeches, while Burke has opened a door to the analysis of rhetoric by focusing on the relation between rhetoric and the audience. By adopting Black and Wander's notions, the theory can become more available for practical analytical purposes. The understanding that positions and roles are constructed within texts implies the invocation of a set of rhetorical tools and mechanisms specifically designed for constructing such positions and roles.

Edwin Black is mostly known for his reputation as a rhetorical critic, especially his critical studies and the development of the theoretical concept, The Second Persona. Through his work, he first and foremost has provided a detailed description of the fundamental powers of the critic. He argues that neo-Aristotelian rhetoric is too narrow and too focused on persuasive discourse. Hence, he demonstrates that the study of rhetoric affords the opportunity for more productive analysis (Kauffeld, 2001, p. 235-236). Rhetoric should, according to Black, reveal the hidden mechanism and the premises the audience accept to be part of a certain rhetorically constructed community.

Black developed a theoretical concept, The Second Persona (1970), where he argues that rhetoric is central to building an audience and the "people", and that rhetorical texts exert ideological influence on their audiences (Black, 1970, p. 111). Discourses are, according to Black, difficult to morally judge because they can be used for both harmful and beneficent purposes. Notwithstanding, moral judgments of rhetoric are needed for fulfilling the critic's mission to create order throughout history (Black, 1970, p. 109). That can be resolved by revealing the ideological content of a text, which leads us to the pathway of the theoretical concept of personae. According to Black, when a rhetor presents himself or herself in a specific way, the rhetor also constructs the ideal audience. The first persona is the image of the rhetor that is implied by the speech or the text. Therefore, elements of a text may also shape an

audience's perception of the rhetor's credibility. Through an analysis of the implied author's rhetoric, the second persona can give insight into the qualities of the perfect audience. However, it does not provide any information about the intentions of the rhetor. Thus, the second persona represents a rhetorically constructed model of the idealized audience. However, it is important to note that the audience will look for the discourse that can indicate or give hints to one's own identity, and thereby explain how the world should be perceived.

«Actual auditors look to the discourse they are attending for cues that tell them how they are to view the world, even beyond the expressed concerns, the overt propositional sense, of the discourse» (Black, 1970, p. 113).

The role of ideology, here, plays an important role in constructing personae. Cues do not have to be explicit in the text. For an orator, more abstract instructions can serve as a way of disseminating a message more efficiently. Through this method, a politician can construct the ideal audience and put forward the ideology they want the audience to adopt. This again, will according to Black shape the audience's act and their position as a subject. Metaphors, signs, and symbols are tools that form the second persona. Black uses the example of how cancer, the disease, is used as a metaphor for communists in *The Blue Book* by Robert Welch. This instance shows how "cancer", a deadly disease, is used to portray a fearful image of a group of people. According to Black, the utilization of the metaphor served as a strategic tool for far-right politicians, enabling them to exploit fears that were implicitly transferred to the intended audience (Black, 1970, p. 115). And so forth, the rhetor guides the audience toward an identity. Through the process of constituting the second persona (in-group), an out-group emerges as a contrast. The latter is the third persona which was developed by Philip Wander, as a critical perspective to Black's essay on the second persona.

The essay of Black was further anthologized and investigated into implied textual personas, including Philip Wander's analysis of the Third Persona (Condit, 2013, p. 2). In *The Third Persona: An ideological turn in rhetorical theory* (1999 [originally published, 1984]). Philip Wander presents the notion of the *third persona*. Philip Wander (1999) describes the third persona as an ideal type that is marginalized and excluded from the defined community that is built around the identity that Black refers to as the second persona. Those who disagree with the ideological premise for the understanding of the self are not part of the rhetor's audience. The third persona serves as a new perspective, by introducing us to the constitution of identities and constituencies through silence. According to Wander:

«[i]t focuses on audiences negated through the “text”—the language, the speaking situation, the established order shaping both. It provides a space in rhetorical theory for those unable not only to find shelter in, but take part in [...] discourse. (Wander, 1999, p. 216)

The third persona allows the researcher to analyze groups that are ignored or left out of a speech through the premises that the rhetor lay down for the belonging of an identity (Wander, 1999, p. 376). From that perspective, the third persona is understood as a rhetorical construction of those who are left out from the rhetor’s desired audience. Put differently, the third persona is the group of people with whom the rhetor does not want the audience to identify with. Third persona’s lack of mobility to become a member of the designed community is particular in the sense that it is not as visibly regulated as the second persona. While the “us” of second persona often is well-defined, the “them” of third persona seems to be less clear (Just & Christiansen, 2012, p. 331). However, the third persona “appears” when the second persona is rhetorically shaped. Third persona is not necessarily rhetorically positioned in opposition to the second persona, for instance as an enemy. The concept of the third persona and second persona in rhetoric represents distinct types of subjects. The third persona refers to an audience that is disregarded or overlooked by the rhetor, while the second persona represents the rhetor’s ideal audience or target. These personas highlight the rhetorical dynamics and the different relationships between the rhetor, the intended audience, and the unaddressed audience.

When rhetoricians expand their ideas and visions through speeches, they shape identity through inclusion and exclusion in the constitutive process of the respective identity. When the rhetor takes the shape of a national spokesperson, for instance, a president or a prime minister, the audience of a speech often extends to a large population and a specific country. Black and Wander provide two textual tools to analyze how national spokespersons constitute an audience in a defined geographical context. This brings us back to Burke’s four terms and the concept of identification. Analyzing the second and third persona through consubstantiality, property, autonomy, and cunning, not only structures the analysis. An examination utilizing these concepts also facilitates the extraction of information pertaining to identification, which is crucial for comprehending the factors that shape a national identity. This allows us to analyze how the second persona is constructed through different identification types, emphasizing on different aspects of an identity. This is also relevant when analyzing third persona, since third persona is left out of the speeches, and by identifying the premises that Macron emphasizes it is possible to analyze the ignored audience.

The analytical framework of second and third persona developed by Black (1970) and Wander (1999) provides valuable tools to examine how Macron constructs the ideal audience

within the framework of Burke's identification theory. Unlike strict interpretations of the second and third persona, as exemplified by Lund and Tønnesson's (2017), this thesis adopts a broader understanding of the textual tools. Burke's more abstract understanding of identification fits better with the analysis of abstract values, such as *laïcité*. Since this thesis uses Burke's textual terms as a foundation for the analysis, the analysis focuses on Burke's identification perspective. Since abstract values exist in the silence of the text, and the meaning of a text varies with the audience (Wander, 1999), it does not necessarily make sense to adopt a strict approach to the analysis. By applying these concepts, we can analyze the rhetorical strategies employed by Macron and understand how he shapes and addresses his intended audience.

The analysis of second and third persona and the underlying idea behind the personae complements the study of ideographs. One of the earliest rhetoricians to approach national ideology as something constructed rhetorically is Michael McGee's conception (1975), which understands the constructed people as praised through rhetoric. As previously informed the second persona represent a rhetorically constructed model of the idealized model and third persona is constituted through being left out from the rhetor's desired audience. This understanding implies the possibility to unite and divide national groups. Likewise, ideographs can also unite and divide a country, because ideographs represent a definitive part of the material and social conditions into which the citizens of a country are born. However, different communities within a country will not necessarily accept the same ideographs. McGee's concept of ideograph represents an ideologically based analytical tool, which is relevant since this thesis is analyzing the reconstruction of *laïcité*. Building on Burke's insight on identity, McGee proves how appeals to a national "people" and a national "we" can be treated as an ideograph to justify political ideologies. The next paragraph focuses on Michael McGee's textual tool, "ideograph", which is necessary to understand how identification occurs through the ideological content implied in Emmanuel Macron's speeches.

3.4 Ideograph: The link between rhetoric and ideology

Similarly to Charland and Burke, Michael McGee builds an understanding of the audience as a flexible concept of identity. However, McGee takes a step further by developing a textual tool that makes it possible to analyze how the implied audience and social categories play together to form an ideological image of the people. Informed by intersubjective rhetorical theory, the audience should be analyzed as constituted entities that emerge through the interpretation of the language (Brummett, 1976, p. 30). However, McGee provides a device that allows the

examination of how political content is framed as natural through the use of social and cultural references. This is necessary since this thesis aims to understand how Macron connects national identity to the French secular term.

In *In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative* (1975), Michael McGee criticizes the rhetorical tradition because it has accepted the audience as an indisputable composition of individuals in a naturally given community. According to McGee, the concept of “people” is a fiction that comes to be when individuals accept to live within a political myth (Charland, 1987, p. 136–137). The people are sovereign, and the language is material and animates the force which is instantiated through acts. In this way, subjects are created through language. According to McGee, the nation is a myth, and the myth is the basis that makes individuals become defined as a “people” and a nation. The moment a group of people is constituted through the rhetorical selection of elements an identity is formed. Consequently, some people are included, excluded, and changed. Rhetoric and semantics shape new perceptions of reality. McGee links the idealist’s study of myths and ideas (ideology) to a materialist account. As an attempt to create an analytical tool for analyzing ideologies and persuasion, he developed the term “ideograph”.

For McGee, the clearest access to persuasion and ideology is through the discourses which an orator uses to produce persuasion. In *The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology* McGee therefore «suggest[s] that ideology in practice is a political language, preserved in rhetorical documents, with the capacity to dictate decision and control public belief and behavior» (McGee, 1980, p. 4). The language that manifests ideology is characterized by a vocabulary of ideographs, which according to McGee, is easily mistaken for the terminology of political philosophy. McGee proposes to analyze the ideographic usage in political rhetoric, to reveal structures of public motives. The latter can be a diachronic or synchronic pattern of political consciousness, used by politicians to exert power and to influence how the audience understands their reality.

According to McGee words are the basic structural elements of ideologies. «Ideographs are one-term sums of an orientation» (McGee, 1980, p. 7), and are used to symbolize a line of arguments that individuals that are part of a society feel committed to pursue. Terms that are asserted with a social significance, can for instance be words such as “liberty” or “property”. McGee argues that such terms are used in everyday language, but problematic because of their specificity. Although terms can appear undefined or vague, members of specific communities will adopt an understanding of the term’s nuance and content. An example McGee uses is that people are taught to think that the rule of law is a logical commitment. However, such terms

can have different definitions in different societies (McGee, 1980, p. 8). There is a social understanding of a term, definitive and conditioned by each society. Ideographs can therefore be understood as instruments of socialization, which instruct, normalize, and inculcate values. McGee suggests that by learning the meaning of ideographs people become predisposed to structure mass responses. Thus, ideology can be understood as a political language composed of terms that construct collective commitment (McGee, 1980, p. 15). McGee's method is suited to investigate the ideology of contemporary societies. The operation of ideographs creates a space for understanding the critic to get insight into how ideology constructs subject positions and controls segments of the population. Hence, myths are tools that secure certain narratives of structural inequality.

Since ideographs are both specific and abstract as well as constructed by the social community, it reflects components of an ideology. It is worth noting that McGee contends that ideographs are often defined in relationship with one another and can become dislocated when the clustered terms change their meaning. The social character of an ideograph also implies division because it represents a political entity. The variation of interpretations of ideographs, along with their respective abstraction, makes them particularly powerful (Mastrangelo, 2017, p. 216). McGee argues that ideologies cannot be understood as entities that are detached from the past understanding and commitment of the respective ideology unless the dislocation has in the past established categories with new meanings. No diachronic ideology can be detached from the "here and now" unless there is intent to justify or form the direction of collective behavior. «Both of these structures must be understood and described before one can claim to have constructed a theoretically precise explanation of a society's ideology, of its repertoire of public motives» (McGee, 1975, p. 14). According to him, a description of an ideology consists of a) the isolation of a society's ideographs, b) the analysis and exposure of the diachronic structure of all ideographs, and c) the characterization of synchronic relationships between the ideographs in a certain context (McGee, 1975, p. 16)".

McGee's literature on ideographs is a tool that can be used to analyze leading values in France through rhetoric. From McGee's definition, ideographs can be understood as terms filled with political content. "Laïcité", the French interpretation of secularism is an example of a value that is particular to the French society. The term is especially relevant since the analysis focuses on terrorism response to attacks led out by religious extremists. However, less contended words pronounced by Emmanuel Macron, such as "freedom" and "solidarity", could hypothetically be used by any political rival to justify their ideologies. Understanding the content, and the underlying ideas behind the use of the terms and the construction of social categories is,

however, what makes analyzing ideographs interesting. An examination of ideographs can provide deeper insights into the interplay between identification and ideology in the process of constructing a national narrative. Analyzing the rhetorical patterns of political awareness in speeches enables us to better understand how political leaders respond to national crises. It sheds light on their strategies, choices, and communication approaches in times of crisis.

3.5 Recent applications of constitutive rhetoric

This thesis builds on the Burkean literature on identification and constitutive rhetoric scholarship by taking a rhetorical approach to understand how national identity is constituted after terrorist attacks. The project invites a literature review on recent contributions, at the intersection of political leader's speeches and national identity building, that builds on the theories presented in this chapter. For this, the background of the academic work is both helpful and needed.

Communication scholars have established an academic milieu for studies using the Burkean approach and the constitutive rhetoric approach. However, the field of political science has yet to demonstrate a comparable level of theoretical investment in these approaches. The professor of communication, Kenneth S. Zagacki has published *Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches* (2007). Zagacki analyses the former US president's, George Bush, speeches from late 2002 to 2007. In the speeches, Bush intended to justify the invasion and occupation of Iraq. The audience consists of both the American and the Iraqi people, and he frames the occupation as a historical founding moment in the Middle East. Based on Maurice Charland's conception of constitutive rhetoric, Zagacki argues that the speeches are examples of failed constitutive rhetoric. For him, the speeches reveal the complexity of creating a particular conception of national identity, in a foreign policy context. More interestingly, through the example of Bush, Zagacki illustrates how ideology is central in constituting a people, and how the lack of recognition from the audience will lead to the failure of constituting a subject. This happens because the rhetor fails to negotiate between the historical narrative, ideology, and the material reality of the foreign subject. It also reveals the limitation and reflexive possibilities of constitutive rhetoric. That brings us back to Burke's conception of identity and his four analytical terms. Though Zagacki's analysis primarily is based on Charland's contributions, he also mentions Burke as a basis for the research's methodology. Though using Burke's literature more actively was not relevant to Zagacki's purpose, Burke's conceptions can serve to get a more in-depth understanding of the identification process.

Another professor of communication, Jake Cowan, published *The Constitutive Rhetoric of Late Nationalism: Imagined Communities after the Digital Revolution*, (2021). In his conclusion, he states that «[...] rhetoricians are called to interrogate more than just the most incendiary symptoms of late nationalism, for our work also plays a critical role in reimagining the very conditions of possibility for a more perfect rhetorical fiction» (Cowan, 2021, p. 195). According to Cowan, constitutive analysis has mainly been developed through the analysis of ideologically extreme figures.

When it comes to terrorism literature and identity shaping, a linguistic scholar at the University of Oslo, Eirik Vatnøy, has published *Leaders' Response to Terrorism: The Role of Epideictic Rhetoric in Deliberative Democracies* (2015). In the paper, he analyses the speech and terror response of the former Norwegian prime minister, Jens Stoltenberg. Vatnøy illuminates the nature of epideictic rhetoric to understand democratic deliberative processes. He concludes by stating that «rhetorical analyses can broaden our understanding of how deliberative processes unfold» (Vatnøy, 2015, p. 18). Even though constitutive rhetoric is central in Vatnøy's analysis, it is mainly focusing on the epideictic aspect of the speech. The analysis focusing on deliberative theory can help us understand how constitutive rhetoric is used to unite a country after terrorist attacks. His analysis helps understand how political communication works within modern societies, and how speeches where the purpose is to unite the people work for creating a community based on a common set of values. This is important because such speeches can influence future political decisions in a country.

Another contribution from a scholar at the University of Oslo comes from the political scientist Tor Gaute Syrstad. In his master's thesis, *The political language of identity* (2017), an analytical model was developed for analyzing new year's speeches of Danish prime ministers. The model unites constitutive rhetoric theory with social identity theory. The structure of the analytical framework serves as a remarkable example of how the field of political science can study rhetoric in political communication and has served as an inspiration for this thesis.

Studies on terrorism and the construction of national identity in France have been led out with different theoretical and methodological approaches. For instance, Ariane Bogain (2019) published an article that focuses on the presidential discourse in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in France, in 2015. It does not give insight into how political leaders use their position to influence and create a national identity, and on what ground national identity is shaped. However, it provides interesting insight on the French case which is useful to understand how political and social meaning is constructed after terrorist attacks in France.

Earlier studies have found that no matter how inclusive the narrative construction of a common «we» is, a community is constituted in contrast to other individuals or groups. The methodology used by Lund and Tønnesson (2017) in their constitutive analysis of the Norwegian king's speech in September 2016, builds on Edwin Black's (1970) and Philip Wander's (1999) literature on "first" and "second persona". By doing so the analysis is a contribution to a continued dialogue about Norwegian identity. Not only is the analysis exposing the moral values and attitudes that the speech negates, and hence excludes a specific audience, but it also shows how the textual tools can be used to analyze and reveal these findings. Overall, it gives a broad understanding of the speech and the audience, which is useful for the analysis part of this thesis.

4. Method and analytical framework

The previous chapter provided valuable insights into the corpus of the Burkean scholarship on identification and the literature on constitutive rhetoric. Furthermore, chapter three manifested how the theories can translate into concrete analytical tools for the analysis of the material, Emmanuel Macron's speeches. This chapter provides information about the methodological approach that will guide the analysis and the material of the analysis.

In the discussion of identification, Burke proposes four analytical terms; *consubstantiality*; *cunning*; *property*, and *autonomy*. While developing and understanding how these factors are central in the process of identification, he emphasizes consubstantiality and division as crucial when defining the realm of rhetoric. Burke conceptualizes identification as a persuasive device that facilitates the process of rhetoric. His understanding of identity is central to the development of the terms that analyze rhetorical inclusion and exclusion, the second and third persona. The concept of identification is also relevant considering the study of ideographs. These theoretical frameworks will serve as critical components in the forthcoming analytical model. The structure of the scheme is inspired by the one developed by Tor Syrstad (2017). The analytical model, proposed in the next section clarifies the analytical framework and will function as a guiding mechanism for examining the four speeches.

4.1 Analytical model

Social and political tensions in France regarding national identity and laïcité affect the way communication is performed. Through the use of an analytical model, the aim is to provide a comprehensive understanding of how the French president utilizes his positions in the aftermath of a catastrophic event to construct a national identity that transcends individual experiences and unifies the collective populace. A rhetorical analysis serves as a valuable tool to understand how rhetoric “positions the reader toward political, social, and economic action in the material world,” (Charland, 1987, p.141). A rhetorical analysis allows us to analyze political discourse, the mechanism of the intersubjective meeting between the rhetor and the audience, and the analysis of the common “we” and the “other”. Since this thesis focuses on the reconstruction of laïcité as the foundation for the French national identity and addresses how terrorism threatens it, identity is at the heart of the analysis. As informed in the previous chapter, Kenneth Burke's philosophical approach to “identification” and the concept of identity serves to understand what basis for identification lay behind Emmanuel Macron's speeches and the reconstruction of laïcité. This section ambitions to present an analytical model, which brings

together the different analytical devices, that were concretized and explained in the theory chapter.

Burke's four terms (1969), developed through the literature of identification serves as a guide for the textual analysis of rhetorical identification; second persona (Black, 1970) and third persona (Wander, 1999); ideograph (McGee, 1975). However, the model uses constitutive rhetoric (Charland, 1987) as an overarching concept for the analytical model.

The analytical model is used to analyze how Macron, through identification, reconstitutes *laïcité* as a foundation for the national narrative through his speeches. In that way, Burke's four categories serve as a guiding tool for the analysis of all the elements of the model. More specifically, the model adopts Burke's approach to identification which he understands and explains through four terms; consubstantiality; property; autonomy; and cunning. As shown in chapter two, these terms have the potential to be used as a qualitative textual tool for the analysis of identification in rhetoric. Through the analysis of identification in political speeches, Burke's literature makes it possible to understand how rhetoric expresses ideas, sensations, and values that form the ground for common sensations and division. Furthermore, Burke opens the door to understanding how language creates the opportunity for political action. That is especially interesting when analyzing the French secular principle.

On the horizontal part of the analytical model, Burke's analytical terms serve as a structure; consubstantiality; property; autonomy; and cunning. Each of the respective terms constitutes a section in the analysis chapter. By dividing the analysis into four sections, we are allowed to dive into the material with specific textual tools, giving an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon identification implies.

In line with Burke's literature on identification, and as a second dimension to the analytical model, four textual terms are highlighted, in the analysis chapter. The two first, the second persona, and the third persona, developed by Black and Wander delineate and concretizes what the analysis seeks to understand. Black's analysis of the the second persona, demonstrates how an orator constructs the ideal audience. By emphasizing ideology in a rather abstract than explicit way, the analysis of the second persona allows us to understand how politicians construct the ideal audience, by analyzing the audience as the primary subject. This brings us over to the next textual tool, the third persona, developed by Wander. Through the analysis of the third persona, Wander provides a tool that helps us to get an understanding of the population, through focusing on the rhetorical construction of those who are not part of the premises for belonging. This analytical approach enhances our comprehension of the broader societal dynamics at play.

Following the Burkean conceptualizations, the ensuing section of analysis aims to identify the ideographs present in the speeches. McGee's literature proposes to analyze ideology and values in rhetoric. Through his approach, he seeks to reveal the political content that revives through rhetoric. In the analytical model, the analytical term serves as a complement to the second and third persona, to understand the process of identification through concrete ideological factors.

The last section of the analysis will collect the findings from each of the previous sections of the analysis chapter which are guided by the Burkean terms. Following the analytical model, the analysis proceeds to Charland's constitutive rhetorical analysis of the national identity constituted through Emmanuel Macron's four speeches. The tool provided by Charland, allows us to unify all the rhetorical perspectives that are used in the analysis chapter. Additionally, it illustrates how the respective rhetorical theories complement each other, and it helps us understand how political leaders, through identification, reconstitute particular values to constitute subjects as part of national narratives.

Through the eight elements used as a basis in the analytical model, four analytical steps are introduced. While the three first steps, informed by Burke's identification theory, follow the same analytical pathway by analyzing second persona, third persona, and ideographs, the last analytical section follows Charland's theory of national identity. The three first sections are used to get an in-dept understanding of the reconstruction of laïcité and the national narrative. The analysis, therefore, ends with the analysis of Macron's national narrative.

The analytical model (Table 1) delineates an interpretive framework for analyzing the contents of the speech and elucidating how language functions as an identifying factor. It is therefore well-suited for the analysis of the material used in this thesis, which consists of four speeches since it allows us to analyze the material altogether. furthermore, the model suits well for answering the thesis question, which is concerned with the reconstruction of laïcité as the model allows the analysis of the constitution of values and principles as a basis for the French narrative.

Table 1: Preliminary analytical model

	Consubstantiality	Property	Autonomy	Cunning
Second persona (Black, 1970)	Emphasis on: - common treats, perceptions, sensations, Ideas, and images. - “we”, “us”, “them” - Epideictic terms.	Emphasis on: - Material properties. - Non-material substances. that people have or assume to have in common.	Emphasis on: - social or economic class. - belonging as rhetorically constructed.	Emphasis on: -actions as rhetorically framed for their effect. - Contrasts, generalizations, exaggerations.
Third persona (Wander, 1999)	The analysis of the group of people that do not identify with the rhetor’s formulations of: - common treats, perceptions, sensations, ideas, and images. Third persona is not consubstantial with the content of the rhetor’s speech.	The analysis of the group of people that do not identify with the rhetor’s formulations of: - Material properties. - Non-material substances. Third persona does not have or assume to have these aspects in common based on the contents of the speeches.	The analysis of the group of people who cannot identify through the rhetor’s description and assumption about: - social and economic class. Third persona consists of those who are not part of the rhetor’s constructed image of the audience.	The analysis of the group of people who cannot identify with the problems or issues that the rhetor intent to frame for the effect: - contrast, generalization, and exaggerations do not affect third persona.
Ideograph (McGee, 1975, 1980)	- Isolates France and emphasizes French values. - Laïcité as a leading French value. - Indirectly referring to laïcité – metaphors, symbols, etc.	Constructing commitment through the property. Using property as an argument for the French ideology, for laïcité.	Social class and work as something connected to ideology. Connecting values and norms to work. Creating commitments based on autonomy.	Analysis of contrasts, generalizations, and exaggerations used to create a common understanding and sensation of the ideas the rhetor intent to frame.
Constitutive rhetoric (Charland, 1987)	National narratives - Link how the identification of the second persona, the third persona, and ideographs result in a unified story of the French people.			

4.2 From text to analysis: the analytical process

Prior to delving into the chosen materials for examination, it is necessary to provide some remarks regarding the analytical process. Firstly, it is important to note that the material analyzed in this thesis is written in French. For one of the texts, namely *Terrorist attack in Conflants-Sainte Honorine* (21. October 2020), a translated transcription is available on the

web page of the French Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs². For the three remaining speeches, the texts are translated into French by the researcher, who speaks French fluently, thus removing the language barriers. For the *Declaration of the President of the French Republic, Emmanuel Macron, in the aftermath of the terrorist attack in Carcassonne et Trèbes* (23. March 2018) no transcription of the speech was available. The transcription was therefore completed by the researcher. Because the thesis analyses texts that are originally provided in French, transparency is important to ensure verifiability. The material is first interpreted in the original language, French, and subsequently translated to accurately reflect its content. It is important to note that such a translation process can result in the loss of textual references and words, leading to a potential loss of meaning (see Bratberg, 2021). To address this, significant words and references are further explained in the analysis to ensure that the significance is retained. Furthermore, the speeches are delivered in French to a French audience, and the translation may not fully capture the linguistic identity present in the original speech. To enable verification of linguistic differences, each quote is accompanied by a footnote that presents the text in the original version. Additionally, the speeches are provided under the attachment with line numbers that are referenced next to the citations.

Secondly, while the analytical model provides a tool to analyze the materials, it is important to note that the argumentation within the materials is not analyzed as logical evidence. Instead, the focus is directed toward the values and symbols present within the texts, and how they may be the foundation for both division and connection. Regarding the analysis, it means that the focus is, not solely, but primarily directed toward rhetorical-based means. As a result of the chosen approach, there is a disproportional focus in some of the texts. The selection of quotes is a result of both the approach and the analytical model, looking at specific factors. However, in line with the interpretive approach to science, other researchers, who have different backgrounds and experiences may read and analyze the material differently. Nevertheless, by adhering to the structure of the analytical model, the thesis aims to organize the analysis, which structures the selection of quotes. Additionally, since the analysis follows the four components of Burke, informed in the previous section, there is a balance between the different focus areas of the speeches.

² <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/French-foreign-policy/human-rights/freedom-of-religion-or-belief/article/national-tribute-to-the-memory-of-samuel-paty-speech-by-emmanuel-macron>

4.3 Material

The present analysis centers on speeches held by Emmanuel Macron, the President of France, given his position as the foremost authority of the state. The selection of Macron's speeches as the focal point of the analysis is informed by the recognition of the pivotal role played by the French presidency in the nation's political landscape and his responsibility regarding national identity building. As such, an examination of Macron's speeches and statements enables a deeper understanding of the secular principle of *laïcité*, as well as the ideological foundations and values that underpin the French state's governance.

The material for the analysis consists of four speeches, ranging from March 2018, almost a year after Macron was elected, to October 2020. Three of the speeches were delivered in the aftermath of terrorist attacks, and one of the speeches, also related to an attack, was held in memory of the victim of the respective attack. The material for the analysis consists of speeches that are accessible to the public and can be found on the website of the French presidency, *Elysee.fr*.

During the first mandate of Emmanuel Macron, starting from when he formally became president on the 14th of May 2017 (Vie Publique, 2017), to the re-election of Macron in April 2022 (Vie Publique, 2022), France has had to face the menace of terrorism, experiencing the most attacks from terrorism in Europe (Statista, 2022). The terrorist attacks have received a different amount of attention, and for many of the attacks, no speech or declaration has been held by the president.

The material for this thesis, however, was found on the web page, *Elysee.fr*, which is the official web page of the president. The Élysée Palace is the residence of all French presidents, and Emmanuel Macron has resided there since his first mandate in 2017. The palace is also the president's office, and the weekly meeting place of the Council of Ministers (Mignon, 2022, p. 23–25). The web page provides information about the president's political agenda and updates regarding the government's political work. Transcriptions and videos of speeches are among the material which can be found on *Elysee.fr*. The official transcription is available for the three speeches delivered in 2020. For the speech delivered in 2018, a video of Macron's speech is available.

The webpage of Élysée has a research function that makes it possible to filter material in accordance with the president of interest and the material type of interest. Though the intersubjective approach can be applied to different types of material, including commercials, campaign material, and interviews, this thesis focuses on material that falls under the genre of

speech. Because this thesis operates with four pieces of material, choosing one genre makes it possible to analyze the material altogether and focus on how identity is constituted through the respective genre. Mixing material with different genres would require a different analytical approach than the one which is adopted in this thesis. Since comparison is not relevant to the research question, focusing on one genre makes the analysis more precise.

As illustrated in Table 2, the material is listed in chronological order, from less recent (1) to most recent (4) speech and the material is referred to by the respective number throughout the analysis. The numbering is used for clarity, to make it easy for the reader to trace citations to a speech while reading. The material is, however, analyzed in its entirety and not as separate units.

The context of each speech is further explained in the next chapter.

Table : List of speeches

	Date	Speech title	Context
1	23/03/2018	Declaration of the President of the French Republic, Emmanuel Macron, in the aftermath of the terrorist attack in Carcassonne et Trèbes ³	Terrorist attack in Carcassonne and Trèbes.
2	16/10/2020	French President's declaration in the aftermath of the terrorist attack at Conflans-Sainte Honorine	Terrorist attack at Conflans-Sainte Honorine
3	21/10/2020	National tribute to the memory of Samuel Paty	Terrorist attack at Conflans-Sainte Honorine
4	29/10/2020	The declaration of the president, Emmanuel Macron, after the terrorist attack in Nice ⁴	Terrorist attack in Nice

³ «Déclaration du Président de la République Emmanuel Macron suite à l'attaque terroriste de Carcassonne et Trèbes»

⁴ «Déclaration du Président Emmanuel Macron après l'attaque terroriste de Nice»

5. The rhetorical situations

This section provides an elaboration on the significant characteristics of the terrorist attacks that Macron addresses in his four speeches. It emphasizes the importance of gaining a comprehensive understanding of the background and context of each speech, including a description of the terrorist attacks themselves. This understanding offers valuable insights and establishes a foundation for comprehending the references made in the speeches. Furthermore, it provides the necessary context to grasp the nature of the crisis that Macron is addressing.

5.1 The role of the French President and the context of terrorism

Since the material of this thesis are speeches delivered by Emmanuel Macron, during his time as a president, a brief paragraph about the political context during his time is useful to understand the political climate under his presidency.

In France, the status of the president has been at the heart of all concerns since 1946. By strengthening the authority of the executive power, the aim was to put an end to parliamentary instability and the brevity of the French government. While Charles de Gaulle endorsed the mission of a strong leader, able to cope with crisis, in 1946, the principle was not implemented until 1962 (Berstein, 2004, p. 11-20). The constitutional changes have exerted a considerable impact on the French president's role and elucidate the specific political-institutional context within which Emmanuel Macron operates.

The constitution of the Fifth Republic first and foremost, elevates the President of the Republic above political parties by endowing the office with autonomous powers and sanctifying the President's political immunity. Nevertheless, in practice, it has become evident that the interconnections between the executive and the legislature necessitate the president to govern in conjunction with political parties. Emmanuel Macron enjoys power conferred by the constitution. Through articles 20 and 21 the Government is given the power to determine and conduct the policy of the nation, and the prime minister assumes the directive role in guiding the actions of the government (Saidi, 2017, p. 2). Thus, Emmanuel Macron has the position of an arbitrator.

The position and the power of the French president come with a great amount of responsibility. That includes answering and finding solutions to national crises, such as terrorist attacks. Islamic terrorism in Western Europe, and especially France has created an understanding of Islamic ideology as against principles related to freedom of belief, and

therefore needs to be controlled. Macron has launched several proposals aimed at fighting back what he labels as Islamic separatism, by strengthening French secularism (Reid, 2020, p. 38). The initiative is situated within a broader discourse surrounding the role of religion, specifically Islam, in the context of a secular France. These political initiatives form part of a larger strategy aimed at establishing an "Islam de France" to regulate Islam and consequently mitigate radical discourse. That includes the government's significant role in integrating the culture of the French Republic with Islamic culture.

The French government has been reclusive in funding Islamic organizations to reduce foreign donations, as the principle of *laïcité* imposes limitations on the involvement of the French state in religious affairs. However, Macron has during his presidency, succeeded in making laws regarding radical discourse, *la loi renforçant la sécurité intérieure et la lutte contre le terrorisme* (SILT), which was enacted on October 30th, 2017 {Citation}. A yet not succeeded campaign promise is the creation of the *Fédération Nationale de l'Islam de France*, which aims at funding renovations and constructions of mosques and funding Imam's training (Thahirah et al., 2021, p. 299). However, it turned out that the SILT policy was considered a violation of human rights, because of too broad and unclear criteria for targeting suspects training (OHCHR, 2018). Preceding the murder of Samuel Paty by a young radical, the rationale for addressing the issue of separatism was strengthened. The French national assembly adopted a new legislative law package, *loi confortant le respect des principes de la République* (August 24th, 2021), to strengthen the respect toward the Republic principles (Dobbernack, 2022, p. 569).

The intentions to reduce radicalism in France may appear reasonable. However, Macron's endeavor to politically regulate Islam in France appears to contradict the values of the Republic. Since the Fifth Republic provided the president with greater power, intending to make the state leader able to confront crises, understanding the political role and power of the French president, and the situation around the anti-terrorism regulations, gives a political context the speeches. The next section complements this section, by providing information about the terrorist context of each speech this thesis analyzes.

5.2 Three terrorist attacks and four speeches

Terrorist attack in Carcassonne and Trèbes - 23. March 2018

On the evening of the terrorist attack in Carcassonne and Trèbes, Emmanuel Macron delivered a speech. Unlike previous terrorist attacks taking place in Paris (Charlie, l'hypercashier, le

Bataclan, Champs Élysees, le stade de France, les terrasses de café, etc.) or other bigger cities in France, this terrorist incident took place in smaller cities and villages. Carcassonne and Trèbes are both cities in the country of l'Aude. While Carcassonne is a city of 46 000 habitants, Trèbes is a municipality with 5600 habitants (Fourquet & Manternach, 2018, p. 4).

On the 23rd of March 2018, a series of attacks were perpetrated by Redouane Lakdim, a French Moroccan individual aged 25 at the time. The first incident took place in Carcassonne, where Lakdim, armed with a handgun, intercepted a vehicle with a driver and a passenger, both of whom were shot, with one sustaining critical injury. Lakdim then absconded with the stolen vehicle, proceeding to target a military barracks, followed by a police barracks where four police officers were taken hostage, subsequently opening fire at them. The final leg of his attack, located five kilometers away from the preceding target, was in Trèbes, where he stormed a supermarket and killed two civilians.

In the supermarket, Lakdim held a hostage under his arm gun while he openly swore allegiance to the Islamic State and demanded the release of Salah Abdeslam who appear to be the only surviving suspect of the November 2015 Paris attack.

The attack taking place in smaller cities in France, and in this case, a supermarket, Super U, is described as further strengthening the feeling of getting, as an individual, closer to the threat of terrorism (Fourquet & Manternach, 2018, p. 4).

Terrorist attack in Conflans-Sainte Honorine (Samuel Paty) – 21. October 2020

In contrast to the indiscriminate nature of the Carcassonne and Trèbes attacks, the Conflans-Sainte Honorine incident involved the targeted assassination of an individual. This event gave rise to two speeches. The first of which was delivered on the night of the attack, which occurred on the 16th of October, and the second of which was delivered in remembrance of the victim on the 21st of October. Notably, like the aforementioned attacks, the Conflans-Sainte Honorine incident took place in a municipality with a population of 35,536 inhabitants. (Insee, 2019).

The victim of the beheading, Samuel Paty was a history and geography teacher who was beheaded by an extremist near the school where he taught, outside of Paris. A social media campaign, started by the father of one of Paty's pupils, called for the teacher's resignation. Paty had delivered a lecture about freedom of expression, during which he drew upon the Charlie Hebdo attacks as a poignant example and illustrated his point with a cartoon of the Muslim prophet. The subsequent murder of Paty, allegedly perpetrated by a radicalized teenager, was driven by the offender's intense outrage over the teacher's action. (Käsehage, 2022, p. 1–2).

What is particular about this attack is that it was interpreted as an attack against the French educational institution. In a research paper delivered by the Research Centre of the Gendarmerie Nationale Officers College (CREOGN), they describe the violent attack and the selection of the victim as having a considerable impact on the country, because attacking a teacher, is by extension, attacking the school institution which in the research paper is described as a symbol of the Republic (Rodde, 2021, p. 1)

The attack was responded to through two speeches delivered by the French president. One of the speeches, on the 16th of October, informed the audience about the incident and condemned the terrorist act. The other speech was delivered at La Sorbonne, in memory of Samuel Paty, and mainly focused on the victim as a representative of French values, and as the symbol of the French Republic.

Terrorist attack in Nice – 29. October 2020

The terrorist attack in the Notre Dame Basilica on the 29th of October 2020 is the most recent attack that this thesis addresses. Unlike the attacks in Conflants-Sainte Honorine, Carcassonne, and Trèbes, this terrorist attack took place in one of France's larger cities. Nice is the fifth largest city in France, and the city has a population estimated at 346 376 (Insee, 2022).

No more than two weeks after the attack in Conflans-Saint Honorine, France experienced a new attack, led by a Tunisian citizen. The perpetrator was armed with a knife and entered the Notre Dame Basilica, where he over the course of 20 minutes beheaded a woman, slit the throat of a man, and severely wounded his third victim. All victims died.

Specific for the incident is the location, a catholic church. Though the largest religious group in France consists of Christians, the church has since the 1905-act, been separated from the state's responsibilities, and is therefore not considered as a French public institution. Given the cultural and religious heritage of France, and the endeavor in the country to uphold Catholicism as an integral part of the national identity, adherence to the Catholic faith could conceivably be perceived by the populace as synonymous with French nationality (Mercier, 2022, p. 11).

6. Analysis

This chapter consists of five different parts. The structure is based on the analytical model (see chapter three). The first four parts are adopting the same structure, with sections that follow Kenneth Burke's analytical terms (1969), consubstantiality, property, autonomy, and cunning. Each term is used to concretize the analysis of the second persona, the third persona, and ideographs. It is important to note that when using Burke's terms to analyze rhetoric, the focus will often revolve on the same type of moments. That is because Burke's terms cannot be entirely separated from each other and because rhetoric is fluid. For instance, "French citizens" can both fall into consubstantiality and property. However, what makes it interesting is how the concepts and the rhetoric is analyzed. Thus, analyzing the same term is likely to give different insights because different perspectives are adopted in Burke's analytical terms.

6.1 Consubstantiality

One of the first terrorist-related speeches Emmanuel Macron held during his first presidential period took place in the aftermath of the Carcassonne and Trèbes attack. Macron starts his speech by declaring that «[t]oday our country has suffered from an Islamist terrorist attack in Carcassonne and Trèbes. An individual killed 3, and injured 16 persons, at least two of whom are in critical condition»⁵ (Attachment 1, line 1-2). Here, Macron is using the plural pronoun to address his audience. Instead of addressing "the country", Macron stresses "our country", which creates a common sensation of what is being attacked. By creating an image of something that the French people own together, one can assume that the effect includes strengthening the audience's ownership of the message that is being delivered. Macron constructs the French subject by building the idea of a common sensation of belonging to an important and bigger national entity. In doing so the individuals that are part of Macron's audience are consubstantial to the perception he is presenting. In another speech, held after the terrorist attack in Conflans-Sainte Honorine, Macron emphasizes certain specific values that can be considered uncontroversial central pillars of the French Republic. Through highlighting freedom of speech and freedom related to belief, Macron addresses the values as if they were non-conflicting, legitimizing the co-existence of the values and in that way anchoring laïcité as the opposite of the ideology held by Islamic terrorism:

⁵ «Notre pays a subi aujourd'hui une attaque terroriste islamiste à Carcassonne et à Trèbes. Un individu a tué 3 personnes, et en a blessé 16 autres, dont au moins deux sont dans un état grave».

«[...] one of our fellow citizens was assassinated today, because he was teaching, because he was teaching pupils freedom of speech, freedom to believe or not to believe. Our compatriot was cowardly attacked, and he was the victim of a characterized Islamist terrorist attack»⁶ (2, 36-38).

In the citation, the use of the pronoun can seem to create a common impression of being part of the country, bringing the people together under the context of tragedy. The same observation can be detected in the speech that was delivered after the beheading of the French history teacher, Samuel Paty, on the 16th of October 2020. By talking on behalf of the nation and using a common “we” to address the audience, Macron intends to make the audience feel part of the collective project, which consists in standing together for freedom and French values. While there is a common understanding of what the term «freedom» implies, Macron narrates a defined content to the term by pointing out values that correspond with the principle of laïcité. This includes standing against what oppresses these respective values. What is indirectly asked for, is solidarity:

«We will continue this fight for freedom [...] because we owe it to you, because we owe it to ourselves, because in France, sir, the Enlightenment will never grow dim. Long live the Republic, long live France »⁷ (3, 187-189).

By centering the attention around a common project, a fight for freedom, Macron indirectly emphasizes the needed sense of solidarity to ensure enlightenment and hold the Republic alive. Choosing solidarity reveals that the French people are consubstantial with values, freedom, and enlightenment. Macron also repeats the need for solidarity directly: «I call for the unity of all»⁸ (4, 238). Not being united as a nation, when confronting a terrorist attack, risks legitimizing the attacks, or worse, it may also delegitimize the sovereignty of the state. It is worth noting that Macron, does not kindly “ask” people to unify. Instead, he “calls” his people. In French, the combination of the pronoun and verb “J’appelle” (I call) can be deconstructed to the infinite form *appeller*, which by Larousse dictionary is defined as “convoke” and “engage” (Larousse, n.d.-b). Macron establishes a connection between loyalty towards the state and the ideograph of solidarity, forging a shared understanding of the indispensability of solidarity which fosters

⁶ «[...] un de nos concitoyens a été assassiné, aujourd'hui, parce qu'il enseignait, parce qu'il apprenait à des élèves la liberté d'expression, la liberté de croire et de ne pas croire. Notre compatriote a été lâchement attaqué, a été la victime d'un attentat terroriste islamiste caractérisé».

⁷ «Nous continuerons, oui, ce combat pour la liberté [...] parce que nous vous le devons, parce que nous nous le devons, parce qu'en France, professeur, les Lumières ne s'éteignent jamais. Vive la République. Vive la France».

⁸ «J'appelle à l'unité de tous»

a sense of consubstantiality. Through this ideograph, Macron draws his audience as obedient and loyal to the French patrimony, to the government, and to the state. Macron creates a contrast between himself and those who do not associate with his way of responding to terrorism, or those who do not trust in the state's ability when it comes to confronting terrorism and preventing extremism from emerging and developing.

The same sort of contrast is detectable in different moments throughout the speeches. For instance, when Macron formulates “our fellow citizen”, someone who does not feel part of the subject Macron describes, will experience being left out. Through the use of such formulations, he stresses that the attack on a citizen is not simply an attack on an individual. Moreover, it is an attack against “our own”. At the same time, the attack is not framed as arbitrary. Instead, it is directly described as an “Islamist” attack, as contrast to the values of the French Republic. Consequently, Macron draws an image of terrorism as something religious. French values are presented in contrasts to what Islamist terrorism represents. In that way Macron creates a general perception of the threat of so-called Islamist terrorism, in a way that allows him to constitute a consubstantial relationship through the classification of values, putting certain values against what threatens the so-called French subject. Macron constitutes his model of the second persona as someone who typically sees themselves as French, and who fear the threat coming from religious fundamentalism. The latter makes the second persona sceptical of religious influences, particularly Islam.

«It is not a coincidence that a teacher was killed by a terrorist this evening, because he wanted to destroy the Republic in its values, the Enlightenment, the possibility for our children, regardless of their background, whether they believe or not, regardless of their religion, to make them free citizens. This battle is ours, and it is existential»⁹ (2, 49-52).

Here, Macron creates a war-like scenario by drawing the image of a “battle”, where an external enemy threatens the French national and people, and the enemy wants to destroy the existence of the French people, by attacking the most fundamental values of the Republic. The French Republic's values consist of “enlightenment” and the possibility for French people to become free citizens. For Macron being free is an existential value that can only be achieved through enlightenment, which he links to the freedom to believe and the freedom from religion. When Macron uses words such as “free citizens” and stresses the right to have a chance to become

⁹ Il n'y a pas de hasard si ce soir, c'est un enseignant que ce terroriste a abattu, parce qu'il a voulu abattre la République dans ses valeurs, les Lumières, la possibilité de faire de nos enfants d'où qu'ils viennent, qu'ils croient ou qu'ils ne croient pas, quelle que soit leur religion, d'en faire des citoyens libres. Cette bataille, c'est la nôtre, et elle est existentielle.

free regardless of religion, he indirectly refers to *laïcité*. *Laïcité* is probably the most consistently repeated ideograph throughout the four speeches. While the value or ideology is framed as something ultimately French, Macron's repetition of the content of *laïcité* helps him to emphasize on certain contrasts. Religiosity as something rigid that should stay personal, and secularism as something liberating.

Macron is emphasizing *laïcité* in his speeches, and he is thus drawing a religious conflict line in his response to the terrorist attacks. Consequently, it may be inferred that terrorism is, to some extent, associated with religion in a spiritual sense. In the case of the four speeches, he directly points out Islam, creating an image of the religion as a threat to *laïcité*. Furthermore, Macron faces a challenge related to the religious identity of groups that live in France; enlightenment and freedom may for some be realized through religion or through the freedom to believe. The kind of *laïcité* promoted by Macron does not necessarily lead to consubstantial affiliation for religious groups in France.

Macron's interpretation of freedom as a basis fills the model of the second persona with a set of values that forms the way they understand the role of the Republic. The second persona believes that the terrorist attacks in France represent attacks against those who identify as French, and against the French values held by the common "we", namely the French people. The model of the second persona accepts that these factors stand in contrast to each other and that the co-existence of values that threaten French values is not possible. Despite the limited first-hand experiences of most French citizens regarding terrorism, such as not having been the direct target of an actual attack, President Macron endeavors to communicate to his audience the potential for violence and attacks to impact anyone within the nation of France. In this way, he creates a sense of consubstantiality based on a shared fear of a common threat. While he may have intended to unite his audience by fostering feelings of trust and equanimity, he instead directs their fears toward terrorism. By emphasizing the importance of *laïcité* as a solution to the problem of jihadist-motivated terrorism, a certain degree of ambiguity is expressed. The sense of consubstantiality created through fear has the potential to instill not only fear of terrorism as a general threat but also fear of religion. Furthermore, by emphasizing the fear of losing loved ones to terrorism, Macron's message may be interpreted as partially targeting Muslims, as Islamist terrorists claim to adhere to the Muslim faith.

«This evening I want to talk about your son, I want to talk about your brother, your uncle, the man you loved, your father»¹⁰ (3, 86-87).

In Macron's speech, in the aftermath of the beheading of the history teacher, Samuel Paty, he emphasizes that the attack was an attack against civil society. Moreover, it is described as an attack without any specific target, if not those who represent French values, which again traces back to Macron's desired audience. The use of nouns that are familiar to most people creates a feeling of closeness. Everyone has a parent, and one can imagine that most of the population also knows someone they consider a sibling or a close family member. In this manner, Macron uses the case of Samuel Paty, to reveal that Paty could have been anyone within the French society that is consubstantial with the fear of "the other" that Macron constitutes. Moreover, in light of the terrorist attack being framed as an attack against France, Macron draws an image of the nation as one big family, which may induce a stronger sentiment of consubstantiality. However, Macron does not describe the terrorist instance as something uncalculated or as any type of coincidence. In the speech, Macron expresses that he at first «[...] believed it to be a random act of madness, a senseless arbitrary act: another victim of gratuitous terrorism»¹¹ (3, 142-143). However, in the same speech, he reasons that Paty's profession as a teacher made him a prime target for the terrorist attack. In doing so, Macron brings the focus away from the individual, Paty, to not only teachers in general but to the broader collective of French society. Through what he represented and through his death, Paty is constituted as a symbol of French values and a martyr:

«[...] that's precisely why Samuel Paty was killed. Because he embodied the Republic which comes alive every day in classrooms, the freedom that is conveyed and perpetuated in schools»¹² (3, 148-150).

The portrayal of Paty and his pivotal role in French society evokes a sense of consubstantiality rooted in the fear of the core values of the society being targeted and under attack. In the speech held after the Notre Dame Basilica attack in Nice, Macron declared that «If we are attacked, once again, it is against the values that we hold, for our taste for freedom, for this possibility on our soil of believing freely and not giving in to any spirit of terror»¹³ (4, 212-214). Again,

¹⁰ «Ce soir, je veux parler de votre fils, je veux parler de votre frère, de votre oncle, de celui que vous avez aimé, de ton père».

¹¹ « [...] j'ai d'abord cru à la folie aléatoire, à l'arbitraire absurde : une victime de plus du terrorisme gratuit».

¹² Samuel PATY fut tué précisément pour tout cela. Parce qu'il incarnait la République qui renaît chaque jour dans les salles de classes, la liberté qui se transmet et se perpétue à l'école.

¹³ «Si nous sommes attaqués, une fois encore, c'est pour les valeurs qui sont les nôtres, pour notre goût de la liberté, pour cette possibilité sur notre sol de croire librement et de ne céder à aucun esprit de terreur.».

Macron puts certain values against each other. "Believing freely" refers to the secular value, *laïcité*. Through using epideictic terms, and uniting the French people, the second persona appears as someone who thinks that the majority of the population shares the same perception when it comes to religion, the Republic, and terrorism. While the second persona perceives the Republic as a champion of freedom, they interpret religious impulses as the driving ideology behind terrorism, which is seen as a force that deprives individuals of their freedom:

«[...] one of our fellow citizens was assassinated today because he was teaching because he was teaching students freedom of expression, the freedom to believe and not to believe. Our compatriot was cowardly attacked, was the victim of an Islamist characterized terrorist attack » (2, 36-38) ¹⁴

In the two previous citations, *freedom* is an example of an ideograph, which is repeated in three of the four speeches. Macron uses freedom as a contrast to terrorism. While the French Republic, along with its laws and norms, provides a conducive environment for individuals to develop as free citizens, terrorism is portrayed as the antithesis of this freedom. «Obscurantism and the violence that accompanies it will not win. They will not divide us» (2, 65)¹⁵. Through the contrast, Macron allows the audience to be consubstantial by being clear about which side French citizens should choose. Either freedom and the rights that come along, or obscurantism, violence, and religious extremism. In such wise, Macron makes sure that nobody wants to show empathy toward terrorists and their acts, by framing the latter as the enemy and the opposite of freedom.

While it may seem evident that terrorists represent the antithesis of freedom, it becomes necessary in the narrative constructed by Macron to depict them as the enemies of France, thus building an image of a war where the French people need to stand prepared and organized together like soldiers. By having a closer look at identification through consubstantiality, it becomes apparent that the ideographs of "*laïcité*" and "*freedom*" are interconnected and employed to foster unity among the French populace around particular norms and values. These values serve as shared symbols that contribute to the collective identification and cohesion of the society. Macron's infusion of an ideograph into *laïcité* can be interpreted as a way of widening the content of *laïcité* through adopting an understanding of freedom and *laïcité* which

¹⁴ «[...] un de nos concitoyens a été assassiné, aujourd'hui, parce qu'il enseignait, parce qu'il apprenait à des élèves la liberté d'expression, la liberté de croire et de ne pas croire. Notre compatriote a été lâchement attaqué, a été la victime d'un attentat terroriste islamiste caractérisé».

¹⁵ L'obscurantisme et la violence qui l'accompagne ne gagneront pas. Ils ne nous diviseront pas.

fits with his message. While Macron defends *laïcité* as an important norm within French society and for the French way of living, he is also emphasizing that religions, such as Islam, need to adapt to the French norms. Though the religion does not represent extremism and the violence of terrorism, it is put in opposition to *laïcité*, by being framed as something that can develop into extremism.

By drawing the image of an enemy, through the clear contrast described in the previous paragraphs, Macron constitutes a consubstantial relationship with his audience by serving a set of values that are central to the conception of freedom he is drawing. While the second persona is consubstantial to the image which is drawn, third persona is left out of that perception. Instead, third persona is constituted around not being recognized by Macron's description of France, the French people, and the visions of threats. Third persona does not necessarily think that terrorism is a threat against what Macron describes as French values, although it is a threat against security. Furthermore, third persona interprets terrorism as an extreme political *ideology* separated from religion and religious belief. That's why, when Macron frames terrorist attacks as a religious attack against France and its people, third persona is not consubstantial to the description, and can therefore not relate to the image created of religion and terrorism.

One of the central challenges Macron encounters in his response, is the aim of uniting the French people. While he is trying to defend a set of values framed as fundamental for securing the freedom of French individuals. He also undermines religious groups, especially Muslims, which may feel that their freedom to believe is getting curtailed and that Macron expresses hostility toward them as a French and religious group. That is contradictory if the purpose of *laïcité* originally was to ensure that religions were not politicized, nor addressed unequally. A feeling that may as well be strengthened by the way Macron addresses Catholics:

«The entire Nation stands by their side and will continue to do so, to allow the religion to be exercised freely in our country because it is part of our country. These are our values, allowing anyone to believe or not believe, which every religion can practice. Today, the entire Nation stands alongside our fellow Catholics»¹⁶ (4, 202-206).

In the given citation, Macron once again emphasizes the citizens' right to freely practice any religion. While highlighting terrorist attacks as assaults against the entire nation, Macron specifically pays special attention to the Catholic community in France. In that way, Catholics

¹⁶ La Nation toute entière se tient à leurs côtés et se tiendra pour que la religion puisse continuer de s'exercer librement dans notre pays, car notre pays sait cela. Ce sont nos valeurs, que chacun puisse croire ou ne pas croire, mais que chaque religion puisse s'exercer. Aujourd'hui, la Nation toute entière se tient aux côtés de nos concitoyens catholiques.

and citizens who feel affiliated with the catholic traditions may experience a feeling of consubstantiality. While the Muslim communities remain unmentioned, the way that Macron addresses the catholic community can be understood as an indirect way of addressing the French nation. The second persona is constituted around traditional values and thinks of Catholics as an integrated part of being French. This contrast between the emphasis on laïcité and the framing of the threat as a "Muslim" threat toward "Catholics" reveals a disparity in the perception of different religions. It highlights the inconsistency in terms of how different religious communities are regarded, which is notable considering the French secular value that ideally treats all religions equally. Third persona does not associate with the catholic religion and neither the threats described by Macron. Instead, third persona represents the Muslims and the foreigners who are not raised with laïcité as part of their personal or national identity. The second persona is constituted as someone who believes that French values are at risk and that religious extremists are taking advantage of the lack of adaption and integration to push fundamentalist interpretations of Islam and Islamism into Islamic cults in France (Azam & Ferret, 2022, p. 2). The audience and Macron are consubstantial as long as they believe that Macron can relate to their perception of society, values, visions and fear of extremism.

6.2 Property

Though Macron, as the head of state, represents the supreme magistracy in France and though he is the highest office in France, he also shares properties with the rest of the French population (Elysée, 2022). At the fundamental level, Macron is for instance a French citizen, with French citizenship. His multiple roles allow people to reflect on themselves through what he represents. Through his status and background, as a highly educated person who comes from a wealthy upper-class family, people from the same milieu could easily recognize themselves through these properties. The mentioned properties are not representative if compared to the general demographic aspect of France and the French population. However, through his speeches, he is also allowed to make people think or believe that they have properties in common with the president. When Macron, for instance, speaks about his fears and visions for the country, he is speaking as a French citizen. The fear of terrorism comes from the fear of experiencing an attack in France. Living in France and having France as a home is a property that is shared by all French citizens.

«I invite each and every one of our citizens to be aware of the seriousness of the terrorist threat, but also to be aware of the strength and resistance that our people demonstrate each time they have been attacked»¹⁷ (attachment 1, line 26-28)

In the quote, Macron invites the citizens for a session of collective awareness. The property of being part of the French people, as a French citizen or someone who identifies as French, is here pointed out as an indirect requirement. By stating “each time” France has been attacked, Macron is referring to historical events in which France has been the target of external threats. It is noteworthy that he does not explicitly refer to terrorist attacks but attacks in a broader sense. This example of rhetorical ambivalence is expressed to revive the pride associated with the French history of dominance. To sum it up, being a French citizen does not just consist in having a French identity card. The property of being French is also used to build an identity, based on fearlessness and the confronting character of choosing awareness, seriousness, strength, and resistance when faced with terrorism. It also includes a set of values shaping a common identity. Thus, the second persona can relate to various aspects, but the property of being a French citizen and fearing for one's security and that of the country should be understood as an important factor in the constitution of second persona. Again, Macron strengthens the sensation of fear to unite the French subject, by reshaping values as property, and by framing them as objects that can be taken away from the French subject. An example can be taken from the speech delivered on the 29th of October 2020, in the aftermath of the terrorist attack in Nice. The terrorist attack which took place in the Basilique Notre Dame de Nice was described as an attack against France.

«Once again, our country has been hit by an Islamist terrorist attack. Once again, this morning, three of our compatriots have passed away in Nice, in the Notre Dame Basilica of Nice, and clearly, France is under attack».¹⁸ (4, 193-196)

In the citation, Macron expresses that the nation is under attack by Islamist terrorism. Instead of framing the attacks as individual criminal offenses, they are generalized and framed as attacks with a war-like scenario. Macron explicitly expresses that «[t]his battle is ours, and it is existential!»¹⁹ (2, 52), echoing the grandeur of the French empire led by Napoleon Bonaparte (Hazareesingh, 2021, p. 7). The threat of losing physical properties, such as geographical areas

¹⁷ «J’invite chacun et chacune de nos citoyens d’être conscient de la gravité de la menace terroriste, mais à être également conscient de la force et de la résistance que notre peuple démontre chaque fois qu’il a été attaqué»

¹⁸ «Une fois encore, notre pays a été frappé par une attaque terroriste islamiste. Une fois encore ce matin, se sont trois de nos compatriots qui sont tombés à Nice, en cette basilique Notre Dame de Nice et très clairement, c’est la France qui est attaqué».

¹⁹ «Cette bataille, c’est la notre, et elle est extensivelle!»

and houses, or non-physical properties such as values becomes prevalent. Macron uses the possessive pronoun when referring to France (“our country”).

One can assume that being French is the property of all the French people, or at least those with French citizenship. The way in which Macron constitutes the second persona, indicates that the property of being French is reserved for his ideal audience. Indeed, reserved for those who think that the attack is closely motivated by religious belief. Macron first described the attack as an Islamist attack and then described the target which was a catholic church. The religions, Islam, and Catholicism are indirectly set up against each other. The fact that “Islamism” means political Islam and is separated from the interpretation of Islam that Muslims practice in France (Hajjat, 2010, p. 144), reveals and expresses the ambivalence in Macron’s rhetoric and between the property of being French and Catholic, and Islamist and Muslim. However, for a French citizen being French could also equal being for instance Muslim, catholic, atheist, or being part of any other religious community. However, for second persona, being French first and foremost equals being catholic. When the catholic church is under attack, Macron draws an image of the “Catholics” as a property that belongs to the French subject. Property is in this respect, not only centered around French citizenship, but a category that can also be interpreted individually. After the attack, Macron expressed his support to the Catholics of France:

«First and foremost, I want to declare all the support of the entire Nation for Catholics in France and elsewhere. [...] [It] is once again the Catholics who are attacked in our country, threatened before the All-Saints’ Day celebrations. The whole nation stands with them and will stand so that religion can continue to be exercised freely in our country. These are our values, which everyone can believe or not believe, but which every religion can exercise» (4, 200-205)²⁰.

Macron expresses that the country stands with “them”, the Catholics. In one way the choice of pronoun can be interpreted as a way of marking that the catholic identity is not a completely integrated part of the French subject and the common “we”. However, one should note that Macron is showing empathy toward the Catholics of France. From that perspective, Macron’s recognition of the group and religious freedom puts the “Catholic subject” in a particular position, since it not only recognizes France as secular but also catholic. By positively denoting

²⁰ «Je veux ici dire d’abord et avant tout le soutien de la Nation tout entière aux catholiques de France et d’ailleurs. [...] [c]’est une nouvelle fois les catholiques qui sont attaqués dans notre pays, menaces avant les fêtes de la Toussaint. La nation tout entière se tient à leurs côtés et se tiendra pour que la religion puisse continuer de s’exercer librement dans notre pays sait cela. Ce sont nos valeurs, que chacun puisse croire ou ne pas croire, mais que chaque religion puisse exercer »

the religious group, the identity of “being Catholic” is constructed as a property that is part of the French subject. Macron does not interpret the attack as an attack against religions, including Muslims as part of the in-subject which would induce a different type of identification. Even though there are no official religions in France, Catholicism is an important part of French religious history, and can therefore be understood as something related to being French.

The attention Macron accords Catholics in the speech could easily be explained by the fact that the terrorist attack targeted a catholic church. However, it also reveals Macron’s ambiguity when it comes to laïcité. Macron presents laïcité as a fundamental characteristic of the French subject, yet a contradiction arises when Catholics are also included in the same subject. This creates a gap between the catholic subjects and the Muslim subject which is constituted as “the other”. There is a paradox, if we interpret the attention toward the Catholic church as a way of elevating their forming role of the French identity, and laïcité representing religious neutrality. On one side, the messages seem to be emitted for the same kind of information and appear as a “double message” leading the audience into confusion. On the other side, this shows that the content given to the terms is not only driven by common understandings. This enables the formation of new interpretations of French identity.

Catholic as an ideograph, is given a specific content in this respect: «Today the whole nation stands alongside our fellow citizens»²¹ (4, 205-206). They are an integrated part of France. This lets the audience understand that an attack against a catholic, is an attack against France and its values. However, none of the speeches express the same toward other religions. Though most terrorist attacks in France have been carried out by jihadist groups, during the last decade, the victims have generally consisted of composed groups. Interpretations of religions range from symbolic, moderate to extreme, and the latter type of interpretation is not representative. However, moderate French Muslims do not receive any particular attention, though their religion is being interpreted in a way that targets them as a religious group. Muslims do not receive commensurate sympathy with Catholics. Additionally, it does not seem that being affiliated with the Muslim faith is a characteristic that Macron seeks to emphasize or identify with. This creates both inclusion and exclusion.

The second persona is a French citizen who identifies as being French, who is either catholic, have catholic ancestry or thinks of it as an important part of French history. Though the second persona thinks that anyone should be free to believe, religiosity should remain part of the private sphere. The second persona harbors concern that religiosity can manifest as

²¹ «Aujourd'hui la nation toute entiere se tient aux côtés de nos concitoyens»

extremism, particularly in relation to Islamic affiliation. However, they may not recognize their skepticism towards Muslims and Islam, because they have moderate Muslim friends, or because they have neighbors, colleagues or sympathize with people who identify as Muslims. While second persona does not feel the same sentiment of fear when it comes to Third persona may identify as French, but not as catholic. Third persona represents the moderate Muslims, who feel the same type of fear and anger as the rest of the population when terrorist attacks occur. While the third persona may partially agree with Macron, they also perceive a certain ambiguity in the approach to terrorism and the role of religion. They sense that being publicly Muslim raises more suspicion than being publicly Catholic. Macron's emphasis on Catholics as integral to French identity also leads the third persona to perceive that being a Muslim is often viewed as a manifestation of fundamental religious devotion, particularly in comparison to Catholicism.

«Support for the Nation in Nice, for the Catholics of France, firmness and unity, such is the line that we must follow today and that we will continue to follow tomorrow»²². (4, 243-244)

Catholics are not only a religious cult, within the French society, Catholics are part of the image Macron creates of the fellow citizen. Though Catholicism is a religion with its own set of values, that have been part of several controversies along with the development of French society in the 20th century, it is here presented as something consubstantial to being French. Supporting Catholics is choosing unity. The property of being catholic, thus is used to promote the French national identity. This can be understood as a way of responding to what threatens France. By emphasizing French traditions, and the religion which has influenced the French way of living, Macron creates a distance from other religions. instead of emphasizing the difference between religion and religious extremism, one can interpret the catholic focus as a way of fostering a dividing line between France and the constructed “French” religion and what is considered foreign and distant.

6.3 Autonomy

Specialized activity may affect the character of a person. Macron's character is at the rudimentary level, for instance, influenced consciously and unconsciously by the role he is holding, as the president of France. Throughout the four speeches, different types of professions

²² «Soutien de la Nation à Nice, aux catholiques de France, fermeté et unité, telle est la ligne que nous devons suivre aujourd'hui et que nous continuerons de suivre demain».

which exist in French society are mentioned repeatedly by Macron. The urge to mention the respective groups, and their role in the context of terrorism illustrates how belonging is something rhetorically constructed. In the president's declaration, after the terrorist attack in Carcassonne et Trèbes, one of the first issues that he raises is the work done by the law enforcement agencies (Les forces de l'ordre) (attachment 1, line 4). In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks at Conflans-Sainte-Honorine and Nice, Macron referred to the interior security forces (2, 62) and military forces (4, 218), respectively, in his speeches. In the next citation, Macron draws the image of the autonomous character, a security force, as a military reference to what the French values represent. In doing so one can observe a personification of the bravery demonstrated by the rescuer, emphasizing the act as a character of the French subject:

«The police intervened with remarkable speed [...] I want to salute their commitment and their professionalism, but also their courage. In particular, I want to salute the courage of a senior officer of the gendarmerie. Who volunteered to replace the other hostages who were severely injured. He saved lives and brought honor to his weapon and our country. He is currently battling death, and our deepest thought goes out to him and his family».²³ (1, 4-11)

In the citation, Macron makes sure to let his audience know that those responsible for security, in France, did all they could to save people during the terrorist attack. In that way, Macron, not only creates an image of a security system that delivers, but he also valorizes the respective profession and the individuals who worked on the day of the attack, inducing autonomy-based identification. Though the word courage is used only once throughout the quote, the adjective is descriptive of the way Macron approaches these groups of people. By recognizing the respective groups, he highlights the importance of their specialized missions, which consist of securing the country. *Courage* is something repeated in three of the speeches. Through the ideograph, Macron is building an image of those working in the respective areas. By highlighting the remarkable defense provided by the security forces, Macron appears to evoke a war-like scenario that resonates with the historical victories of France.

«This evening, I would also like to thank all of the forces of order who, with exemplary courage, intervened with exceptional speed to put an end to the fatal course of this terrorist; to the municipal police, thank you Mr. Mayor, and thank you to your agents, and to our national police who, with courage, did their duty» (2, 54-57)²⁴

²³ «Les forces de l'ordre sont intervenues avec une rapidité remarquable [...] Je veux ici saluer leur engagement et leur professionnalisme, mais aussi leur courage. En particulier le courage d'un officier supérieur de la gendarmerie. Qui s'est porté volontaire pour se substituer aux autres otages et qui a été très gravement blessé. Il a sauvé des vies, fait honneur à son armée et notre pays. Il lutte actuellement contre la mort, et toutes nos pensées vont à lui et sa famille».

²⁴ «Ce soir, je veux aussi remercier l'ensemble des forces de l'ordre qui, avec un courage exemplaire, sont intervenues avec une rapidité exceptionnelle pour mettre fin à la course mortelle de ce terroriste ; à la police

In the given citation, Macron attributes significant qualities to the term "courage" when referring to the actions of groups and individuals within society who confront terrorism. By emphasizing the bravery of police officers, Macron confers legitimacy to their authority as a key agents in maintaining and safeguarding national security and identity. Moreover, his words create an expectation for decisive and effective responses to future security threats. There is a certain consistency in the way Macron brings up this ideograph.

In a different speech, Macron declares that «[he] want[s] to salute [...] their courage. Particularly the courage of a senior officer of the gendarmerie»²⁵ (1, 7-9). The senior officer is constituted as the grandeur of the French nation, namely the French courage and will to sacrifice. Macron's distinction between the safeguarding and defense of French values and security on the one hand, and terrorism and religion-based motivations on the other, conveys a rhetoric of war and instills a sense of apprehension regarding a possible assault on French values. The president's use of language evokes the notion of an imminent threat aimed at "tearing off" the very fabric of French society. Instead of focusing on the national, internal problem of terrorism, Macron addresses terrorism as something external and foreign. In that way, he excludes conversations that address the challenges of terrorism *within* and as part of French society. However, Macron addresses the role of the French police in securing internal security. By acknowledging that the attack should be treated internally, he reveals the ambiguity related to whether it is an external or internal threat. In this regard, the second persona can be interpreted as embracing the ambiguous premise presented by Macron regarding how terrorism should be tackled. While second persona sees the attack as external, a foreign threat, from a foreign religion, there is acceptance for it being treated with the help of internal police forces. However, the police and army force's act of bravery and selflessness aligns with the notion of the French subject. In that way the security forces are not only framed as defending the security in general, but as a defender for the French nation.

The mentioned groups are not the only professions that Macron addresses throughout his speeches. French society is, indeed, dependent on a working security force to confront crises related to security within the society. However, when a terrorist attack occurs, it is also a threat to French values. That makes the educational system a target for terrorism. Though terrorists do not have a history of attacking schools and other educational institutions, the attack on the

municipale, merci monsieur le Maire et merci à vos agents, et à notre police nationale qui, avec courage, a fait son devoir».

²⁵ « Je veux ici saluer [...] leur courage. En particulier le courage d'un officier supérieur de la gendarmerie ».

history teacher, Samuel Paty, symbolized an attack against the nation and the values that it represents. Most people in France have a direct relation to the educational system in France, as former or currently enrolled pupils. Through the autonomous relation to the professionalized activity, the individual is made part of a group that may feel compassion for their former teachers and their profession. The teacher is symbolized as both enlightenment and laïcité and personified as the ultimate symbol of the French subject, as the enlightened, civilized, free, and brave subject. The second persona does not necessarily have a strong relationship to the profession of teachers but recognizes the importance of the educational system as a central norm and value-building institution for enlightenment and laïcité:

«... in every school, in every secondary school, in every high school, we'll give teachers back the power to "create Republicans," restore their rightful position and authority. We'll train them, we'll esteem them, we'll support them, and we'll protect them as much as necessary. The abuse of ignorance and obedience inside and outside schools, the pressures, which some individuals would like to establish, have no place in our country»²⁶ (3, 134-139)

In this citation, Macron highlights how the Republican institution is facing the threat of an extreme ideology, and he proposes different measures to reinforce the institution. Here, several contrasts can be identified. First, teachers are constituted at the top of the hierarchy, represented as the ultimate creators of Republicans. The French subject can be interpreted as those who belong to the French Republic, which consists of enlightened people. Through autonomous identification, teachers through their fundamental role as value-builders for the French people, are constituted as a personification of the French subject. Second, the opposition the teachers are described as "abusers". In that way, Macron draws the image of an enemy which can be understood as the fellow enemy of the second persona. The autonomous identity is built around the educational institutions and the values that they hold alive.

For the second persona the profession has an elementary mission which consists of *creating* Republicans, as described by Macron. In other words, the French school system plays a pivotal role in the process of shaping individuals into French citizens and the French identity. While the third persona does not align with extremism, it also does not fully subscribe to the values endorsed by the French educational system, with the dominating principle of laïcité. Third persona thinks the educational system should show more flexibility when it comes to the

²⁶ « [...] dans chaque école, dans chaque collège, dans chaque lycée, nous redonnerons aux professeurs le pouvoir de « faire des républicains », la place et l'autorité qui leur reviennent. Nous les formerons, les considérerons comme il se doit, nous les soutiendrons, nous les protégerons autant qu'il le faudra. Dans l'école comme hors de l'école, les pressions, l'abus d'ignorance et d'obéissance que certains voudraient instaurer n'ont pas leur place chez nous».

expression of personal identity, whether it is religious or non-religious. It does not disapprove of all French values but does not necessarily identify with how Macron frames the educational system as enlightened “Frenchness” against foreign foolishness.

In the speech held on the 21st of October, Macron expresses that Samuel Paty was assassinated «[b]ecause he embodied the Republic which comes alive every day in classrooms, the freedom that is transmitted and perpetuated in schools»²⁷ (3, 148-150). Here, Paty is used as a symbol for what teachers in France represent. The aspect of autonomy is again centered around the role of specific professional roles, and it expresses how this segment of society is an important foundation for the development of the French national identity. When highlighting the different professions, teachers, and emergency and security forces, Macron emphasizes the importance of solidarity. At the end of the day, those working in these respective professions, are individuals who constitute France. Thus, standing together is the only way of overcoming such tragedies. Courage is also used to describe how the school director dealt with the attack on Samuel Paty: “We have seen the school principal who, with remarkable courage in recent weeks, has stood up to all the pressures, has exercised her profession, done her duty with remarkable dedication»²⁸ (2, 41-43). By commenting on the specific profession’s duty during a time of crisis, Macron idealizes a certain type of behavior and a specific way of managing a crisis, which consists of being resistant and defensive.

The antonym of “courage”, “lâcheté” (cowardice) is used by Macron to describe the opposite of the French subject, namely the terrorists, and their contributors: «Our compatriot was cowardly attacked, was the victim of an Islamist terrorist attack characterized»²⁹ (2, 37-38). By using antonyms to describe autonomous groups that represent the opposite, Macron is creating a further contrast to his ideal audience.

Another ideograph used in the context of autonomy is “apprendre”, which can both be translated into teaching and learning (Larousse, n.d.-a). The ideograph is used consistently in two of the speeches, where Macron addresses the terrorist attack against Samuel Paty. Macron uses the ideograph as a counterpoint to the attack against a teacher, and the French educational system Paty represented, namely the Enlightenment. The way in which Macron responds to the attack shows the will to defend the values schools in France promote. Not only laïcité but liberty more generally. Freedom of expression and religious freedom is mentioned several times, in

²⁷ «Parce qu’il incarnait la République qui renaît chaque jour dans les salles de classes, la liberté qui se transmet et se perpétue à l’école».

²⁸ «Nous avons vu madame la Proviseure qui, avec un courage remarquable ces dernières semaines, a tenu face à toutes les pressions, a exercé son métier, fait son devoir avec un dévouement remarquable».

²⁹ «Notre compatriote a été lâchement attaqué, a été la victime d’un attentat terroriste islamiste caractérisé»

the context of *teaching* values. That is not very controversial, since these are values with a consensus among French citizens. Within the context of terrorism, the fundamental values of society become a counterpoint to the threat, with education and dissemination of knowledge on liberties and the principles of a "free society" serving as the weapon to combat the menace. That implies that teachers are willing to attend their worksites and continue teaching about French values, though there may be a real threat or a potential fear of threat.

The specialized activities can be interpreted as important identity builders since they are framed as important for the national interests and more specifically the national identity. In that way, the second persona is left with the idea of these professions as important building stones for the French secular state. The ideal audience is portrayed as a proud and courageous protector of France, embracing the principles of enlightenment, knowledge, and freedom of religion. However, this ideal audience also acknowledges the existence of varying degrees of freedom among individuals. On the other hand, the second persona exhibits an ambivalent understanding of *laïcité* and maintains a conflicted perspective regarding whether terrorism represents an external or internal threat. The third persona, however, may see the importance of both security forces and the teacher's role in teaching values. Yet, the third persona does not necessarily approve of the approach through which these professions are framed as the defender and symbol of *laïcité*, while religion and Muslims are left with the sensation of being interpreted as the opposite, as the provokers, and as a springboard for extremist beliefs.

As analyzed in the previous paragraph, the speeches are built on a discourse that intends to unify the French audience and people. He does so through the personification of the bravery identified in the act of specific autonomous groups, not only generalizing it to include all teachers and all people working with security but both the police officer and the teacher become the symbols of *laïcité* and a central part of the French subject.

6.4 Cunning

Individuals who operate rhetorically upon themselves, construct identification through motives that are nonconscious or unexamined. When Macron expresses that «[i]n France, there is only one community, it is the national community»³⁰ (attachment 4, line 234-235), he creates an illusion of those who represent the French subject based on national features, which may be done to unite French citizens. Nevertheless, that also implies divisions between those who do

³⁰ «En France, il n'y a qu'une communauté, c'est la communauté nationale».

not recognize themselves in the description of Macron and the French subject. How he defines being part of the French subject, will not only depend on the individual's interpretation, but on the rhetorical situation. In the context of terrorism, the will to constitute a strong national identity and unify the country may seem like a crucial obligation for the French president. Doing so through exaggeration is a rhetorical choice. When Macron declares that the only acknowledged community is the French community, unconscious identifications may occur. While an individual who holds anti-immigration opinions may understand the quote as a way of demonstrating the French subject as something opposed to the non-French, language-wise, ethnicity-wise, culturally, etc. More moderate French citizens may understand that the whole population stands against an external subject, which has its basis outside of France and French society. However, the concept of "nationality" remains a subject of debate and contention. In the French context, debates on national identity have significantly elevated questions regarding loyalty, particularly concerning immigrants who bear a constant weight of scrutiny and expectation (Simon, 2013, p. 204). The Janus-like concept of national identity, which incorporates people as part of the French subject, partly through loyalty to the state and citizenship, and excludes others by creating hierarchies, reflects the ambiguity in the message from Macron. Furthermore, he continues by stating that:

«I want to say to all our fellow citizens, regardless of their religion, whether they believe elsewhere or do not believe, that we must at these times unite and not give in to the spirit of division»³¹ (4, 235-237)

Here, one can identify a difference in how Macron builds up the idea of a nation and the idea of the citizens. While the first term is described as united, he seems to have a different approach to the latter. The people who go under the definition of French citizens are those who reside in France. The fraction that Macron underlines are described through the plural pronoun "they", which narrates a gap between the subject "we" and "them". By emphasizing the religious affiliation or non-affiliation of the group he denominates as "they", and by asking them to stay united, Macron creates an image of the subject he is describing and an illusion of his desired audience. The will to unite and at the same time split the French society into groups expresses a rhetorical contradiction and a cunning identification, which highlights the dilemma Macron encounters when he tries to unite his people by reconstructing *laïcité*.

³¹ «Je veux dire à tous nos concitoyens, quelle que soit leur religion, qu'ils croient d'ailleurs ou qu'ils ne croient pas, que nous devons dans ces moments nous unir et ne rien céder à l'esprit de division».

The second persona perceives it as a responsibility to maintain national unity. Yet, this does not necessarily imply the inclusion of all groups of people within the French subject. The second persona believes that some groups, especially religious minorities should in these times show more effort and will to adapt and to show unity during the crisis of terrorism. This second persona even thinks it would be insuring to have the religious minorities declaring that they condemn the extremist's acts. The third persona may also agree when Macron asks the nation to stay united but may not identify with the way some specific groups are asked to "not give in to the spirit of division". The third persona feels targeted due to their religious affiliation. While Macron does not point the finger at moderate Muslims when describing the "enemy", experiencing an Islamist terrorist attack while being a Muslim can generate a sense of suspicion. By indirectly asking people to "not give in", there is a gap created between the third persona and Macron. The third persona experiences that their religious affiliation and identity are viewed with suspicion.

«I call on all our compatriots, during these times, to unite [...] because we are first and foremost citizens united by the same values, a history, a destiny. Unity is essential».³² (2, 66-69).

In this quote, Macron again asks for unity, and he emphasizes on the characteristics citizens in France may have in common. While certain values can be interpreted as deeply personal and contested, some values may also be interpreted as uncontroversial. However, values can in this quote be interpreted according to the context of terrorism. When Macron emphasizes the shared history of the French people and indirectly praises the bravery of various citizens and groups within France, he accentuates specific values that encourage his audience to embrace those beliefs as well. However, it can also be interpreted as a way of acknowledging the importance of certain groups, creating a hierarchy where usefulness and utility during a crisis make groups climb higher. Additionally, Macron externalizes those who do not affiliate with French history, such as immigrants and their descendants. Whereas being French means being courageous, while "the other" is externalized and framed as a threat. Macron heroically describes a specific officer:

«He saved lives and brought honor to his weapon and our country» (1, 10)³³.

³² «Et j'appelle l'ensemble de nos compatriotes, dans ce moment, à faire bloc [...] car nous sommes d'abord et avant tout des citoyens unis par des mêmes valeurs, une histoire, un destin. Cette unité est indispensable».

³³ «Il a sauvé des vies, fait honneur à son armée et notre pays».

While the use of weapons is something usually connected to pejorative interpretations, especially in the context of terrorism, like violence and death, it is here preached in a way that informs the audience that violence is accepted and encouraged. The circumstance Macron describes is when defending the country, and in that way, one may bring honor to the weapon. Hence, Macron constitutes the police officer into a soldier, ready to fight in a war against terrorism. By framing the “enemy” as non-French, Macron undermines the fact that terrorism in France has also been led out by French citizens, and he ignores the fact that there is an internal national dimension to the conflict. That is the case for the murder of Samuel Paty and the terrorist act in Carcassonne and Trèbes, where the perpetrators were French citizens radicalized in France.

The metaphor of bringing “honor” to a weapon, functions as a bridge between a violent act and what is considered an act of bravery. The term *honor*, thus functions as an ideograph. In ordinary circumstances, violence would be condemned. Though Macron originally points out the act of a person who is employed for the maintenance of security, that is not what Macron points out in the speech. Instead, he focuses on the action. It is in the interest of the country that people respect the rules and laws. However, this phrase leads the audience to cunning identification because Macron’s message is not incisive. For the second persona, Macron is referring to the opposite of the values held by the terrorists. While terrorist groups represent extremism, brutality, and anti-Western values. The second persona experiences the lack of consensus within the French society, among the citizens, concerning “Western values” as a threat. The ambiguity of the meaning and content of «Western values» creates division because it hinders a united fight against terrorism. The model of the third persona experiences division. However, the third persona identifies with interpretations of French values but acknowledges that minorities have a more complex experience and understanding of the so-called grandeur of French history. For instance, many minorities identify with other cultures than the French. However, the third persona may still identify with a certain interpretation of being French which is different from the French subject drawn by Macron. That explains why a feeling of exclusion occurs when terms used to express unity exclude groups that experience being externalized from the French subject.

«We will defend the freedom that you taught so well, and we will strongly proclaim the concept of laïcité. We will not disavow the cartoons, or the drawings, even if others recoil. We will

provide all the opportunities that the Republic owes all its young people, without any discrimination»³⁴ (3, 168-170).

The quote above is taken from the speech delivered as a national tribute to Samuel Paty. By presenting a statement about the French secular concept, *laïcité*, Macron is emphasizing the religion-secularism dimension. By introducing *laïcité* as a concept closely related to freedom, Macron undermines that *laïcité* may also challenge values such as freedom of religion. This can bring his message to the edge of cunning because it creates a problem of consciousness. By emphasizing certain values, other values are ignored. For the audience, this means that they may create an understanding that does not necessarily correspond with what is being said by Macron. The audience may generally support freedom of religion but in the context of religious-motivated terrorism. However, rhetoric that emphasizes secular values may be particularly appealing, especially for those who have experienced terrorism more directly. The model of second persona is constituted to not only believe the nation should hold on to its principles, which include secular values but may also become less critical of how freedom of speech can create a gap between religious minorities and the French subject. The context in which Macron is speaking affects how the audience interprets the message. The third persona holds a different perspective. The means by which *laïcité* is framed as a provider of non-discrimination is not what legitimates the secular value for the third persona. That is, according to the third persona misleading, and it devalues the important nuances and debates around how values should be interpreted. Such abstruseness appears throughout the respective speech. For instance:

«Like you, we will relentlessly seek to understand, and to gain an even better understanding of the things they'd like to take away from us [...] [and] [w]e will remember that our freedoms will endure only if we end hatred and violence, only if we respect others»³⁵ (3, 176-179).

In the quote, Macron points out the importance of seeking out knowledge about the crisis, and what “they” are trying to obtain through terrorist attacks. Unlike earlier, terrorism is presented as an internal, national threat, based on the violence of the common “we”, the French subject. Yet, Macron still frames the attackers as people that want to take away something from the

³⁴ «Nous défendrons la liberté que vous enseigniez si bien et nous porterons haut la laïcité. Nous ne renoncerons pas aux caricatures, aux dessins, même si d'autres reculent. Nous offrirons toutes les chances que la République doit à toute sa jeunesse sans discrimination aucune».

³⁵ «Comme vous, nous chercherons à comprendre, sans relâche, et à comprendre encore davantage cela qu'on voudrait éloigner de nous [...] [et nous] [n]ous rappellerons que nos libertés ne tiennent que par la fin de la haine et de la violence, par le respect de l'autre».

French people. He encourages his audience to find out what. By doing so, the duty of finding reasons for the terrorists' attacks becomes an individual responsibility. He continues by saying that it is only by ending the violence and hatred that French people will remain free, and that respect is a crucial part of it. *Respect* is an ideograph used by Macron to describe the attitude of the audience. The content of the term is not directly defined by Macron. Instead of telling his audience how they should show respect toward other people, he describes contrasting to give substance to the term. Through describing Paty as someone who «[...] believed in knowledge» (3, 155-156), and as a curious and respectful person who always sought to «[...] discover the richness of otherness» (3, 157), Macron personifies French values, by emphasizing the war-like rhetoric of France being threatened. In that way, Macron narrates France as a nation of knowledge and enlightenment, and himself as the army commander who defends “enlightenment”. Paty is not only rhetorically constructed as a hero, but as «[...] the teacher that Jaurès dreamed of [...]»³⁶ (3, 115). Jean Jaurès (1859-1914) is a French political figure that was particularly known for promoting laïcité as a pillar of French democracy, highlighting the necessity in the French Republican secular school system (Lamarre, 2022, p. 3).

By describing Paty as the symbol of the Republic, he implies tolerance, openness, and knowledge-seeking as French values. The “other” is described as a contrast to the French subject: «they thrive on ignorance [...] [and] [t]hey cultivate hatred of the other» (3, 156). Though Paty is described as the ideal, exerting respect toward other people in an exemplary way, the audience is not asked to act accordingly. Instead, the ideograph serves to unite the French population, on the grounds of common values and a common enemy. Through cunning identification, giving each citizen ownership and descriptive rights to what is considered as “respect”. Macron constitutes a composed audience that may not agree with the interpretation but still identifies with his rhetoric. In this way, his audience identifies through cunning identification, giving a vague understanding of what is being said

6.5 The national narratives of Emmanuel Macron

The previous sections of the analysis chapter have displayed how identification through consubstantiality, property, autonomy, and cunning identification interplays with the construction of narratives. The analysis proved that identification through Burke's respective concepts is closely linked to the construction of narratives. Through consubstantiality, Macron

³⁶ «Samuel PATY incarnait au fond le professeur dont rêvait JAURÈS [...]»

creates an understanding of the foundational elements underlying the national narrative by appealing to the audience's sense of identity and shared values, illustrated through the constant emphasis on French secularism, the common values, and loyalty to the French state. Additionally, properties within narratives such as having French citizenship, being catholic, or identifying as French serves as a mechanism for generating a sense of belonging and fostering identification. The same happens when Macron foregrounds narratives that highlight self-determination and professions such as teachers, police, and security forces. Furthermore, through cunning identification, Macron encompasses both conscious and unconscious identification strategies that impact the audience's comprehension of the narrative. Together, identification through property, autonomy, consubstantiality, and cunning identification work synergistically to construct a French national narrative. By establishing connections based on shared possessions, individual agency, and common values, narratives create a sense of identification and draw the audience into the story.

The analysis reveals the importance of positioning during national crises. Emmanuel Macron does not only speak to the French people, through identification he is part of an intersubjective situation, where rhetoric plays the role of mediator between himself and the audience. The ideological dimension, through the ideographs, amplifies the identities from which Macron draws his model of the second persona and the third persona. The narratives and the ideographs are the foundation for the national narrative that Macron constitutes in his response to the terrorist attacks. The identification process, analyzed through Burke's terms, shows how identification emerges through rhetoric, and how persuasion is connected to the process.

Through rhetorical inclusion, Macron builds his ideal audience around specific values and a vision of the world that makes it possible for his audience to be consubstantial. It is through creating a link between his position and the audience's understanding of the world that he allows the audience to experience consubstantiality. He is doing so, by using contrasts to draw the image of what Macron idealizes, and the opposite, the values that his audience does not identify with. For instance, the second persona is constituted as someone who typically identifies as "French" and who sees religious fundamentalism as a threat, Macron emphasizes specific values. The French subject is described as "enlightened" and represents "free thinkers", and those are values that the French Republic defends, more specifically represented through *laïcité*. For the second persona fundamentalism and extremism represent the opposite of the French values, and secularism is not only a value, but a principle and the solution, not only as a leading value against terrorism, but for all individuals that aspire to become free citizens.

However, the expressed ambivalence becomes visible when Macron frames the terrorist threat, not only as a threat toward French values but also toward the territorial security of the country which is strengthened through the war-like rhetoric and historical references.

Consubstantiality is amplified through Macron's use of pronouns when uniting his audience around the values of "the Republic", which first and foremost entails the ideographs *laïcité* and freedom. The ambivalence in Macron's rhetoric is also expressed when he frames *laïcité* as a protector of freedom to believe, which implies religious freedom, it is also described as the counterbalance of religion. Hence, the third persona represents the religious or ethnic minorities and may be affiliated with Islam. For the third persona, Islamism is an extreme political ideology, detached from religion and religious belief. By creating an ideal, division is implied through contrasts between those who identify and those who do not, between the "Western French" and the "rest". On one side, he draws the French values as something unique for France. First of all, by continuously describing the French state as the "French Republic", and second, by framing the Republic as something almost static and unchangeable. A Republic is first and foremost a form of governance. However, for the audience that believes in Democracy, they may as well believe in the institutions that hold the Republic alive.

By constituting the Republic as a contrast to the terrorist threat and emphasizing the French Republic as inherently French, in opposition to terrorism, Macron engenders a sense of French state nationalism. In doing so, Macron creates a narrative that fosters a collective identification with the French nation-state. While Macron intends to unite diverse people, through commonalities, the content of his discourse may as well be interpreted as the opposite. Regardless of the ambiguity, when a terrorist attack occurs, Macron manages to create a link between the audience and the system they are part of, by creating an image of war, resulting in a feeling of consubstantiality, as participants of the French Republic and the values that unite the French subject.

Not only does Macron allow his audience to experience a sense of consubstantiality through the values he is defending but identification is also amplified through Macron's emphasis on the property of being French. Macron is himself part of the subject he is drawing. Though he represents a specific segment of the population, his fears and visions for the country may be shared by groups of the population. When Macron describes himself as part of the common "we", he puts himself in a position where his citizenship becomes a property that allows him to identify with people who share the same property, giving more specific content to what being a French citizen implies. The second persona is constituted as being convinced

of choosing awareness instead of ignorance, seriousness over superficiality, and strength and resistance over cowardice.

Laïcité is described as a characteristic of the country and the French people. At the same time, Macron constitutes Catholics as a particularly selected part of the French subject, which represents both French tradition and history and the antithesis of laïcité. Catholicism as French and non-secular expresses ambiguity. On the one hand, laïcité is framed as a French property, and on the other hand, “Islamic terrorism” is framed as both the opposition to Catholicism and laïcité. However, for Macron, it seems like Catholicism and laïcité are both properties that belong to the French subject. For the third persona, there is a contrast narrated by Macron, between French Muslims and French Catholics. The sympathy directed toward the Catholics, described as the “Catholics of France”, illustrates a will to include the religious group as part of the French subject, which in return expresses the ambivalence between the property of being secular (laïque) and Catholic. Though Muslims have a present role in all the speeches, they are not offered the same type of sympathy by the French president. In that way, the French national narrative implies a hierarchy where the catholic subject is placed in the middle, the Muslim on the bottom, and where the secular subject is placed on top. The hierarchy, where groups are ranked according to their respective affiliation to secularism, illustrates the role of laïcité in the construction of the French national narrative. However, it also shows that the interpretation of laïcité can differ depending on the orator. The third persona may identify as being French, but not necessarily with the content given to the French subject by Macron.

In the speeches, Macron mentions different types of autonomous groups of professions, including teachers, security forces, and police officers. Though the autonomous groups represent different fractions of French society, the commonality between the respective groups consists of their role in legitimizing French sovereignty. The security and police forces are crucial in enforcing the law and the educational system is the principal ground for promoting “French values”. Not only is identification through autonomy communicating the importance of certain professions, by recognizing the importance of their role in times of crisis, to prevent crisis or to promote values, but it also creates a common understanding among the audience of Macron, that reflect what the French national narrative valorizes. The model of the second persona is constituted around trust toward the state apparatus of the French Republic as national pride and its ability to confront crises effectively. Though the third persona may also valorize the work of the security forces, the way Macron frames the attacks as an attack against the French values is opposed to the vision of the third persona.

The way in which Macron frames secularism as an opposition to religiosity while pointing up the co-existence of the catholic religion builds a narrative of the French state as built on both secular principles and the catholic heritage. This is more specifically highlighted through the cultivation of national symbols. That is for instance the case when Macron emphasizes values such as “enlightenment” when he constructs the narrative of “a brave act of a police officer who puts his own life at risk to save civilians in a “war-like situation”, though the conflict is internal. It is even more obvious in the case of Samuel Paty. Not only is one of the speeches personally dedicated to Samuel Paty, but through the speech, Macron explicitly mentions that the teacher was killed because he represented the values of the French Republic.

Through the ideographs, Macron tells a story of the French subject as heroic and brave when faced with the threat of terrorism. By drawing parallels between historical ideals of French war success and contemporary acts, Macron constructs a narrative of the French people as static. The French people will win the war against the common enemy, terrorism, which represents cowardice. The bravery of the French people is further informed through the rhetorical construction of the security forces as national protectors, willing to risk their lives for the nation. In this way, Macron constructs a narrative of the French subject as strong, loyal, and courageous, akin to soldiers. By drawing on historical references, Macron creates an image of a battlefield where the French people stand on the frontline, defending the French institutions, particularly the educational institutions that shape enlightened citizens. Macron portrays these institutions as the primary target and source of fear for the externalized threat, terrorists. Macron constructs a narrative of a country which the ability to confront any threats that intend to bring the country and the respective values down, sending echoes back to the French history of war victories. Enlightenment through learning and teaching is what the security force defends, and what the French educational system promotes.

The cunning identification illustrates the ambiguity when it comes to the values Macron addresses. The model of the second persona is built around the secular value, *laïcité*, as a provider of freedom and non-discrimination. For the third persona, there is a contradiction in the way in which Macron frames religions in a hierarchical way while holding on to the principle of *laïcité* which according to his own words is necessary for creating non-discrimination between religious groups. It also contrasts with Macron’s description of France as “one community”. By constructing the French narrative, based on ideographs such as honor and respect, Macron’s story of the French people is built on values widely recognized as positive attributes. However, his story of the French people as honorable and respectful opens up for interpretation and ambiguity in the way in which these respective values should be

interpreted, leading to cunning identification because the message defended by Macron includes contradictions. By not giving clear guidelines regarding the content when it comes to values seen as important for the French narrative the audience may interpret freely, resulting in a cunning interpretation of the French subject.

6.6 Analytical model with the results

Table 2 Analytical model, including results

	Consubstantiality	Property	Autonomy	Cunning
Second persona (Black, 1970)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Belonging to “the French Republic”; the values of the Republic - “we”, “us”, “our country”, “fellow citizen” - Uniting through values: freedom of speech, freedom to believe or not, loyalty, laïcité 	Identifying through properties such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Being French, French citizenship, being part of the French Republic. - The property of being French is used to unite. 	Belonging is constructed around specific professions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers; educational system. - Police officers: security forces. - Paty as a symbol - Qualities of respective groups are central for the identification 	Identification is built around the idea of laïcité <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Framed as a provider of freedom; - However, Macron defends “one community”.
Third persona (Wander, 1999)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Belongs to religious minorities, ethnic minorities, or foreign cultures or countries. - May feel French, but do not recognize the content Macron use to constitute the French subject 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May identify as French, but does not recognize the values which are framed as part of being French - Sees terrorism as a threat to security not necessarily the values of the Republic. - Religion as separate from terrorism: Terrorism is not the opposition to secularism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May identify with the importance of having a well-functioning educational system and security forces but do not agree on the content. - The lack of flexibility in the educational system is perceived as a challenge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not identify with Macron’s framing of laïcité as a provider of non-discrimination; perceives it as an exaggeration. - Interprets the image of “one community” as misleading.
Ideograph (McGee, 1975, 1980)	<i>Laïcité, Freedom</i> Building stones to the subject Macron constitute.	<i>Catholic.</i> Constituted as close to the French subject	<i>Courage, apprendre</i> characteristics of French autonomous groups (security forces, educational system)	<i>Honor, respect</i> the content allows interpretation. The audience may give the terms a meaning
Constitutive rhetoric (Charland, 1987)	National narratives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The secular principle of laïcité is central to the constitution of personae and ideographs. The rhetoric of Emmanuel Macron is built on highlighted values that appear as ideographs, and those are central in the identification process of the second and third persona. The link between these elements, results in a unified story of the French people. 			

While the preliminary model served as an analytical guideline, the model presented in Table 3 offers a structured and concise list of the key findings derived from the analysis of Emmanuel Macron's four speeches. The analytical model establishes a repertoire of various types of identification and textual tools. Based on the literature of Kenneth Burke (1969), Maurice Charland (1987), Michael McGee (1975), Edwin Black (1970), and Philip Wander (1999) the model has enabled the analysis of textual representations regarding inclusion and exclusion and central ideas and values. Further, it has allowed us to get a better comprehension of the reconstruction of the secular principle, *laïcité* in the national narratives in France.

Having provided an in-depth analysis of the material in the preceding section, the following section will transition to a discussion of the research question before concluding.

7. Discussion and conclusion

This thesis sought to answer the following question: *How does Emmanuel Macron reconstitute laïcité as a foundation for national identity, through his speeches delivered as responses to terrorist attacks in France, between March 2018 and October 2020?* The purpose of raising this question was to acquire a more profound comprehension of how the French president employs the secular principle of laïcité in the construction of the French subject's identity, specifically in response to jihadi-motivated terrorist attacks. As a result of bridging the Burkean literature of identification and constitutive rhetoric, an analytical model was developed and used as the main tool for the analysis. The subsequent sections will commence by presenting the findings derived from the analysis, followed by a discussion on the implications and significance of these findings. Finally, the section will conclude with reflections on the broader implications of the study.

7.1 Reconstitution of laïcité as a foundation for national identity

When one enters a rhetorical situation, and as soon as someone recognizes being spoken to, a collective subject is being built. Political leaders are important rhetors in society and by addressing larger audiences, they shape a collective narrative and a common understanding of common problems and solutions within the society. While traditional rhetoric has focused on the rhetor as the primary subject, modern rhetoric, and constitutive rhetoric allow the analysis of intersubjective rhetoric, and how it shapes narratives.

Constitutive rhetoric has developed to become important for the analysis of rhetoric, and various analytical approaches focus on different analytical areas. Different textual approaches such as ideographs, the second persona, and the third persona, have enriched the growing body of rhetoric research. However, there have been fewer attempts to bring these together into one analytical model. Central in the different textual approaches is the shared basis, namely the focus on identity. I believe that a more profound focus on identification can give a better understanding of how national narratives are constituted.

By presenting an analytical model that brings together textual tools and an in-depth focus on identification, the aim has been to present a framework that can cover the complexity associated with identity building and the reconstitution of values in times of crisis. Additionally, the aim has also been to present a suitable tool to the research areas of the political science field, and ultimately suited to answer the research question of this thesis. The rhetorical situation is

the context of terrorism, where Emmanuel Macron is confronted with the necessity of responding to crises related to terrorism. The results from the analysis can be summed up in four major findings.

First, Macron reactivates the link between *laïcité* and the French subject in his response to terrorism. Macron calls for the unification of the French people through consubstantiality. That happens using the pronouns such as “we” and “us” and through the possessive pronouns such as “our country” when denominating the French people, and hence Macron constructs the second persona through the feeling of belonging and being consubstantial, based on the common set of values. By doing so, while constantly emphasizing ideographs such as *laïcité*, and *freedom*, Macron tells a story of a common “we” constituted through specific values. The ideographs serve as important building stones for the consubstantial connection between the audience and the message of Macron. The French audience is addressed in a way that informs that Macron’s *laïcité*, is built on a selective understanding of freedom which is not consistent throughout the speeches. Furthermore, the content of *laïcité* becomes personified. By creating a symbol out of the history teacher, Samuel Paty, he becomes the figure and role model of the ideal teacher and a martyr for the French Republic. In the same way, the police officer that set his own life at risk is narrated as a soldier in a fight for freedom, motivated by *laïcité*.

Second, Macron treats terrorist incidences as external threats. In the French context, where the threat comes from Jihadi-motivated terrorism and in many cases from the French Republic’s citizens, Macron chooses to respond to the threat by constituting terrorism as an external and foreign threat, and as the opposition to the French values. While Macron tells a story of France grounded on *laïcité*, enlightenment, and bravery, he externalizes problems related to radicalism and terrorism. The fact that the terrorist incidents are rooted in radical misinterpretations of Islam contributes to the legitimization of externalizing the religious group. Through the construction of the second persona, Macron portrays a strong association with quintessential French values and the French system, thereby reinforcing the image of Catholicism and historical military triumphs as integral components of the French identity. That creates a contrast to what is considered non-French. Terrorism is externalized explicitly. However, the portrayal of religious minorities, particularly Muslims, as externalized entities reveal their exclusion from the construct of the French subject. This is further evident in Macron's depiction of jihadi-motivated terrorism as a foreign ideology and radicalism as something non-French. Hence, Macron constitutes a crisis between the nation (us) and external impulses (terrorism) separated from the French values and the French subjects. The insight from the analysis showed that the third persona does not necessarily disagree with values such

as laïcité, solidarity, and freedom. Instead, the third persona disagrees with the content implied by Macron in the respective terms.

Third, Macron constructs the French narrative by employing war rhetoric, characterized by references to past war victories, the use of militaristic rhetoric such as battle, honor to the weapon, combat, and the identification of an enemy. Instead of naming the enemy, the hatred behind terrorism, the enemy is constructed as the opposite of laïcité, as the “religion endorses”. However, the gray zone between “peaceful religiosity” and terrorism is not addressed, creating cunning identification because there is wide room for interpretation. By utilizing war references and contrasts, Macron creates a narrative that evokes a war-like scenario when addressing his audience. The heroes are constituted through the identification of autonomous groups, such as “teachers”, “the educational system”, the “police” and the “security forces”. Discursively speaking, Macron constructs the role of the teachers and security forces in terms reminiscent of its initial mission. For instance, laïcité is confronted as the key to a free society which legitimizes the institutional practice of laïcité within the French educational system. Furthermore, these specific groups are portrayed as individuals who are prepared to sacrifice their own lives for the sake of the Republic, similar to the sacrifices made during times of war. They defend French values and identity.

Lastly, through using historical references, Macron disregards that the demography of French society has changed, and he thus ignores multiculturalism in the reconstitution of laïcité. While Macron adopts a negative understanding of laïcité, by emphasizing neutrality and equal treatment of all religions, he contradictorily constitutes the ideograph “Catholic” as part of the French subject, constituting the second persona accordingly. The catholic church has a historical role in France; however, the role of the catholic church has changed since the codification of laïcité. While laïcité and the components of the French state are framed as something unchangeable, Macron expresses ambiguity when Catholics are constituted as part of the French subject. With a closer look at the properties highlighted by Macron, being French, having French citizenship, and living within the national border are important properties for the constitution of the second persona. However, these properties are framed as something fixed and determined. Though the third persona may consider themselves as French, the property of being French described by Macron is for the third persona not descriptive of their understanding of being French.

These four aspects demonstrate how the French president uses the speeches held after the terrorist attacks in France to constitute a national “we” by linking laïcité and French historical events to the French subject, thus creating a political and social identity and a basis

for the French narrative. The common “we” is a model of the second persona, who accepts the framing of laïcité and who agrees with Macron’s national narrative. Macron builds the French national narrative on principles of “freedom”, and “laïcité” and by constantly referring to “enlightenment”, telling a story of the French people as intellectual, brave, and reflected. He underlines French superiority, by referring to historical events and especially war victories, and reinforces the myth of France as a dominant culture and country, with leading principles. While laïcité historically aimed to separate the influence of the catholic church from the state, Macron recreates a narrative of laïcité and Catholicism as purely French and in line with one and each other. However, the analysis shows how laïcité, as a strong factor in the national narrative constituted by Macron, challenges the aim to unite the French people. Islam threatens the unity of the French people, and those affiliated with the respective religions are represented through the third persona. While constituting the French narrative the nuances between private and public religiosity and moderate and fundamental religious interpretations are not addressed. That underlines the challenge Macron encounters when reconstructing laïcité as the foundation of the French national identity.

7.2 Broader implications and concluding remarks

The dramatic terrorist incidents that have occurred in France in the past decades portray how the national community remains consistently relevant in times of crisis. Understanding the very concrete instances of rhetoric requires an in-depth analysis of individual national leaders, and their respective speeches. That is necessary if the aim is to understand how national leaders build national identities through rhetoric. For the field of political science today, that means taking a greater effort to study rhetoric and investigate the role of identity and identification processes in shaping a national narrative.

By investigating concrete political rhetoric, such as the case of Emmanuel Macron in France, we are more able to understand the development of the national narrative within specific countries of interest within the field of political science. Furthermore, it can provide a better understanding of the debate climate in France, in discussions about secularism and terrorism. Instead of exclusively focusing on the effect of terrorism, or the leader’s ability to implement political measures against terrorism, analyzing the audience and the constituted people allows a more nuanced examination of how rhetoric shapes social and political realities. Moreover, it offers valuable insight into the complex relationship between language, identity, and political and social dynamics within specific societies. The current thesis is a small contribution to this,

which focuses on France in 2018 and 2020. Through this lens, I offer a perspective on how the French identity is constituted.

Though this thesis analyzed different speeches, it is important to note that it represents a small investigation of national narrative-building in France. This means that it provides only one perspective on how the French national identity is formed. The goal was to gain insight into the unique case of France, rather than drawing general conclusions. Nonetheless, it can provide a better understanding of identity building in a broader context. For instance, cases where other countries experience similar type of rhetorical dilemma in the response to terrorism. The insight can also be abstracted and applied to the understanding of important phenomena in the field of political science. This modest contribution can complement studies on ideology, nationalism, and leadership, as well as research on terrorism, democratization, and policy development. By doing so, it contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of complex societal issues.

Additionally, this type of research can provide a better understanding of cases that deal with similar types of rhetoric. Future analytical frameworks can serve to analyze political crisis communication and foster a better understanding of speeches that draw on national narratives in times of crisis. Another implication is that analyzing the constitution of an audience can aid in understanding the prevailing values within diverse societies and their significance within the national intersubjective community. Furthermore, it can give a better understanding of how crises that create a collative sense of grief, create a space for changing the collective identity.

Though the study can contribute to a better understanding of national narrative building and state leaders' rhetorical confrontation of crises, certain limitations need to be addressed. One of them is linked to the position of the respective researcher. In line with the interpretive approach to science, researchers in different situations and with different backgrounds and experiences will interpret and understand the material differently. A Norwegian master's student like myself may interpret and analyze Macron's speeches differently than for instance a French master's student. My preconception of French politics from the Norwegian perspective. As an outsider, I have an implicit comparative perspective where I position myself as part of the collective "we," while perceiving France as "the others." The respective society and research field may also have an impact on how texts are understood. Indeed, it also influences the contextual understanding of references in the material. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that research is influenced by factors including personal perspectives. Recognizing these influences allows us to engage in critical reflection and helps advance our understanding of the social and political world.

Another limitation is linked to the selection of material. Since the language of this thesis is different from the language of the material, there is a double interpretation process. The content of the speeches was interpreted and translated, which means that a loss of meaning may have occurred. When it comes to the selection of material one should note that one of the speeches is not a declaration per se, but a tribute to the memory of a victim. Compared to the other speeches, it did not provide an equal abundance of rhetorical references to national narratives. Choosing another speech could potentially make the analytical process more fluid. Further reducing the number of speeches could also enable more in-depth analysis and more textual focus on symbols, and the meaning of the language and terms.

Concerning the selection of literature, it is interesting to note that Charland (1987) and Burke (1969) share a different understanding of the role of persuasion in rhetoric. Though the thesis did not measure the rhetorical abilities of the French president, it would be interesting to further investigate if a different structure to the analytical would provide a different analytical approach in that respect. This could be done by focusing on other elements of the theories or by complementing the model with other perspectives.

When it comes to the field of political science, I hope this can inspire scholars to further investigate rhetoric. Studying the state implies understanding the national community and the people who reside within the delimited territory. Understanding how values and principles structure the role of the state in respect of other entities within the state, can provide a better understanding of the policies that are implemented within a state. Additionally, investigating how Laïcité is rhetorically reconstructed in the context of crises, provide knowledge important for future works on how political measures are shaped and how they may or may not change over time.

With the constant development of technology, political communication has extended to new platforms and to new ways of addressing the audience. With political leaders moving over to different social media platforms, such as TikTok, Instagram, and Twitter, questions regarding rhetoric and narrative-building should be raised. There is an overall need for more exploration of how political leaders' constitutive national narratives, and what kind of principles guide the identity-building process. This perspective and the study of constitutive rhetoric can serve as a valuable complement to other viewpoints within the field of political science, allowing for mutual exchange and fostering the potential for interdisciplinary study and understanding.

Literature

Akan, M. (2009). Laïcité and multiculturalism: The Stasi Report in context. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 60(2), 237–256. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01229>

Azam, J.-P., & Ferret, J. (2022). Radicalization of Islam or Peddling Radicalism? Lessons from the French Experience. *Toulouse School of Economics*, 1296, 33.

Baubérot, J. (2009). L'évolution de la laïcité en France: Entre deux religions civiles. *Diversité urbaine*. <https://doi.org/10.7202/037756ar>

Baubérot, J., Beloucif, S., Benbassa, E., Dieckhoff, A., Donegani, J.-M., Droit, R.-P., Gaucher, M., Giuliani, B., Guillard, A., Hervieu-Léger, D., Honicker, N., Hopes, J., Lacorne, D., Löwy, M., Morineau, M., & Ferenczi, T. (2003). *Religion et politique, une liaison dangereuse* (T. Ferenczi, Ed.). Éditions Complexe.

Baubérot, J., & Poulat, É. (2017). LAÏCITÉ. In *Encyclopædia Universalis*. Encyclopædia Universalis. <http://www.universalis-edu.com.ezproxy.uio.no/encyclopedie/laicite/>

Bauer, A., & Bruguière, J.-L. (2010). *Terrorisme, terrorismes ?* (pp. 3–4). Presses Universitaires de France. <https://www.cairn.info/les-100-mots-du-terrorisme--9782130579502-p-3.htm>

Berstein, S. (2004). Le projet gaullien. *Parlement[s], Revue d'histoire politique*, 1(3), 11–22. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-parlements1-2004-3-page-11.htm>

Black, E. (1970). The Second Persona. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 56(2), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637009382992>

Bogain, A. (2019). Terrorism and the discursive construction of national identity in France. *Routledge - Taylor & Francis Grouå*, 21(3), 241–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14608944.2018.1431877>

Bratberg, Øivind. *Tekstanalyse for samfunnsvitere*. 3. Cappelen Damm Akademisk, 2021.

Brummett, B. (1976). Some Implications of ‘Process’ or ‘Intersubjectivity’: Postmodern Rhetoric. *Penn State University Press*, 9(1), 21–55.

Brummett, B. (2008). *A Rhetoric of Style*. USA: Southern Illinois University Press.

Brummett, B. (2014). *Rhetoric in Popular Culture* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1st ed.). University of California Press.

Campbell, D. (1998). *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* [Book]. University of Minnesota Press. <https://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/writing-security>

Charland, M. (1987). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the peuple quebécois. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73(2), 133–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638709383799>

Cole, A. (2019). *Emmanuel Macron and the Two Years That Changed France*. Manchester University Press.

Condit, C. M. (2013). Pathos in Criticism: Edwin Black’s Communism-As-Cancer Metaphor. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 99(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2012.749417>

Cowan, J. (2021). The Constitutive Rhetoric of Late Nationalism: Imagined Communities after the Digital Revolution. *Rhetoric Review*, 40(2), 183–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198.2021.1883833>

DGSI. (2023, January 2). *L’état de la menace terroriste en France* | Direction Générale de la Sécurité Intérieure. Direction Générale de La Sécurité Intérieure. <https://www.dgsi.interieur.gouv.fr/la-dgsi-a-vos-cotes/lutte-contre-terrorisme/letat-de-la-menace-terroriste-en-france>

Dobbernack, J. (2022). Civic inclusion for permanent minorities: Thinking through the politics of “ghetto” and “separatism” laws. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 45(16), 568–590.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2022.2113419>

Elysée. (2022, December 15). *The Role of the President*. Elysee.Fr.
<https://www.elysee.fr/en/french-presidency/the-role-of-the-president>

Europol. (2022). *European Union—Terrorism Situation and Trend Report 2022* (p. 96) [TESAT]. Publications Office of the European Union.
https://www.europol.europa.eu/cms/sites/default/files/documents/Tesat_Report_2022_0.pdf

Fourquet, J., & Manternach, S. (2018). Trèbes: Un village français: *Hérodote*, N° 170(3), 57–76. <https://doi.org/10.3917/her.170.0057>

Hajjat, A. (2010). « Bons » et « mauvais » musulmans: L’Etat français face aux candidats « islamistes » à la nationalité. *Cultures et Conflits*, 79/80, 139–159.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23703657>

Hazareesingh, S. (2021, July 9). Une part de nous: Emmanuel Macron’s admiration for Napoleon. *Times Literary Supplement*, 7+. <https://go-gale-com.ezproxy.uio.no/ps/i.do?p=AONE&u=oslo&id=GALE%7CA669344381&v=2.1&it=r>

Horvilleur, D. (2014). Is Laïcité Lost in Translation? In J. Berlinerblau, S. Fainberg, & A. Nou (Eds.), *Secularism on the Edge* (pp. 125–131). Palgrave Macmillan US.
https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137380371_10

Insee. (2019). *Compareur de territoires – Commune de Conflans-Sainte-Honorine (78172)* | Insee. <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/1405599?geo=COM-78172>

Insee. (2022, December 29). *Populations légales 2020 – Commune de Nice (06088)* | Insee.
<https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/6676182?geo=COM-06088>

Introvigne, M., Amicarelli, A., Fautré, W., Rigal-Cellard, B., & Pansier, F.-J. (2020). “Separatism,” Religion, and “Cults”: Religious Liberty Issues (pp. 1–30) [A White Paper]. CESNUR.

Jasinski, J., & Merecieca, J. (2010). Analyzing Constitutive Rhetorics The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions and the “Principles of ’98”. In S. Parry-Giles & M. Hogan (Eds.), *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Just, S., & Christiansen, T. (2012). *Doing Diversity: Text–Audience Agency and Rhetorical Alternatives* | *Communication Theory* | *Oxford Academic*. 22(3), 319–337.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2012.01407.x>

Käsehage, N. (2022). No Country for Muslims? The Invention of an Islam Républicain in France and Its Impact on French Muslims. *Religions*, 13(1), Article 1.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13010038>

Kauffeld, F. J. (2001). Edwin Black on the Powers of the Rhetorical Critic. In *Twentieth-century Roots of Rhetorical Studies*. Praeger Publishers Inc.

Kis, J. (2012). Berlin’s two concepts of positive liberty. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 12(1), 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474885112463647>

Lamarre, J.-M. (2022). Jean Jaurès: Neutralité, religion, socialisme et école laïque. *Éducation et Socialisation*, 64. <https://doi.org/10.4000/edso.18959>

Larousse. (n.d.-a). *Définitions: Apprendre - Dictionnaire de français Larousse*. Retrieved 11 May 2023, from <https://www.larousse.fr/dictionnaires/francais/apprendre/4746>

Larousse, É. (n.d.-b). *Définitions: Appeler, être appelé, s’appeler - Dictionnaire de français Larousse*. Retrieved 27 January 2023, from <https://www.larousse.fr/dictionnaires/francais/appeler/4669>

Légifrance. «Projet de loi confortant le respect des principes de la République (INTX2030083L) - Dossiers législatifs - Légifrance», 14. mai 2021.
<https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/dossierlegislatif/JORFDOLE000042635616/>.

Lund, M., & Tønneson, J. (2017). Kongens tale ved hagefesten | Åpne dører mot verden. In *Åpne dører mot verden: Norske ungdommers møte med fortellinger om skyld og privilegier*

(pp. 32–46). Universitetsforlaget. <https://www.idunn.no/doi/full/10.18261/9788215030227-2017-03>

Macron, E. (2018). *Déclaration du Président de la République Emmanuel Macron suite à l'attaque terroriste de Carcassonne et Trèbes* [Declaration/speech].

<https://www.elysee.fr/emmanuel-macron/2018/03/23/declaration-du-president-de-la-republique-emmanuel-macron-suite-a-lattaque-terroriste-de-carcassonne-et-trebes>

Macron, E. (2020a). *Déclaration du Président Emmanuel Macron suite à l'attentat de Conflans-Sainte-Honorine*. <https://www.elysee.fr/emmanuel-macron/2020/10/16/declaration-du-president-emmanuel-macron-suite-a-lattentat-de-conflans-sainte-honorine>

Macron, E. (2020b). *Cérémonie d'hommage national à Samuel Paty à la Sorbonne*. [Speech]. <https://www.elysee.fr/emmanuel-macron/2020/10/21/ceremonie-dhommage-national-a-samuel-paty-a-la-sorbonne>

Macron, E. (2020c). *Déclaration du Président Emmanuel Macron après l'attaque terroriste de Nice*. | *Élysée* [Declaration/speech]. <https://www.elysee.fr/emmanuel-macron/2020/10/29/declaration-du-president-emmanuel-macron-apres-lattaque-terroriste-de-nice>

Mastrangelo, L. (2017). Changing Ideographs of Motherhood: Defining and Conscripting Women's Rhetorical Practices During World War I. *Rhetoric Review*, 36(3), 214–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198.2017.1318253>

Maurot, É. (2012, February 10). *Jean Baubérot: « N'utilisons pas la laïcité contre l'islam »* [Interview]. https://www.la-croix.com/Debats/Opinions/Debats/Jean-Bauberot-N-utilisons-pas-la-laicite-contre-l-islam-_NP_-2012-02-10-767265

McGee, M. C. (1975). In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 61(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637509383289>

McGee, M. C. (1980). The "ideograph": A link between rhetoric and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66(1), 1–16.

Mercier, C. (2022). La « religion culturelle » en France et au Québec: Quelques réflexions à partir de l'étude des Journées mondiales de la jeunesse. *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses*, 000842982211224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00084298221122456>

Mignon, E. (2022). L'Élysée, lieu de décision. *Pouvoirs*, 180(1), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.3917/pouv.180.0023>

Millar, D. P., & Heath, R. L. (2003). *Responding to Crisis: A Rhetorical Approach to Crisis Communication*. Routledge.

Nesser, P., Stenersen, A., & Oftedal, E. (2016). Jihadi Terrorism in Europe: The IS-Effect. *Perspectives on Terrorism*, 10(6), 3–24. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26297702>

OHCHR. (2018). *Preliminary findings of the visit: UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism concludes visit to France*. OHCHR. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2018/05/preliminary-findings-visit-un-special-rapporteur-promotion-and-protection>

Pannier, A., & Schmitt, O. (2019). To fight another day: France between the fight against terrorism and future warfare | International Affairs | Oxford Academic. *International Affairs*, 95(4), 897–916. <https://academic.oup.com/ia/article/95/4/897/5492774>

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and nation: Categorization, Contestation and Mobilization*. SAGE Publications.

Reid, C. (2020). Macron's Crackdown on Islamist Separatism. *Towson University*, 54(2), 37–45. <https://bpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/wp.towson.edu/dist/b/55/files/2018/04/Carolyn2021.pdf>

Rodde, A. (2021). *Tueries planifiées dans les lieux d'enseignement. Antécédents, évolutions et approche sécuritaire* (No. 55; Note du CREOGN, p. 5). Research Centre of the Gendarmerie Nationale Officers College. <https://hal.science/hal-03095062/document>

Rosenfeld, L. B. (1969). Set theory: Key to the understanding, of Kenneth Burke's use of the

term “identification”. *Western Speech*, 33(3), 175–183.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10570316909384575>

Saidi, R. (2017). *The French President, Above Political Parties?*

<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3283833>

Simon, P. (2013). Contested Citizenship in France: The Republican Politics of Identity and Integration. In A. Cole, S. Meunier, & V. Tiberj (Eds.), *Developments in French Politics 5* (pp. 203–217). Macmillan Education UK. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-34917-0_13

Statista. (2022, July 27). *Le terrorisme en France et dans le monde—Faits et chiffres | Statista*. Statista. <https://fr.statista.com/themes/3402/le-terrorisme-en-france/#dossier-chapter1>

Syrstad, T.G. (2017). The political language of identity. A cross-disciplinary analytical map for understanding national rhetoric. Tested and refined through analyses of New Year’s speeches held by Danish prime ministers between 2002-2017. [Master thesis, University of Oslo, Norway]. Duo Research Archive <https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/57629>

Taguieff, P.-A. (2017). *Macron: Miracle ou mirage ?* Les éditions de l’observatoire.

Thahirah, Marihandono, D., & Susanto, D. (2021). The Efforts of President Emmanuel Macron in Making Islam de France. *Atlanti Press*, 593, 295–301.

<https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211110.044>

UNTS. (1977). *European Convention on the suppression of terrorism. Concluded at Strasbourg on 27 January 1977* (Vol. 1137). The United Nations Treaty Series.

<https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%201137/volume-1137-I-17828-English.pdf>

Vatnøy, E. (2015). Leaders’ Response to Terrorism: The Role of Epideictic Rhetoric in Deliberative Democracies. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 11(2), Article 2.

<https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.235>

Vie Publique. (2017, May 9). *Présidentielle 2017: Emmanuel Macron est élu*. [vie-publique.fr](http://www.vie-publique.fr).

<http://www.vie-publique.fr/en-bref/19635-presidentielle-2017-emmanuel-macron-est-elu->

resultats-du-second-tour

Vie Publique. (2021, August 2). *Loi du 30 juillet 2021 relative à la prévention d'actes de terrorisme et au renseignement*. vie-publique.fr. <http://www.vie-publique.fr/loi/279661-loi-30-juillet-2021-prevention-terrorisme-et-renseignement>

Vie Publique. (2022, April 25). *Résultats de la présidentielle 2022: Emmanuel Macron est réélu*. vie-publique.fr. <http://www.vie-publique.fr/en-bref/284916-resultats-de-la-presidentielle-2022-emmanuel-macron-est-reelu>

Wander, P. (1999). The Third Persona. An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory. In J. L.

Lucaites, C. M. Condit, & S. Caudil (Eds.), *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory*. (pp. 357–379). The Guilford Press.

Zagacki, K. S. (2007). Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches. *Western Journal of Communication*, 71(4), 272–293.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10570310701653786>

Attachements

The first speech presented under "attachments" is transcribed by the author. For the three remaining speeches (b, c, and d), the transcriptions are provided by the web page, Elysee.fr.

a) Déclaration du Président de la République suite à l'attaque terroriste de Carcassonne et Trèbes

23.3.2018

1 Notre pays a subi aujourd'hui une attaque terroriste islamiste à Carcassonne et à Trèbes. Un
2 individu a tué 3 personnes, et en a blessé 16 autres, dont au moins deux sont dans un état grave.

3
4 Les forces de l'ordre sont intervenues avec une rapidité remarquable. À la fois pour contenir
5 l'individu qui s'était retranché avec des otages ; pour localiser une de ses victimes encore
6 vivantes qu'il avait laissé dans les alentours, et pour donner l'assaut, mené par le GIGN, dès
7 qu'il est apparu qu'il n'y avait pas d'autre solution. Je veux ici saluer Leur engagement et leur
8 professionnalisme, mais aussi leur courage. En particulier le courage d'un officier supérieur de
9 la gendarmerie. Qui s'est porté volontaire pour se substituer aux autres otages et qui a été très
10 gravement blessé. Il a sauvé des vies, fait honneur à son armée et notre pays. Il lutte
11 actuellement contre la mort, et toutes nos pensées vont à lui et sa famille.

12
13 Le terroriste a été identifié. Il a été abattu pendant l'assaut et l'enquête devrait apporter des
14 réponses à un certain nombre de questions importantes : Quand et comment s'est-il radicalisé,
15 où s'est-il procuré cette arme. Tous les moyens nécessaires à l'obtention de ces réponses seront
16 mobilisés.

17
18 Cet attentat a fait l'objet d'une revendication de Daech, laquelle est actuellement analysée.
19 Nous avons depuis plusieurs années payé le prix du sang pour savoir la dangerosité de la menace
20 terroriste. Nos soldats à l'étranger risquent leur vie pour réduire la menace venant de l'Irak et
21 de la Syrie. Nos forces de l'ordre sur notre territoire ne comptent pas leurs efforts ni leurs
22 risques pour identifier les menaces et les identifier.

23

24 Je veux ici les en remercier. Je veux aussi dire ce soir à la nation tout entière. Ma détermination
25 absolue, et la détermination du Premier ministre et de tout le gouvernement pour mener cette
26 lutte. J'invite chacun et chacune de nos citoyens d'être conscient de la gravité de la menace
27 terroriste, mais à être également conscient de la force et de la résistance que notre peuple a
28 démontré chaque fois qu'il a été attaqué
29
30 Je vous remercie.

(Macron, 2018)

b) Déclaration du président de la République suite à l'attentat de Conflans-Sainte-Honorine

16.10.2020

31 Je voulais ce soir, accompagné des Ministres, de monsieur le Maire, de monsieur le Président
32 du Conseil départemental, de nos Préfets, de nos fonctionnaires ici, dire quelques mots.
33 Un de nos concitoyens, dont je ne dirai pas de manière officielle le nom ce soir car notre
34 Procureur s'exprimera dans les prochaines heures et il lui appartient de dévoiler l'ensemble des
35 identités comme des faits, et donc je ne parlerai pas des détails de ce qui s'est passé ce soir à
36 Conflans, mais un de nos concitoyens a été assassiné, aujourd'hui, parce qu'il enseignait, parce
37 qu'il apprenait à des élèves la liberté d'expression, la liberté de croire et de ne pas croire. Notre
38 compatriote a été lâchement attaqué, a été la victime d'un attentat terroriste islamiste caractérisé.
39
40 Ce soir, je veux avant toute chose avoir une pensée pour l'ensemble de ses proches, sa famille,
41 avoir une pensée pour ses collègues ici, au collège. Nous avons vu madame la Proviseure qui,
42 avec un courage remarquable ces dernières semaines, a tenu face à toutes les pressions, a exercé
43 son métier, fait son devoir avec un dévouement remarquable. Je veux avoir un mot de soutien
44 pour elle, l'ensemble des enseignants, l'ensemble de l'équipe de ce collège. Mais plus largement,
45 je veux dire ce soir à tous les enseignants de France que nous sommes avec eux, que la Nation
46 toute entière sera là à leurs côtés aujourd'hui et demain pour les protéger, les défendre, leur
47 permettre de faire leur métier, qui est le plus beau qui soit, faire des citoyens libres.
48

49 Il n'y a pas de hasard si ce soir, c'est un enseignant que ce terroriste a abattu, parce qu'il a voulu
50 abattre la République dans ses valeurs, les Lumières, la possibilité de faire de nos enfants d'où
51 qu'ils viennent, qu'ils croient ou qu'ils ne croient pas, quelle que soit leur religion, d'en faire des
52 citoyens libres. Cette bataille, c'est la nôtre, et elle est existentielle.

53

54 Ce soir, je veux aussi remercier l'ensemble des forces de l'ordre qui, avec un courage
55 exemplaire, sont intervenues avec une rapidité exceptionnelle pour mettre fin à la course
56 mortelle de ce terroriste ; à la police municipale, merci monsieur le Maire et merci à vos agents,
57 et à notre police nationale qui, avec courage, a fait son devoir. Beaucoup de choses ont été dites.
58 monsieur le Procureur de la République reviendra dans les heures qui viennent, je le disais, sur
59 cette affaire, et détaillera ce qu'il sait et ce qui sera établi de cet acte terroriste islamiste. Mais
60 je veux dire ce soir de manière très claire : ils ne passeront pas.

61

62 Nos policiers, nos gendarmes, l'ensemble de nos forces de sécurité intérieure, nos forces de
63 renseignement, mais au-delà de cela, toutes celles et ceux qui tiennent la République, et à leurs
64 côtés, magistrats, élus, enseignants, tous et toutes, nous feront bloc. Ils ne passeront pas.
65 L'obscurantisme et la violence qui l'accompagne ne gagneront pas. Ils ne nous diviseront pas.
66 C'est ce qu'ils cherchent, et nous devons nous tenir tous ensemble, citoyennes et citoyens. Et
67 j'appelle l'ensemble de nos compatriotes, dans ce moment, à faire bloc, à être unis sans aucune
68 distinction quelle qu'elle soit car nous sommes d'abord et avant tout des citoyens unis par des
69 mêmes valeurs, une histoire, un destin. Cette unité est indispensable. Beaucoup de choses ont
70 été dites et je n'en rajouterai pas ce soir. Les actes sont là et seront là, avec fermeté, rapides.

71

72 Vous pouvez compter sur ma détermination et celle du Gouvernement.

Source : (Macron, 2020a)

c) Discours du président de la république lors de l'hommage national à la mémoire de samuel paty

21.10.2020

73 Mesdames, Messieurs,

74

75 Ce soir je n'aurai pas de mots pour évoquer la lutte contre l'islamisme politique, radical, qui
76 mène jusqu'au terrorisme. Les mots, je les ai eus. Le mal, je l'ai nommé. Les actions, nous les
77 avons décidées, nous les avons durcies, nous les mènerons jusqu'au bout.

78

79 Ce soir, je ne parlerai pas du cortège de terroristes, de leurs complices et de tous les lâches qui
80 ont commis et rendu possible cet attentat. Je ne parlerai pas de ceux qui ont livré son nom aux
81 barbares, ils ne le méritent pas. De noms, eux n'en n'ont même plus. Ce soir, je ne parlerai pas
82 davantage de l'indispensable unité que toutes les Françaises et tous les Français ressentent. Elle
83 est précieuse et oblige tous les responsables à s'exprimer avec justesse et à agir avec exigence.
84 Non.

85

86 Ce soir, je veux parler de votre fils, je veux parler de votre frère, de votre oncle, de celui que
87 vous avez aimé, de ton père. Ce soir, je veux parler de votre collègue, de votre professeur tombé
88 parce qu'il avait fait le choix d'enseigner, assassiné parce qu'il avait décidé d'apprendre à ses
89 élèves à devenir citoyens. Apprendre les devoirs pour les remplir. Apprendre les libertés pour
90 les exercer. Ce soir, je veux vous parler de Samuel PATY.

91

92 Samuel PATY aimait les livres, le savoir, plus que tout. Son appartement était une bibliothèque.
93 Ses plus beaux cadeaux, des livres pour apprendre. Il aimait les livres pour transmettre, à ses
94 élèves comme à ses proches, la passion de la connaissance, le goût de la liberté. Après avoir
95 étudié l'Histoire à Lyon et avoir envisagé de devenir chercheur, il avait emprunté la voie tracée
96 par vous, ses parents, instituteur et directeur d'école à Moulins, en devenant « chercheur en
97 pédagogie » comme il aimait à se définir, en devenant professeur. Aussi ne pouvait-on trouver
98 meilleur endroit que la Sorbonne, notre lieu de savoir universel depuis plus de huit siècles, le
99 lieu de l'humanisme, pour que la nation puisse lui rendre cet hommage.

100

101 Samuel PATY aimait passionnément enseigner et il le fit si bien dans plusieurs collèges et
102 lycées jusqu'à celui de Conflans-Saint-Honorine. Nous avons tous ancré dans nos cœurs, dans
103 nos mémoires le souvenir d'un professeur qui a changé le cours de notre existence. Vous savez,
104 cet instituteur qui nous a appris à lire, à compter, à nous faire confiance. Cet enseignant qui ne
105 nous a pas seulement appris un savoir mais nous a ouvert un chemin par un livre, un regard, par
106 sa considération.

107

108 Samuel PATY était de ceux-là, de ces professeurs que l'on n'oublie pas, de ces passionnés
109 capables de passer des nuits à apprendre l'histoire des religions pour mieux comprendre ses
110 élèves, leurs croyances. De ces humbles qui se remettaient mille fois en question, comme pour
111 ce cours sur la liberté d'expression et la liberté de conscience qu'il préparait depuis juillet
112 encore l'été dernier à Moulins à vos côtés et des doutes qu'il partageait par exigence, par
113 délicatesse.

114

115 Samuel PATY incarnait au fond le professeur dont rêvait JAURÈS dans cette lettre aux
116 instituteurs qui vient d'être lu : « la fermeté unie à la tendresse ». Celui qui montre la grandeur
117 de la pensée, enseigne le respect, donne à voir ce qu'est la civilisation.

118

119 Celui qui s'était donné pour tâche de « faire des républicains ».

120

121 Alors, reviennent comme en écho les mots de Ferdinand BUISSON « Pour faire un républicain,
122 écrivait-il, il faut prendre l'être humain si petit et si humble qu'il soit [...] et lui donner l'idée
123 qu'il faut penser par lui-même, qu'il ne doit ni foi, ni obéissance à personne, que c'est à lui de
124 chercher la vérité et non pas à la recevoir toute faite d'un maître, d'un directeur, d'un chef, quel
125 qu'il soit » « Faire des républicains », c'était le combat de Samuel PATY.

126

127 Et si cette tâche aujourd'hui peut paraître titanesque, notamment là où la violence,
128 l'intimidation, parfois la résignation prennent le dessus, elle est plus essentielle, plus actuelle,
129 que jamais. Ici, en France, nous aimons notre Nation, sa géographie, ses paysages et son
130 histoire, sa culture et ses métamorphoses, son esprit et son cœur. Et nous voulons l'enseigner à
131 tous nos enfants.

132

133 Ici, en France, nous aimons le projet tout à la fois terrien et universel que porte la République,
134 son ordre et ses promesses. Chaque jour recommencer. Alors, oui, dans chaque école, dans
135 chaque collège, dans chaque lycée, nous redonnerons aux professeurs le pouvoir de « faire des
136 républicains », la place et l'autorité qui leur reviennent. Nous les formerons, les considérerons
137 comme il se doit, nous les soutiendrons, nous les protégerons autant qu'il le faudra. Dans l'école
138 comme hors de l'école, les pressions, l'abus d'ignorance et d'obéissance que certains
139 voudraient instaurer n'ont pas leur place chez nous. « Je voudrais que ma vie et ma mort servent
140 à quelque chose » avait-il dit un jour. Comme par prescience.

141

142 Alors, pourquoi Samuel fut-il tué ? Pourquoi ? Vendredi soir, j'ai d'abord cru à la folie aléatoire,
143 à l'arbitraire absurde : une victime de plus du terrorisme gratuit. Après tout, il n'était pas la
144 cible principale des islamistes, il ne faisait qu'enseigner. Il n'était pas l'ennemi de la religion
145 dont ils se servent, il avait lu le Coran, il respectait ses élèves, quelles que soient leurs
146 croyances, il s'intéressait à la civilisation musulmane.

147

148 Non, tout au contraire, Samuel PATY fut tué précisément pour tout cela. Parce qu'il incarnait
149 la République qui renaît chaque jour dans les salles de classes, la liberté qui se transmet et se
150 perpétue à l'école.

151

152 Samuel PATY fut tué parce que les islamistes veulent notre futur et qu'ils savent qu'avec des
153 héros tranquilles tels que lui, ils ne l'auront jamais. Eux séparent les fidèles, des mécréants.

154

155 Samuel PATY ne connaissait que des citoyens. Eux se repaissent de l'ignorance. Lui croyait
156 dans le savoir. Eux cultivent la haine de l'autre. Lui voulait sans cesse en voir le visage,
157 découvrir les richesses de l'altérité.

158

159 Samuel PATY fut la victime de la conspiration funeste de la bêtise, du mensonge, de
160 l'amalgame, de la haine de l'autre, de la haine de ce que profondément, existentiellement, nous
161 sommes.

162

163 Samuel PATY est devenu vendredi le visage de la République, de notre volonté de briser les
164 terroristes, de réduire les islamistes, de vivre comme une communauté de citoyens libres dans
165 notre pays, le visage de notre détermination à comprendre, à apprendre, à continuer d'enseigner,
166 à être libres, car nous continuerons, professeur.

167

168 Nous défendrons la liberté que vous enseigniez si bien et nous porterons haut la laïcité. Nous
169 ne renoncerons pas aux caricatures, aux dessins, même si d'autres reculent. Nous offrirons
170 toutes les chances que la République doit à toute sa jeunesse sans discrimination aucune.

171

172 Nous continuerons, professeur. Avec tous les instituteurs et professeurs de France, nous
173 enseignerons l'Histoire, ses gloires comme ses vicissitudes. Nous ferons découvrir la littérature,
174 la musique, toutes les œuvres de l'âme et de l'esprit. Nous aimerons de toutes nos forces le
175 débat, les arguments raisonnables, les persuasions aimables. Nous aimerons la science et ses

176 controverses. Comme vous, nous cultiverons la tolérance. Comme vous, nous chercherons à
177 comprendre, sans relâche, et à comprendre encore davantage cela qu'on voudrait éloigner de
178 nous. Nous apprendrons l'humour, la distance. Nous rappellerons que nos libertés ne tiennent
179 que par la fin de la haine et de la violence, par le respect de l'autre.

180

181 Nous continuerons, professeur. Et tout au long de leur vie, les centaines de jeunes gens que
182 vous avez formés exerceront cet esprit critique que vous leur avez appris. Peut-être certains
183 d'entre-eux deviendront-ils enseignants à leur tour. Alors, ils formeront des jeunes citoyens. À
184 leur tour, ils feront aimer la République. Ils feront comprendre notre nation, nos valeurs, notre
185 Europe dans une chaîne des temps qui ne s'arrêtera pas.

186

187 Nous continuerons, oui, ce combat pour la liberté et pour la raison dont vous êtes désormais le
188 visage parce que nous vous le devons, parce que nous nous le devons, parce qu'en France,
189 professeur, les Lumières ne s'éteignent jamais. Vive la République. Vive la France.

190

Source : (Macron, 2020b)

d) Déclaration du président de la République après l'attaque terroriste de Nice

29.10.2020

191 Mesdames, messieurs,

192

193 Une fois encore, notre pays a été frappé par une attaque terroriste islamiste.

194

195 Une fois encore ce matin, ce sont trois de nos compatriotes qui sont tombés à Nice, en cette
196 basilique Notre Dame de Nice et très clairement, c'est la France qui est attaquée. Au même
197 moment, nous avons un site consulaire français qui était attaqué en Arabie saoudite, à Djeddah,
198 au même moment, des interpellations sur notre territoire se faisaient.

199

200 Je veux ici dire d'abord et avant tout le soutien de la Nation toute entière aux catholiques de
201 France et d'ailleurs. Après l'assassinat du père HAMEL à l'été 2016, c'est une nouvelle fois les

202 catholiques qui sont attaqués dans notre pays, menacés avant les fêtes de la Toussaint. La Nation
203 toute entière se tient à leurs côtés et se tiendra pour que la religion puisse continuer de s'exercer
204 librement dans notre pays, car notre pays sait cela. Ce sont nos valeurs, que chacun puisse croire
205 ou ne pas croire, mais que chaque religion puisse s'exercer. Aujourd'hui, la Nation toute entière
206 se tient aux côtés de nos concitoyens catholiques.

207

208 Le deuxième message que j'ai est pour la ville de Nice, Monsieur le Maire, pour les Niçoises et
209 les Niçois, si durement éprouvés par la folie terroriste et ce terrorisme islamiste. C'est la
210 troisième fois que le terrorisme frappe votre ville, vos habitants. Je sais le choc que votre ville
211 ressent, avec elle tout le pays, et, je crois, le monde entier qui nous regarde. Là aussi, je vous
212 dis le soutien, la solidarité de toute la Nation. Si nous sommes attaqués, une fois encore, c'est
213 pour les valeurs qui sont les nôtres, pour notre goût de la liberté, pour cette possibilité sur notre
214 sol de croire librement et de ne céder à aucun esprit de terreur.

215

216 Je le dis avec beaucoup de clarté une fois encore aujourd'hui : nous n'y céderons rien. Ce matin,
217 nous avons décidé d'augmenter la posture de vigilance partout en France pour nous adapter à la
218 menace terroriste. J'ai décidé que nos militaires seront, dans les prochaines heures, davantage
219 mobilisés, et nous passerons la mobilisation dans le cadre de l'opération Sentinelle de 3 000 à
220 7 000 militaires sur notre sol. Nous nous mettrons ainsi en situation de protéger tous les lieux
221 de culte, en particulier bien évidemment les églises, pour que la Toussaint puisse se dérouler
222 dans les conditions qui sont dues. Nous protégerons aussi nos écoles pour la rentrée qui vient.
223 Demain se tiendra un Conseil de défense, où nous acterons de nouvelles mesures dans la
224 continuité de ce que nous faisons depuis plusieurs mois, dans la continuité de ce que j'avais
225 annoncé lors du discours des Mureaux et de ce que nous avons ensuite mis en œuvre de manière
226 permanente. Je veux saluer la mobilisation de tout le Gouvernement, et tout particulièrement
227 du ministre de l'Intérieur et du garde des Sceaux qui m'accompagnent. Le procureur RICARD
228 aura dans les prochaines heures à donner tous les détails sur les faits de ce matin, à la fois sur
229 le déroulé des événements, sur l'auteur. Il ne m'appartient pas ici de les commenter, simplement
230 de dire notre détermination absolue et que des actes continueront de suivre pour protéger tous
231 nos concitoyens, pour répliquer. C'est donc un message de fermeté absolue que je veux passer
232 aujourd'hui.

233

234 Enfin c'est également un message d'unité. En France, il n'y a qu'une communauté, c'est la
235 communauté nationale. Je veux dire à tous nos concitoyens, quelle que soit leur religion, qu'ils

236 croient d'ailleurs ou qu'ils ne croient pas, que nous devons dans ces moments nous unir et ne
237 rien céder à l'esprit de division. Je sais que tous nos concitoyens sont aujourd'hui profondément
238 choqués, bouleversés de ce qui vient une fois encore de se passer. J'appelle à l'unité de tous.
239 Voilà le message que j'étais venu passer aujourd'hui à Nice et je sais combien la ville, le
240 département sont éprouvés. J'étais à vos côtés il y a quelques semaines à peine à la suite des
241 inondations.
242
243 Soutien de la Nation à Nice, aux catholiques de France, fermeté et unité, telle est la ligne que
244 nous devons suivre aujourd'hui et que nous continuerons de suivre demain.
245
246 Je vous remercie.

Source : (Macron, 2020c)