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Our study context

- The public sphere is one of the places where the solicitation of attention for violence is more and more noticeable and arises loomingly.
- The video *Stop Jihad* is an example of this phenomenon.
- After the 2015 terrorists attacks, French government made this video aimed at creating a reaction to the regimentation of young citizens.
- The video was broadcasted on public TV channels to alert and dissuade to go to Syria.
- The public space was used to make visible what is normally invisible.
  - Violence /war images/etc.
- We are hence challenged by messages that are not always intended for us, that are potentially aggressive to us or even do us violence.
- Especially: Not to be seen by under 12 years old.
Our study context

➢ As part of a project funded by the CNRS interdisciplinary mission (AMI 2016) we interviewed 28 subjects and collected their emotional reactions after viewing this clip. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ke3i9-7kkQM

➢ Our presentation focuses on a discursive analysis of the interpellation and address processes

➢ And:

1. The use of 2 different and opposed lexical fields in the video
2. The reaction of the video clip of the French government stop djihadism by 18 to 25 years old subjects
Theoretical framework: we are French linguists (1)

Our field of study is language sciences & our theoretical framework is:

- **French discourse analysis** and **pragmatics** (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2005),
- **Rise in tension** : **politeness → impoliteness → verbal violence** (Moïse et al., 2008; Fracchiolla et al., 2013; Fracchiolla et Romain, 2018)
- **Speech Acts theory** (Austin 1962, Laforest & al., 2004),
- **Argumentation** (Perelman & al., 1988; Plantin 1996; Vincent & al., 1993; Amossy 2010).
Theoretical framework: interpellation and address procedures & verbal abuse (1)

- « Verbal abuse is a complex, situational and interactional process » (Auger et al.: 2010).
- **Interpellation** is a **founding** and **original speech act** (Auger et al., 2010) that can mark both negotiation and conflict.
- Thus, **Terms of address** according to the **value** they can take occupy a central place in verbal abuse (Rosier: 2007).
- **Interpellation** therefore is wider than the only contexts of daily rituals (cf. Althusser: 1970).
Theoretical framework: interpellation and address procedures & verbal abuse (2)

- **Def**: Terms of address correspond to the set of expressions that a speaker uses/has to designate his or her allocutaries (André-Larochebouvy: 1994).

- **Ex**: In French the use of pronouns (tu/vous) reflects the distance between speakers (Kerbrat-Orecchioni: 1992).

- They are often perceived as a position of authority (Ex: in an asymmetrical interactional framework "I" vs. "you" where the "you" is subordinated to the knowledge or the power of the enunciator / speaker (classroom situation).

- In particular, terms of address have a relational value (particularly used to establish a certain type of social link).
Theoretical framework : la réaction des récepteurs (3)

- Denomination is considered in the frame of discourse and in the prospective of its reception (= we don’t speak just for ourselves…) (Constantin de Chanay : 2001). (« shared stereotype »)

  → Cf. Kleiber & Wierzbicka think we use words according to the concept we think our interlocutor masters and not accordingly to the concept that we ourselves have of what we are talking about (2001 : 10)

  → Links with « accommodation » (Giles, Coupland & Coupland 1991)

  → cf. for Perelman « the other » is a thus a constitutive part of the discourse itself.
the act of denomination has an intentional dimension (Cadiot and Visetti, 2001: 176):

« Denomination transforms the perceptual spectacle by putting us, through it, in relation with the world" (180)

For the performative effect (particular, singular goal) sought through a directed production to be effective, a continuum must exist between the stakes of the denomination chosen by the speaker and those which will be attributed to him by his turn the interlocutor (need for a continuum in the attribution of a common sense).

(cf. denominational routines, conversational history of interlocutors, Brennan and Clark (1996), see co-reference of Blanche-Benveniste (1984)).
End of theoretical frame...

Thus...
Our goal is to question the role of denomination, and more especially the use of interpellation and address procedures, in parallel to the violence of the images and the verbal content accompanying them.

- This, in order to understand how the act of denomination can be considered as a transitory object of mediation between the public sphere and the private sphere.

- In this dialectic of private (daily life) and public (social life), we study the act of denomination as a vector of visibility and interpenetration of the public and the private sphere

- We then will confront this role to its effect through the reactions of the exposed subjects.

→ What kind of interpersonal relation is elaborated throughout the forms of address within the video governmental discourse?
Stop-Djihad video

ILS TE DISENT :
“SACRIFIE-TOI À NOS CÔTÉS,
TU DÉFENDRAS UNE JUSTE CAUSE.”

EN RÉALITÉ
TU DÉCOUVRIRAS L’ENFER SUR TERRE
ET MOURRAS SEUL, LOIN DE CHEZ TOI.

ILS TE DISENT :
“REJOINS-NOUS ET VIENS AIDER
LES ENFANTS SYRIENS.”
 Ils te disent : « *sacrifie-toi* à nos côtés, tu défendras une juste cause. »
En réalité « *tu découvivras* l’enfer sur terre et mourras seul, loin de chez *toi.* »

 Ils te disent : « *viens* fonder une famille avec un de nos héros. »
En réalité : « *tu élèveras tes* enfants dans la guerre et la terreur. »

 Ils te disent : « *rejoins-nous* et *viens* aider les enfants syriens. »
En réalité : « *tu seras complice du massacre de civils.* »

 Ils te disent : « *tu vis dans un monde de mécréants impurs,* la vérité est ici. »
En réalité : « comme seules vérités *tu découvriras* l’horreur et la tromperie. »

Les discours d’embrigadement djihadistes font chaque jour de nouvelles victimes

They tell *you*: « *sacrifice yourself* with us, *you will defend a just cause.* »

In fact, *you will discover hell on earth and die alone, far from home.*

They tell *you*: "*Come and start a family* with one of our *heroes.*

In reality: "*You will elevate your* children in *war and terror.*"

They tell *you*: "*Join us and come help the Syrian children.* »

In reality: "*You will be complicit in the massacre of civilians.*

They tell *you*: "*You live in a world of unbelievers, unclean,* the *truth* is here."

In reality: "As only truths *you will discover? horror and deception."

Jihadist organizing speeches are making new victims every day
PART 1a: A discursive analysis of the interpellation and address processes used in the video

- The message of the government aims at unmasking, preventing, warning and protecting from a material danger represented by "they".

- The government therefore holds the truth (the knowledge):
  - 1/ on one hand it addresses it directly to the one who watches the video: "they tell you ... in reality ... you" (ungendered) ; and
  - 2/ on the other hand it makes it known more widely in public space, to all young people.

- It resorts to the process of interpellation & address "you" (which is in danger), opposed to "them" (who manipulate).
PART 1: A discursive analysis of the interpellation and address processes used in the video

- However, it does it with supports of images, video excerpts ... which plunge the televiewer in the violence of the images but also of the words since two lexical fields are opposed:

- 1/ the pejorative one (the truth of the intentions of "they": « Hell, you will die far from home, war, terror, massacre of civilians, horror, deception ») and

- 2/ the meliorative (the manipulation to which the "you" is subjected and may give in: « sacrifice yourself for a just cause; find a family; hero; help the Syrian children; truth »).

- It is easy to imagine that these choices of denomination of persons and realities refer to a speech act (Lüdi, 1995) as "an instruction to the addressee to construct, in the discourse universe, a corresponding representation » who would be the one to turn away from a proposal that aims to deceive the recipient and endanger his life.
The **government expectation**, is that its denunciation of the situation and its choice of denomination will make the **receivers** of the message **turn away** from a potential project of departure for Syria,

→ **desired performative effect**

→ Which **implies** that (it thinks) it and his receptors are in **agreement on the reference** (the **good** vs. the **evil**, the identification of the good and the identification of the evil,

→ the word of the **government** is the **source of truth** =

→ **shared concepts and stereotypes**

→ **Is it the case then?**
PART 2 : Disourse analysis of the video reception

When showing this video we were looking at what people actually say about what they « see » and how they feel about it. Our first enquiry was about the felt emotions when facing violence.

- However, we got some more responses than just to this question.
- What we could see is that: more generally, the reactions were not necessarily the one expected by the government.
- There are argumentative markers and discursive elements that tilt the discourse towards controversy.
- Show that Compassion (for the terrorists/the poor people « there »), is in competition with the expected mobilization against (terrorism)?
- As Anger is with understanding.
1a: contrary effect: giving envi to leave, empathy for populations

- Ex 1:

- « Well, I am very upset with the Islamic State, against what is happening there. I'm uh ... Pfff ... well, that is, I'm sad actually about what people are living there. And ... - and after uh, well I still want to do even more stuff to make it stop. »

French

- Ben, je suis très énervé contre l'état islamique, contre ce qui se passe là-bas. Je suis euh... Pfff... voilà, je suis triste en fait de ce que les gens vivent sur place, quoi. Et... - et après euh, j'ai encore plus envie de faire des trucs pour faire en sorte que ça s'arrête, quoi.
1b : contrary effect : giving envi to leave, empathy for populations

Ex 2 :

« It was ... It was hard for me to express myself, but it was ... a bit of ... not pain, but ... compassion, especially for the families. Because it's mostly that which is unfortunate, then. Because they really did not ask for anything. And ... and it's also sad to see young people who let themselves... young or not so young anymore, but who let themselves go ... who let their minds to be so easily shaped (changed). I do not know how to explain, but who let themselves ... (Silence ---) who just let themselves be fooled, so easily ». 

French

C'était de la… J'avais du mal, d'ailleurs, à m'exprimer, mais c'était de la... un peu de... pas de la peine, mais de la… de la compassion, surtout pour les familles. Parce que c'est surtout ça qui est malheureux, quoi. Parce qu'ils n'ont vraiment rien demandé. Et... et c'est triste aussi de voir des jeunes qui se laissent... jeunes ou moins jeunes, mais qui se laissent... qui se laissent aussi facilement se faire l'esprit. Je ne sais pas comment expliquer, mais qui se laissent... (Silence ---) qui se laissent avoir, quoi, tout simplement.
2: the danger of collateral effects
(no longer helping people)

Ex 1:

« It's still a little ... Well, I do not know where they broadcast it, but you have to be careful, because it can hurt some people, I think. And it can actually cause others ... I know it's to prevent young people or other people to get hooked, but there it can do ... well, people can sometimes live a little in a paranoia, that's it. For example, here, they say "join Syria", but look what's going on. So maybe people who want to do humanitarian work, I work in that. So do humanitarian, go on the spot, go help, so now they will say, "no, in fact Syria, it's the jihads, that's all." So there it is. »

French

Que c'est quand même un peu... ben je sais pas où ils la diffusent, mais qu'il faut faire attention, parce que ça peut heurter certaines personnes, je pense. Et ça peut susciter en fait d'autres... je sais que c’est pour éviter que les jeunes ou d'autres personnes soient embrigadées, mais là, ça peut faire... enfin, les gens peuvent vivre dans une parano un peu, voilà. Par exemple, là, ils disent « rejoignez la Syrie », mais regardez ce qui se passe. Donc peut-être que des personnes qui auront envie de faire de l'humanitaire, je travaille dans ça. Donc l'humanitaire, aller sur place, aller aider, donc maintenant, ils se diront, « non en fait la Syrie, c’est les djihads, c’est tout ça ». Donc voilà.
3 : reception as propaganda

Ex1 :

• « But the government, it has nevertheless taken a party... a bias to do... this is not a caricature, but to ... to do ... to show the good seen by the jihadists, I don’t know if I express myself well, but what the jihadists think is good, well, showing it in the video, and then, to show the reality, uh, I think some people could think it’s manipulation, but in the other direction. »

French

enfin, le gouvernement, il a quand même pris un parti... un parti pris de faire... ce n’est pas une caricature, mais de... de faire... de montrer le bien vu par les djihadistes, je ne sais pas si je m’exprime bien, mais ce que les djihadistes pensent bien, montrer ça dans la vidéo, et ensuite, de montrer la réalité... euh, je pense que certaines personnes pourraient se dire c’est de la manipulation, mais dans l’autre sens.

• Ex 2 :

• Uh I was struck seeing ... well, it confirmed my first feelings on... well, the fact that it is propaganda. Namely, you will discover a hell finally, it's the same type of speech finally, finally, I do not know. It bothered me.s

French

Euh j’ai été frappé en voyant... enfin, ça a confirmé mes sentiments premiers sur... enfin, le fait c’est de la propagande. À savoir, tu vas découvrir un enfer enfin, c’est le même type de, de discours finalement, enfin, je ne sais pas. Ça m’a dérangé.
3 : reception as propaganda

Ex3 :

« On one side I said ... I did not like the fact that on the one hand, they(we) try to prove things through the image, on the other hand, they(we) try to prove something else through the image also and in the end, we do not know where the truth is. It's not ... for me, it's not ... it does not change anything, finally for me, I'm not concerned, maybe the people who are concerned, but it's it's it's not impacting. It impacts emotionally eventually, because ... it's nice to watch, but in thought no. »

French

Je disais d’un côté… je n’ai pas aimé le fait que d’un côté, on essaye de prouver des choses à travers l’image, d’un autre côté, on essaye de prouver autre chose à travers l’image aussi et au final, on ne sait pas où se situe la vérité quoi. Ce n’est pas… pour moi, ce n’est pas… ça ne change rien, enfin pour moi, je ne suis pas concernée, peut-être les gens qui sont concernés, mais c’est c’est c’est pas impactant. Ça impacte émotionnellement éventuellement, parce que… c’est agréable à regarder, mais dans la pensée non.
The means used to dissuade have nothing to do with reason – but the discourse is based on fear: because the pictures and texts associated show scary things.

The effect is a feeling of threat (potential manipulative dimension effect).

The speech ends up having a counter effect (on the receiver) compared to the aimed effect. The governmental video/ i.e. speech against jihad favors the opposite reaction to the one expected: a reaction which shows some of the characteristics in favor of the emergence, the adhesion or the reinforcement to a movement « against » (against the speech against the jihad).
Conclusion (2)

The **public sphere is used to penetrate the private sphere**, which works: the governmental discourse has been elaborated around:

- **1/ pivotal elements** ensuring this switch to address through the "you" (vs. "they");
- **2/ the violence of images and words** (pejorative: terror, war, horror, massacre ...)
- ➔ the video arouses reactions among the subjects who have already been touched by the message ... (more than by the ones who might be touched...)
- ➔ Visibility and interpenetration of the two spheres (private and public).
Nevertheless, the goal is not achieved (relative performative effect: the message does not leave unharmed and produces reactions but not the expected one).

Mistrust of the message ("propagandist message"), envy to leave and help the populations, empathy, negative effect of the message which would dissuade some to go to help the populations, etc ...

→ the absolute performative effect would have constituted in a reaction of 'aversion to the' THEY ‘, but it is not reached for all subjects and those who evoke it also evoke other effects ...

The violence of images and words does not produce the expected effect (perhaps because of the absence of argumentative and reasonning content ?)

→ But allows a successful penetration of the public sphere into the private sphere.

→ It is the realized effect that is not the expected one because the recipients finally perceive the message as intellectual interference ...
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