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Abstract
The goal of this research is to identify economic and social impacts of the terror attacks in France during 2015 and 2016. Three large scale attacks in Paris and Nice within two years shocked the nation, with consequences felt both domestically and throughout the world. Specifically, the research aims to identify economic effects of terrorism on France’s tourism industry, as well as the determinants of tourism and travel. The research will also analyze the response of the French public, government, and media outlets to the attacks, along with the reactions of neighboring countries who have also witnessed terror attacks within their respective borders. By studying both the economic and social effects of terrorism within France, the true cost of terror attacks will be identified and discussed.

Chapter One: Introduction
France is a nation well-known across the world as a premier tourist destination, with many cities and attractions visited by millions each year. The capital city of Paris, with the Eiffel Tower and many art museums is a top destination, along with southern beach cities Nice, Marseille, and Cannes. Bordeaux sits in the heart of French wine country, and many smaller towns in the southeast bordering the Alps attract winter sports enthusiasts from around the world. According to the World Travel and Tourism Council, the total contribution of travel and tourism to France’s 2015 Gross Domestic Product was 199.3 billion euros, or 9.1% of total GDP, with a predicted increase of 3.1% in 2016. In absolute size, this contribution to GDP ranks 6th out of 184 countries. Therefore, the tourism industry in France makes one of the largest contributions to GDP anywhere in the world (WTTC, 2016). The tourism industry is also very important when it comes to French employment statistics. In 2015, tourism accounted for 4.2% of total employment in France, or 1,170,500 jobs, with a predicted increase of 2.1% in 2016 (WTTC, 2016). Together, these statistics demonstrate the importance of tourism to the French economy as a whole.

On January 7 and November 13, 2015, the city of Paris, France, was devastated by terror attacks on the Charlie Hebdo newspaper building, and the Bataclan theater and Stade de France, respectively. The Charlie Hebdo attackers, identifying with the terror group Al-Qaeda, killed 11 people and injured 10 before they were stopped by police two days later. On November 13, attackers killed 130 people and injured another 368; the next day, the terror group ISIL claimed responsibility for the attacks, the deadliest in France since World War II. Finally, on July 14, 2016, a massive cargo truck was intentionally driven on to Nice’s Promenade des Anglais, the site of a large gathering to celebrate Bastille Day, a national holiday. The rogue attacker drove through the crowd, causing a toll of 86 deaths and 434 injuries, deepening the sadness of an already grieving nation.

This research will aim to identify the determinants of tourism in France using a historical analysis, including variables such as GDP per capita, exchange rates, stability indicators, trade flows, regime, and special events such as the Olympics or global expositions. From these variables, this research will define the main determinants of tourism in France through several decades. This study will then determine the effects the recent terror attacks had on France’s tourism, related businesses, and employment, as well as the nature of the tourism
industry after the attacks. Since tourism accounts for a significant proportion of France’s Gross Domestic Product, a sharp decline in inbound tourism activity will reverberate throughout France’s economy as a whole, causing losses in profit for businesses directly and indirectly related to tourism, as well as potential unemployment in these sectors.

This topic is very salient because the attacks were as recent as this past summer of 2016 in Nice, thus this is a very legitimate question facing not only France, but other countries that have recently experienced terrorist attacks such as Belgium and Turkey. With terror attacks by organized groups such as Al-Qaeda and ISIL, as well as “lone wolf” attacks inspired by these groups, tourists may be dissuaded from taking trips to foreign countries, which will impact the domestic tourism industries, especially in France, one of the world’s most visited countries. The World Tourism and Travel Council reports that in 2015, 82% of travel and tourism’s contribution to France’s GDP originated from leisure spending, thus a decline in tourists attracted to the country for leisure will have a negative effect on the tourism industry, related businesses, employment, and therefore France’s overall Gross Domestic Product (WTTC, 2016).

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Statistics from the World Travel and Tourism Council state that the tourism industry and related revenue are very important to France’s economy. Thus, if the industry is expected to grow, can the same be expected for the economy? Cárdenas-Garcia et al. (2013) acknowledge that there are two main viewpoints surrounding the concept of tourism as a tool for economic progress; the first being that tourism is not the primary driver for socio-economic progress. However, the second argues that tourism has in the past become a tool for progress in certain countries. Cárdenas-Garcia et al. state that tourism has become an “effective tool” for countries that host a large number of tourists. When compared among many countries, the economic results are mixed (Cárdenas-Garcia et al., 2013). In principle, the authors suggest that the expansion of tourism in a country can result in economic growth, and be a critical part in achieving real economic development.

The authors’ research questions whether the growth of tourism in countries enhances their respective level of economic development, and the research used a sample size as large as possible, 144 countries. For the construction of a correlation, the authors use both tourism growth variables and economic development variables. Two variables of tourism growth important in their research were direct contribution to employment (DCE), which measures the direct number of jobs generated within the travel and tourism industry, and international tourism exports (ETI), which includes the expenditure by international tourists in the country, both for business and leisure travel, including the cost of transport. When studying the effect of tourism on overall economic progress, it is essential to include these two variables, as these will reflect the overall health of the industry in the country of study. In the study, both DCE and ETI were found to have a statistically significant correlation at 5% on direct contribution to GDP (DCP).

In their conclusion, the authors divide the 144 countries of study into two groups. The first, Group A, comprises the more economically developed countries in 1991, and the second, Group B, includes developing or economically weak nations. For Group A, which includes France, it was discovered that the beta parameter was statistically significant at the 5% level, confirming the existence of a direct relationship between tourism growth and economic development, and also confirming that for some nations in Group A, tourism is a major activity and is an “essential pillar” of economic activity (Cárdenas-Garcia et al., 2013). Additionally, France was ranked third among the 144 countries, according to a synthetic index of economic development, scoring a 99.96 out of 100. Thus, the research concludes that France has one of the strongest relationships between tourism growth and economic development.

Overall, Cárdenas-Garcia et al. produced valuable work in accounting for the different tourism growth variables in their model, such as ETI and DCE. These are two important statistics that could be included in a regression to determine the number of tourists in France for a given year, and will deepen the understanding of the effects of the terror attacks in France on the overall economic performance of the country, specifically via tourism.

One of the main components of this research is to build a regression and historically analyze tourism data for France to determine effects of different variables on the number of tourists visiting the country each
year. Thus, it is essential to identify variables to be used in this regression that could affect tourism flows from year to year.

Eilat and Einav (2004) state that tourism accounts for nearly to almost 10% of international trade, thus a better understanding of what determines tourism is vital to achieve a better understanding of international trade and finance. When discussing their model, the authors accurately describe some of the disadvantages of variables such as exchange rates, which can be inaccurate if costs of tourism such as airfare and hotel stays are paid in advance, and income in the origin country, GDP per capita, of which the effects of income distribution on tourist trends are still “unresolved” (Eilat & Einav, 2004).

As of 1998, France ranked as top tourist destination with 70 million arrivals, over 22 million more visitors than second-ranked Spain, with 72% of the arrivals being classified as “leisure”, as opposed to “business” travel. From this data, we can conclude that leisure tourism in France is a large component of overall tourism activity, and its tourism industry is one of the most vibrant in the world. The authors split their countries of study into two groups, High and Low GNP countries, with High GNP being classified as GDP per capita over $10,000 in 1998. In their results, Eilat and Einav found that travel to high GNP destinations “does respond” to price fluctuations, and is statistically significant at 1%. Additionally, it was concluded that no matter what classification of country, the destination risk variable was found to be significant at 1%, suggesting that risk in the destination country does play an important role in determining international tourism.

This study proved to be quite accurate, and found many variables were statistically significant at the 1% level for high GNP countries, including price fluctuations, risk index, and trade, distance, and GDP per capita between the destination and origin countries. Therefore, in determining the number of tourists visiting France in a given year, a risk indicator, GDP per capita, trade, and exchange rate variables would all be appropriate. In their literature review, the authors stated that variables such as special events (Olympics, Expos), or trade flows between countries could be used to determine tourism, and thus the question arises as to why they did not include these variables in their regression model. Playing host to a large sports tournament, as France did in the summer of 2016 for the UEFA European Championship, attracts many tourists to a country and could skew the impact of the terror attacks on tourism flows. Thus, to ensure the accuracy of a model for French tourism demand through 2016, a “special event” variable would be necessary. In addition to variables such as GDP per capita, exchange rates, special events, and trade, a risk indicator is also necessary for an accurate regression. The three recent terror attacks in France could have a negative effect on tourists visiting the country, and therefore decrease the amount of revenue gained from tourism and related businesses. Thus, identifying how terror attacks affect tourism demand in a country is paramount in analyzing tourism activity.

Sönmez (1998) analyzes how political instability and terror attacks affect tourism demand in many countries, including China, Israel, Mexico, and Spain, among many others. Sönmez critiques previous research done by other authors on the effects of attacks and political instability, and examines how the relationship between the two and tourism is more closely related than expected.

The author makes a valid point in suggesting that tourist responses to terrorist attacks involves “cultural differences in reacting to risk” (Sönmez, 1998). Sönmez cites previous studies, Goszczynska, Tyszka, and Slovic (1991), and Tremblay (1991) to argue that studies of risk perception across different cultures confirm this theory, and that country of origin could be used to predict a tourist’s reaction to terrorist threat. Thus, different cultures will react to terror attacks and political instability in diverse ways, and therefore tourism flows cannot be predicted uniformly across the world.

Sönmez argues that “random terrorist activities intimidate tourists and curtail or realign tourism flows until the public’s memories of the publicized incidents fade” (Sönmez, 1998). He is correct in stating that tourism flows are negatively impacted by terrorism and political instability, but the author does not suggest a time frame for recovery for any of the countries of study. When will affected countries see tourism and related industries return to normalcy? Additionally, this article was written in 1998, nearly two decades ago. With the development of modern media, including news outlets and social media, news about terrorist attacks spreads quicker and to more people than ever before. Thus the effect of media today is amplified and could likely cause a higher decrease in tourism flows.
Overall, the article used many compelling case studies to show how political instability can affect tourism, but the research lacked depth in examples of terrorism’s effect. Many of Sönmez’s examples were of armed rebellions or wars in various countries such as Fiji, Northern Ireland, Slovenia, and Zambia and Zimbabwe. While the author makes a compelling argument and has several credible, key points, his research does not specifically address terrorism’s effect on a large, developed nation such as France that relies on the tourism industry.

Additionally, the three recent attacks in France varied in size, with the 2015 attack on the Charlie Hebdo newspaper in Paris amounting to 11 dead and 10 injured, while the 2016 attack on the Stade de France and the Bataclan was the deadliest in France since World War II. The scale of terrorist attacks could also have an impact on the number of tourists visiting France in a given year. For tourists potentially visiting an attacked country, what would matter more? The size of the attack, or the frequency at which they occur?

Pizam and Fleischer (2002) address the question whether or not the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001 would have a lasting effect on the domestic tourism industry. To anticipate any effects, the authors used previous research conducted on the impacts of terrorism on tourism demand in Israel from May 1991 to May 2001, which studied which variable would have a greater negative effect on tourism demand: frequency of acts of terrorism or the severity of these same acts.

The authors’ first model included only the severity of attacks variable, and found “the coefficient of severity level was negative and significant.” Therefore, they conclude that the more severe an attack, the greater the decline in tourists visiting Israel in the given time frame (Pizam & Fleischer, 2002). When the frequency variable was added to the model, Model 2, its coefficient was also negative and highly significant, with a higher R-squared value than Model 1. From these results, Pizam and Fleischer conclude that the most important factor affecting tourism in Israel was the frequency of terrorist attacks, and not their severity.

The authors' methodology and regression model proved persuasive, and in their conclusion they predict that within 6 to 12 months, the American tourism industry would return to normalcy after September 11, 2001.

While Pizam and Fleischer cite previous studies by Sonmez (1994), and Enders, Sadler, and Parise, (1992), that state the impact of terrorism can last anywhere between 3 and 9 months after the event, the authors’ conclusion lacked depth, and it seemed they simply guessed at a time period in which the industry would return to normalcy, without building another model that included necessary variables to solidify their prediction.

This research lacked similarity to one of the underlying questions in this paper, which is how terrorism affects a developed nation such as France, which relies on tourism as a critical part of its Gross Domestic Product, and this effect in modern times. Data from the World Travel and Tourism Council show that the contribution of travel and tourism to GDP is greater in France than in Israel by 2.1% in 2015 (WTTC, 2016). Would a larger tourism industry see a greater decrease in revenues and tourists visiting the country? Additionally, because the attacks were as recent as this year, 2016, the country of France provides for a current and interesting case study of the economic effects of terrorism.

Another consideration to be made when determining tourism demand is tourists’ willingness to travel, especially after a terror attack or series of attacks. If tourists are concerned about travel or destination risk, they may be less inclined to take a leisure trip, which may delay or eliminate revenue gained by the host country’s tourism and related industries.

Floyd, Gibson, Pennington-Gray, and Thapa (2004) study the relationship between anticipated risk and travel plans among residents in the New York City area following the terror attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. The authors used travel risk, destination risk, and safety concerns as dependent variables in the model, to identify main reasons behind tourists’ willingness to travel.

Floyd et al. make several key points, as tourists’ reluctance to fly had “adverse effects on other sectors of the tourism industry,” as the authors note severe decreases in hotel occupancy rates, the cancellations of vacations or business trips, and layoffs of workers within the sector (Floyd et al., 2002). In addition, the authors state that the tourism industry experienced “severe aftershocks” in the three months following September 11 (Floyd et al., 2002). According to an article published by Fox News Travel, as of August 2016, Paris had lost an estimated $850 million in tourism revenue for the year, with hotel stays decreasing by 8.6% and sharp decreases in tourists from Japan, Russia, and China (Wood, 2016). It is clear Paris is experiencing the aftershock described
by Floyd et al., but it remains to be seen how long these effects will last, as Pizam and Fleischer suggest the frequency of attacks is more important in determining tourism demand than their severity. Using Pizam and Fleischer’s results, it is suggested that the effect of terrorism on tourism will be greater in France than in the United States following September 11, due to the higher number of attacks.

There were a number of shortcomings of the article, including the low response rate of the study, which conducted only 348 interviews out of 1,647 eligible households. Therefore, the accuracy of the survey comes into question, as a large majority of eligible interviewees were not able to express their insight on the issue. Additionally, the sample came from the area around New York City, the site of the attack. When determining tourism demand in France, many of the potential tourists come from outside of the nation, and the study conducted by Floyd et al. does not address the travel intentions of other Americans outside of the New York City area, or international tourists. This study identifies willingness to travel among residents around the site of the attack to another destination, rather than determining willingness to travel to a country in which an attack occurred by non-domestic tourists.

Another key question arising from the recent attacks in France is whether tourists still visit the country despite perceived risks; will they travel somewhere else as a substitute, or will they not travel at all? If tourists trend towards choosing another destination, then France could begin to lose competitiveness within the global tourism industry, and therefore see a prolonged decrease in revenues associated with the industry and related businesses. Research by Dupeyras and MacCallum (2013) is intended as a guiding document for members of the OECD, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, so that the 34 member states including France and many other developed countries, can identify key indicators in determining competitiveness among tourist destinations within the Organization. Published on behalf of the OECD Tourism Committee, this analysis charts tourism indicators governments should follow, so that they may gain competitiveness in the tourism industry and craft policies beneficial to the development of tourism in their respective countries.

The authors identify several primary indicators of tourism competitiveness, including Tourism Direct Gross Domestic Product, purchasing power parity and tourism prices, inbound tourism revenues per visitor, and cultural and creative resources (Dupeyras & MacCallum, 2013). These variables identify the contribution of tourism to overall GDP, how much the tourist is able to purchase in the host country compared to their home country, and other attractive features such as cultural variables; examples could include the Eiffel Tower or the Louvre, which are two attractions distinctly unique to France. France ranks sixth in the world in terms of direct and total contribution of travel and tourism to GDP. Thus, this is an important variable to include in an analysis of the country’s tourism industry (WTTC, 2016). Purchasing power parity is also important to consider, as the United Kingdom was the second-largest inbound travel market for France in 2014 (OECD, 2016). The United Kingdom uses a different currency than France, the pound, therefore exchange rates must be considered along with other variables. A sharp change in exchange rates stemming from an event like Brexit, in the summer of 2016, could make travel to France very favorable or unfavorable depending on the rate, and impact the tourism flows to the country.

While the identified indicators are crucial in determining competitiveness among OECD member states, there was no indicator included in the research that measured risk. If tourists perceive risk in a potential destination, will they still be inclined to travel there? How would an event such as a terror attack or series of attacks impact the tourism competitiveness of a country? If competitiveness is affected, what economic effects will be seen in the country’s domestic tourism industry, and in the economy as a whole? These are questions left unanswered by the OECD research concerning tourism competitiveness indicators, and must be included in a future analysis of tourism determinants.

To identify the effects a risk variable may have on the number of tourists visiting a country, it is useful to analyze visitor data and economic performance from top tourist attractions across the country of study. If increased risk felt by tourists could decrease visitation to a country, would the top attractions within the country see a decline in visitors and tourist expenditure? For France and particularly the Paris region, areas of study may include visitor data from sites such as the Eiffel Tower, the Louvre, or Disneyland Paris, and financial performance from these attractions.

Hoffstetter (2015) cites the Comité Régional du Tourisme in claiming that the tourism sector accounts for
500,000 jobs in the Paris Île de France region alone, which attracts 30 million visitors per year. Hoffstetter acknowledges no previous study on the impact of the Paris attacks has been done, but he uses information gathered from various sites around the city to make key points and predictions.

The author uses the example of Disneyland Paris to illustrate how major tourist attractions could be affected by the attacks. Immediately following the November attack, President François Hollande announced three days of national grieving, meaning many major attractions and businesses would close to observe the “deuil national”. According to Disney, the park attracted 1.4 million visitors in 2014, or as Hoffstetter calculates, 30,000 visitors per day, and he predicts millions of euros in entry fees, consumption, and shopping in the park lost as a result of the closure. He further predicts that the effects would be the same for the thousands of cafés, museums, restaurants, and shops in the region, many of whom closed on additional days for “security reasons”.

Hoffstetter also makes an interesting case as he points out the cost of adding extra security measures around the Paris region and the borders by the French government. While this number is difficult to estimate, he predicts a large amount of public funds was spent on bolstering security measures around the country, including the deployment of soldiers in Paris, reinforcing border guards, and other actions taken by the government.

This article takes the first step in determining the effects of the terror attacks on the French tourism industry. Published only three days after the November 2015 attack, Hoffstetter notices the security measures taken by the government, and the initial reaction of tourist attractions and businesses around the Paris Île de France region. While he estimates the amount of revenue lost due to the closures of firms around the country, these closures only lasted for a short time after the attacks, therefore only the immediate impact of the attacks was studied in this article. It is necessary to further track the number of visitors to top tourist attractions such as Disneyland Paris to identify any lasting effects on the attractions, and their impact on the tourism industry as a whole.

To further address the salience of this topic, and help fill the gap of recent examples of other countries where terror attacks have happened, it is useful to find recent cases and analyze their effects. Thirty-eight tourists were killed by a terrorist at a beach resort in Tunisia in June, 2015. The minister of tourism, Selma Ellouma Rekik, declared that the economic impact of the attack was an expected 450 million euros in 2015 alone (Huffington, 2015). Tourism is a large industry in Tunisia, accounting for 7% of GDP and providing for 400,000 jobs, directly and indirectly (Huffington, 2015).

In terms of percent contribution to GDP, the tourism industry in Tunisia is similar to that of France, which makes it a valuable case study to analyze and compare to France. Rekik estimated that the 450 million euros lost due to the attack was on the low end of the estimate, and that the total effect on the economy could amount to over 1 billion euros (Huffington, 2015). If the attack such as the one in Tunisia had that large of an effect on the domestic economy, would the effect of multiple and larger attacks in France amplify the economic impact there? This research aims to address this question.

Another useful indicator of tourism flows in a country of study can be the number of hotel stays, and observing the changes in the amount of reservations to determine seasonality of tourism, or in this case, the effect a terror attack may have on tourist’s travel plans. The Charlie Hebdo attacks were small in size, compared to the later events in Paris and Nice, but Sulzer (2015) notes that in the 10 days following the attacks, January 8 through 18, 2015, hotel stays decreased 9%. Sulzer also cites Weekendesk, an online hotel reservation leader domestically in France, and states that hotel stays were anticipated to reach normal levels by the following weekend, January 24 and 25.

While this article shows a decrease in hotel stays directly after a terrorist attack, there are a few flaws identified in this research. Sulzer states that January is normally the calmest month for France in terms of tourism; therefore, the 9% reduction in hotel stays after the attacks is not reflective of reactions to attacks during a busier month when more tourists would visit the country, and make hotel plans. During a busier month, perhaps the reaction to the attacks would be more negative, with a greater decrease in the percentage of hotel stays. Secondly, the author states that while Weekendesk is a leader in online hotel reservations in France, the majority of their clientele are French. Therefore, their analysis of hotel stays returning to normalcy by the end
of January reflects the willingness of French citizens to travel again, and neglect the international tourists the Paris region in particular depends heavily on.

While hotel stays can be a useful indicator of the health of tourism flows in a country of study, this information must be reflective of all tourists visiting that country, and not just domestic travelers. In addition, because the Charlie Hebdo attack was the first in France out of the three since 2015, the effect might not have been as large as the later attacks. Recalling Pizam and Fleischer (2002), the frequency of attacks had a greater effect on tourism than the severity of the attack; thus the 9% decrease in hotel stays following the January 2015 attack is an underestimation of the total effect on hotel stays, as Charlie Hebdo was the first and least-severe attack out of the three. Perhaps the reaction to hotel stays would be more significant after the Nice attack, which was the final attack out of the three, extending the frequency of attacks mentioned by Pizam and Fleischer.

As of August, 2015, France was on track to set a record for number of tourists in one year, as the country approached 85 million tourists visiting the country. Tourism minister Laurent Fabius stated that tourism numbers were consistent with the previous year, despite the Paris attack in January 2015 that saw a temporary economic effect for several weeks (Sotinel, 2015). Sotinel also states that the number of hotel stays in Paris saw a decline so far in 2015, but said it would be difficult to estimate whether the effects of the attack would last (Sotinel, 2015).

While France was on track to see a record number of tourists as of August, 2015, this was after only one of the three major terror attacks had taken place in the country, with the other two taking place in November, 2015, and July, 2016. Fabius mentioned the negative economic effects lasted a few weeks following the first attack, however could the effects last longer following the two attacks that happened after the article was published? Recalling Pizam and Fleischer (2002), the economic effect after three attacks would be more negative than just one, as frequency of attacks was determined to be more important than severity. Therefore, a greater negative economic impact would be expected after the attacks in November, 2015, and July, 2016.

While the tourism industry sees a decline in revenues and tourist flows following a terror attack, the overall economic effect could reach other parts of France’s economy. Economist Howard Archer stated that consumer spending, one of the strongest parts of France’s economy, could see a large decline due to the risk perceived by domestic consumers (Craig, 2015). Consumer confidence in France fell from an eight-year high in October of 2015, and consumer spending was flat for a second straight month in September 2015 (Craig, 2015). From these statistics, it is shown that the economic effect of terror attacks reaches beyond the tourism sector of the economy. Craig’s research was published after the second of the three attacks, and the author argues that the serious negative economic effects were already being seen before the second attack, in November 2015. Additionally, these effects were not contained within the tourism industry, and were affecting other parts of the French economy, such as consumer spending based on consumer confidence levels. If the effects of terror attacks are felt throughout the French economy as a whole, the overall economic impact could be much greater than previously thought, and therefore further research into this topic is vital to achieving an understanding of economic performance in France.

Because the terror attacks in France were as recent as 2016, the country provides for a compelling modern case study to analyze the effects of terror attacks on tourism. Many case studies have been done in the past, including Eilat and Einav (2004) and Sonmez (1998); this research will provide a new insight into the tourism industry in France. Additionally, with France being the most visited country in the world according to the World Travel and Tourism Council, a case study analyzing the effects of terrorism attacks in the country would be useful in predicting economic performance within the tourism sector and related industries (WTTC, 2016). The literature consulted for this research does not fully analyze the impacts of terror attacks, as many of Sonmez’s (1998) analysis discusses political uprisings or revolts, nor does it specifically address the effects on a leading tourist destination such as France; thus there is a considerable gap in the literature that this research intends to fill.
Chapter Three: Empirical Analysis

The goal of this chapter is to choose a method to analyze the economic effects of the terror attacks in France on the country’s Gross Domestic Product via tourism and the related industry; it is clear that a regression model is the most appropriate to identify trends and correlations between variables in the model. Regressions are used to quantify relationships between variables in a model, and they can also identify how close these relationships are and with what significance (Ramcharan, 2006). Tourism is a broad category with many economic and social factors contributing to it, therefore a regression analysis will be the most useful in analyzing the many variables affecting tourism in France for a given year.

In building the regression for this model, there were many variables taken into consideration for inclusion in the regression. Because of France’s adoption of the euro single-currency in 2002, beginning a historical analysis of tourism and tourism related statistics with that date as the starting point is logical.

Consistent with Eilat and Einav (2004), many variables can be taken into consideration for inclusion in the regression model outlining main determinants of tourism in France. In their study of high-GNP countries, Eilat and Einav found the following variables to be statistically significant at 1%: GDP per capita, trade, exchange rates, and a risk index.

GDP per capita is an important variable to include in this regression model because as Eilat and Einav (2004) demonstrated, tourists prefer traveling to countries with a higher GDP per capita, which is often a sign of the host country with a higher GDP per capita being more developed, and thus a more attractive destination for leisure-bound tourists. Additionally, GDP per capita growth is a sign of economic growth as a whole in a country, thus for France, an increase in this statistic is a good sign for the domestic economy. It is important to note that GDP per capita in France decreased drastically from 2014 to 2015, by 15.2% (World Bank). This drastic reduction in GDP per capita obviously suggests major problems in France’s domestic economy, of which tourism is a large part (WTTC, 2016). This regression will explore the possibility that the two terror attacks in 2015 and the Nice attack in 2016 did have an effect on France’s economic performance in 2015 and 2016.

Eilat and Einav (2004) found a positive impact of trade on tourism demand, therefore more trade between France and other countries will lead to increased tourism demand by foreign visitors. According to data obtained from the World Bank, trade as a percentage of GDP in France for 2016 was 61.43%, the highest level seen in France throughout the years of study for this model, 2002 through 2016 (World Bank). For the years 2014 and 2015, trade as a percentage of GDP was 59.09% and 59.88% respectively, both 10-year highs, while the number of arrivals in the country were 83.63 million and 83.76 million visitors, respectively, and were also all-time highs for the country (World Bank). It is clear that Eilat and Einav’s findings correlate with the statistics from France for the 2015 and 2016, and that trade in France is an indicator of tourism demand by foreign visitors. Additionally, a higher volume of trade could mean that France has become more open to trade, investment, and tourism from other countries.

The leading inbound tourism markets for France in 2014 were Germany, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Italy, and the Netherlands, respectively. Since all of those nations use the euro, excluding the United Kingdom, exchange rates taken into consideration will be those between the United Kingdom and France since 2002. The exchange rate between Great Britain and the Euro Group hit a multi-year low in 2015, and would have been attractive for potential tourists in France, however, it has since recovered and is above the historical average (European Central Bank).
Using the average GDP of the top 5 visiting countries as the independent variable would be useful to include in the regression. This statistic would indicate whether or not income in these countries affected tourism revenues in France. If income decreases in the top 5 visiting countries decreases, would a decrease in visitation to France and therefore a decrease in the contribution of travel and tourism to overall GDP be expected?

Inflation is also an important statistic to consider when creating this regression. An increase in the inflation rate would make the cost of travel, including hotel stays and industry-related goods and services, more expensive, and could deter potential tourists from entering the country. Higher inflation in France could be associated with decreases in both the number of arrivals to the country and the contribution of travel and tourism to overall GDP, two very important statistics when analyzing the effects of the terror attacks on France’s economy.

Exchange rates of the euro to the United States dollar have been at a level not seen since the inception of the euro single-currency in 2002. Increased panic over weak economies in the Euro Group including Greece, Italy, and Spain, political turmoil with the election of far-left Syriza leader Alexis Tsipras in Greece and the rise of far-right leaders in France and the Netherlands such as Marine Le Pen and Geert Wilders, and social fears over increased terrorism and attacks by immigrants in France and Germany have combined to weaken the euro drastically. As of May 31, 2016, the exchange rate for 1 euro was $1.11 USD, which is incredibly low compared to a historical average (European Central Bank). For non-euro group tourists, this means the cost of tourism in France in 2015 and 2016 was the cheapest seen in years.

When combined with the fact that France is the world’s premier tourist destination, and attracts the most visitors out of any other country, an incredibly weak euro makes travel and inbound tourism to France very alluring for potential tourists. This combination provides for an interesting study as to whether the risk factors posed by the recent terror attacks will outweigh the cost of traveling to France, at one of the cheapest levels seen since the inception of the euro in 2002.

Risk index was also found to be significantly significant at 1% by Eilat and Einav (2004), therefore it is an important variable to include in this study. The terror attacks in 2015 and 2016, at Charlie Hebdo, the Bataclan and Stade de France, and in Nice were the deadliest and largest attacks in France since World War II, and therefore the risk index for these years would be much higher than the other years of study, 2002 through 2014. Therefore, the use of an indicator variable to identify the higher level of risk involved with traveling to France in 2015 and 2016 would be appropriate for this model. For this indicator, the use of threat level in France measured by the domestic “Vigipirate” system would be used as a dummy variable, with the lowest level of “white” as a 0, and the highest level of “scarlet” as a 4. Due to various ways of assessing risk in a country, three different statistics will be used for the risk indicator: the Vigipirate ranking system where the highest score of the year will be used for the entire year, a weighted average of Vigipirate rankings that give the average score for the year, and a score from the World Bank assessing political stability and absence of violence and terrorism in the country.

Additionally, a “special event” variable would need to be included in order to accurately interpret the results of this regression model. Hosting a large event such as an international soccer championship as France did in 2016, or Euro Cup, draws millions of tourists from around the world who are expected to spend over a billion euros while visiting France, and could skew the impact of terror attacks on the number of tourists visiting the country as well as the total contribution of travel and tourism to GDP (Dolgos, 2015). Therefore, the inclusion of this variable in the model is vital to ensuring accuracy and interpretation of results. The inclusion of a special event variable also differentiates this unique and current case study from previous authors, as they did not include this variable in their respective regression models.

Thus, this model will use a regression to determine whether the variables described above and the contribution of tourism and travel to Gross Domestic Product are correlated, and ultimately conclude whether the recent terror attacks in France have had an economic effect on the country’s GDP, via the contribution of tourism and travel. Additionally, 2016 data for some variables were not yet released at the time of this research, thus 5-year moving averages were used to calculate 2016 estimates for the following variables: GDP per capita, trade, World Bank risk indicator, and average GDP per capita for the top 5 visiting countries. Therefore, the
The regression equation for this model will be as follows:

\[ Y(\text{contribution of travel and tourism to GDP}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{GDP per capita} + \beta_2 \text{trade} + \beta_3 \text{risk index} + \beta_4 \text{exchange rate (USD)} + \beta_5 \text{number of arrivals} + \beta_6 \text{top 5 visiting countries' avg. GDP} + \beta_7 \text{inflation rate (%Δ year to year)} + \beta_8 \text{special event indicator} \]

The first model uses the highest Vigipirate score of the year as the value for the entire year, thus if the threat level at any time was identified as scarlet, the highest level, a “4” would be the score for the entire year. Vigipirate uses five different indicators to identify threat level, from white, the lowest, to scarlet, the highest. Therefore, a score of 0 will be assigned to white, increasing to 4 for scarlet.

**Figure 3.1: Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of tourism to GDP (in billions USD)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>197.1933</td>
<td>5.749964</td>
<td>187.6</td>
<td>208.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (USD)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38397.25</td>
<td>5798.301</td>
<td>24275.24</td>
<td>45413.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate (Euro-USD)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.26034</td>
<td>.153157</td>
<td>.9387</td>
<td>1.5521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Indicator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.86667</td>
<td>.6399405</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Trade</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.744642</td>
<td>.0301101</td>
<td>1.695201</td>
<td>1.788395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Indicator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.133333</td>
<td>.3518658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of arrivals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.93 x 10^7</td>
<td>3490372</td>
<td>7.44 x 10^7</td>
<td>8.45 X 10^7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GDP per capita, top 5 visiting countries (USD)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40685.25</td>
<td>5836.64</td>
<td>26174.95</td>
<td>47643.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation rate (%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.416667</td>
<td>.8209373</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.2: Contribution of Tourism & Travel to France’s Gross Domestic Product (in billions USD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita, France</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>-0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>-7.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk indicator – “Scarlet”</td>
<td><strong>0.001</strong></td>
<td>-155.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk indicator – “Red”</td>
<td><strong>0.001</strong></td>
<td>-74.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita, France</td>
<td>*0.027</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>41.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Indicator – “Scarlet”</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>8.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk indicator – “Red”</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-6.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log trade</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>135.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special event indicator</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>7.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of arrivals</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>3.49 x 10^-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GDP per capita, top 5 visiting countries</td>
<td>*0.028</td>
<td>-0.00093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation rate</td>
<td>*0.043</td>
<td>3.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>-58.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*denotes significance at 95% confidence interval

From these results in Model 2, the data shows that a higher GDP per capita in France will result in a higher contribution of tourism and travel to total GDP. Perhaps this is due to a higher GDP per capita of a country, indicating higher individual wealth and standard of living, is perceived as a more appealing place to travel to by tourists. Meanwhile, a higher average GDP per capita among the top 5 visiting countries, including Germany,
England, Holland, Italy, and Belgium, results in a decrease of travel and tourism’s contribution to GDP. This could be explained by higher levels of income not necessarily translating into increased travel and tourism spending by citizens of these countries. Inflation also proved significant at 95%, with a positive coefficient relating to the contribution of travel and tourism to GDP, however this is expected. As inflation rates rise, so will the prices of all goods and services relating to travel and tourism, thus making the cost of tourism more expensive, driving up the total contribution to GDP.

Weakly significant variables included the “red” and “scarlet” indicators, meaning that the threat level in France had no effect on tourism’s contribution to GDP. It is interesting that the scarlet has a positive coefficient; perhaps this could be explained by no difference in perceived risk by tourists between the red and scarlet threat levels. Joining the indicator variables in the group that was weakly significant is trade and exchange rate, meaning that exchange rates between England and France were not significant in determining travel and tourism contribution to GDP in this model, along with trade as a percentage of France’s GDP.

Model 3 uses the weighted average of the Vigipirate threat level as the number for the risk indicator variable. This score reflects the threat score of each month for the year totaled, then divided by 12 months for an overall average monthly score.

---

**Figure 3.4: Contribution of Tourism & Travel to France’s Gross Domestic Product (in billions USD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita, France</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.0002074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>41.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk indicator</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log trade</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>114.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special event indicator</td>
<td>*0.028</td>
<td>10.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of arrivals</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>3.56 x 10^{-7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GDP per capita, top 5 visiting countries</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>-0.00093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation rate</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>-58.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Observations:</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (8, 6)</td>
<td><strong>2.07</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R-Squared</strong></td>
<td>0.6013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*denotes significance at 95% confidence interval

However, the only significant variable produced from this model is the special event indicator, significant at 95% confidence level. This shows that special events in France, such as a European soccer championship tournament, boost the contribution of travel and tourism to overall GDP in the country. This result is not surprising considering the millions of visitors drawn to France from many different countries as a result of hosting the weeks-long tournament.

Model 4 uses the World Bank Worldwide Governance indicator for the risk variable, which measures political stability and the absence of violence and terrorism in the country. This scale estimates the level of governance in a country, ranging from -2.5, weak, to 2.5, strong governance performance. Because the score for 2016 had not been released at the time of this research, a 3 year moving average was used to estimate this score. The score for 2015 as reported by the World Bank was 0.27, and the statistic has decreased in value each year since the 2010 score of 0.67 (World Bank, 2016).

**Figure 3.5: Contribution of Tourism & Travel to France’s Gross Domestic Product**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita, France</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate</td>
<td>*0.031</td>
<td>41.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk indicator (World Bank Governance indicator)</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>-12.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log trade</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>143.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special event indicator</td>
<td>**0.005</td>
<td>13.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of arrivals</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>2.83 x 10^{-7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GDP per capita, top 5 visiting countries</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>-0.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation rate</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>1.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>-98.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Observations:</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (8, 6)</td>
<td><strong>6.45</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R-Squared</strong></td>
<td>0.6780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita, France</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>41.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk indicator (World Bank Governance indicator)</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>-12.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log trade</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>143.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special event indicator</td>
<td><strong>0.005</strong></td>
<td>13.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of arrivals</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>2.83 x 10^{-7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GDP per capita, top 5 visiting countries</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>-0.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation rate</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>1.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>-98.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Observations:** 15

**F (8, 6):** 6.45

**Adjusted R-Squared** 0.6780

*denotes significance at 95% confidence interval, **denotes significance at 99% confidence interval

Results from Model 4 indicate that special events and the exchange rate are decisive factors in identifying the main determinants of tourism in France, measured by tourism and travel’s contribution to GDP. Special events hosted by France, such as the Euro soccer championship in 2016, draw millions of tourists from around the world, boosting the overall tourism economy with the large number of tourists spending money in the country.

Exchange rates are also important, however these can only be considered for the exchange rates between France and England, as the other 4 of the top 5 visiting countries to France also use the Euro. Exchange rates between the two countries in 2015 and 2016 were the lowest they have been in many years, making the pound less valuable in comparison to the euro.

Due to the recently decreased value of the pound, British tourists’ purchasing power is lower than in previous years, therefore it is anticipated that a decline in inbound tourists from Great Britain would be seen as a result. Additionally, the Euro has also seen a decline in value against the dollar in recent years, making tourism in France attractive for countries outside of Europe.

Table 3.1 – Pound vs. Euro, 2000-2017
3.1 – POTENTIAL FOR BIAS AND ERROR

In the four regression models described earlier, there exists some potential for bias and error. Heteroskedasticity is when the error variance depends on the values of 1 or more x-variables. To correct for heteroskedasticity, a “robust” regression was applied in each model, which accounts for the error by running a linear regression.

Multicollinearity can create inefficiency, and occurs when independent variables are highly correlated to each other, often making it difficult to determine the statistical significance of variables in the regression. To correct for multicollinearity, a correlation matrix of all independent variables was run for each regression model. No multicollinearity was found for statistically significant variables in each of the four models.

Figure 3.6: Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tourism contribution to GDP</th>
<th>GDP per capita</th>
<th>Exchangerate</th>
<th>Risk Indicator</th>
<th>Log trade</th>
<th>Special Event Indicator</th>
<th>Number of arrivals</th>
<th>Average GDP per capita, top 5 visiting countries</th>
<th>Inflation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism contribution to GDP</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>.3220</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchangerate</td>
<td>.2003</td>
<td>.7907</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Indicator</td>
<td>.1939</td>
<td>.4560</td>
<td>.0309</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log trade</td>
<td>.4787</td>
<td>.5151</td>
<td>.0721</td>
<td>.5430</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Indicator</td>
<td>.3288</td>
<td>-.3955</td>
<td>-.6158</td>
<td>.0846</td>
<td>.0344</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of arrivals</td>
<td>.4866</td>
<td>.5230</td>
<td>.0885</td>
<td>.5053</td>
<td>.9244</td>
<td>.0700</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GDP per capita, top 5 visiting countries</td>
<td>.3285</td>
<td>.9917</td>
<td>.7656</td>
<td>.4838</td>
<td>.5749</td>
<td>-.4007</td>
<td>.5768</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation rate</td>
<td>-.1991</td>
<td>-.3842</td>
<td>-.0890</td>
<td>-.4088</td>
<td>-.544</td>
<td>.0190</td>
<td>-.6099</td>
<td>-.4168</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In conclusion, the regression results suggest that while the Vigipirate risk indicators are weakly significant and may impact the overall contribution of tourism and travel to France’s GDP, the main determinants in France’s tourism industry are exchange rates and special events being held in the country.

Chapter Four: Effets sociaux des attentats terroristes

Le pays le plus fréquenté du monde, il est certain que le tourisme et l’industrie reliée sont indispensables à l’économie française. Selon World Travel and Tourism Council, l’industrie du tourisme contribue 199,3 milliards d’euros au Produit Intérieur Brut de la France en 2015, 9,1% du PIB total. Cette contribution se classe sixième entre 184 pays, donc l’industrie du tourisme en France fait une des plus grandes contributions au PIB du monde, et une augmentation de 3,1% est prévue en 2016 (WTTC 1). En 2015, le tourisme constitue 4,2% de l’économie, ou 1.175.000 des emplois, avec une augmentation prévue de 2,1% en 2016 (WTTC 4). Ensemble, les deux statistiques indiquent l’importance du tourisme à l’économie française.

Le tourisme et l’industrie reliée sont indispensables à la France, donc un choc à l’industrie aurait des conséquences sérieuses pour le pays. Dans les deux années passées, la France a été la cible d’attentats terroristes, avec trois grandes attaques dans ce temps. Le 7 janvier et le 13 novembre 2015, la ville de Paris a été bouleversée par des attentats terroristes sur le bâtiment de Charlie Hebdo, un journal français, et le théâtre Bataclan et le Stade de France, respectivement. Les assaillants de Charlie Hebdo, qui s’identifient avec le groupe de terreur Al-Qaeda, ont tué 11 personnes et blessé 10 avant ils d’être arrêtés par la police après deux jours. Le 13 novembre, les agresseurs ont tué 130 et blessé 368; le lendemain, le groupe ISIL a réclamé la responsabilité pour les attentats, qui sont les attentats les plus mortels en France depuis la seconde guerre mondiale.

Finalement, le 14 juillet 2016, un énorme camion a été conduit sur le Promenade des Anglais, à Nice, où une grande foule était venue pour la Fête de la Bastille, une fête nationale. L’assaillant a conduit à travers la foule; il a tué 86 et blessé 434, ce qui intensifie la tristesse d’un pays désespéré.

Il est certain que les grands attentats ont eu un énorme effet sur l’économie française par l’industrie du tourisme, mais les attentats terroristes ont provoqué des réponses sociales par les citoyens de France. Ces attentats ont mis en oeuvre de grands problèmes comme la sécurité et la défense du pays, et l’immigration et les sentiments publics envers les immigrés.

4.1 RÉACTION DOMESTIQUE - LE PUBLIC, LA PRESSE FRANÇAISE

Les réactions de la presse française et le public montrent comment les attentats terroristes horribles de 2015 et 2016 ont transformé la France en un état en guerre contre le terrorisme. Les soucis du public français incluent des soucis de sécurité, une critique du gouvernement et son effort pour combattre le terrorisme, un sentiment “anti-immigré” senti par un grand nombre de français qui commencent un débat sur le sujet de l’immigration, et peut-être un sens de nationalisme qui est arrivé comme une réaction aux trois attentats.

4.1.1 - UN SENS DE NATIONALISME

Tandis que les attentats par les terroristes en 2015 et 2016 ont dévasté la France, avec les pires attaques depuis la Seconde guerre mondiale, un sens de nationalisme a développé autour des victimes. Le Président Hollande a déclaré que la France est en guerre, et les citoyens du pays se sont ralliés derrière le drapeau tricolore.

Après le premier attentat, aux bureaux de Charlie Hebdo, il y avait une “gravitation” par les parisiens vers la Place de la République, une grande symbole du pouvoir français et du peuple: c’est là où les protestations de mai 1958 ont eu lieu pendant la chute de la IVe république, et où de Gaulle a présenté la nouvelle constitution de la Ve république en septembre de la même année (Welch & Perivolaris, 2016). Les formes de la protestation qui apparaît après l’attaque Charlie Hebdo ont réfleté les démonstrations de mai 1958 et 1968, avec les manifestants qui aux montés sur le monument dans la Place avec le drapeau tricolore (Welch & Perivolaris, 2016).

Figure 4.1

En remembrance des victimes des attentats à Charlie Hebdo et au Bataclan, il semble que les Français s’intéressent à se joindre aux forces militaires de la France. Après l’attentat sur le Bataclan en novembre 2015, qui était l’attaque la plus sanglante en France depuis la Seconde guerre mondiale, il y a eu beaucoup d’activité sur le site, S’engager.fr, qui est le site Internet de recrutement de l’armée française. Le nombre de demandes par jour sur le site a triplé après l’attaque au Bataclan, car le site recevait 500 demandes par jour avant l’attaque et 1.500 par jour après (Guibert, 2015).

Après le deuxième attentat, le Président Hollande a dit qu’il veut augmenter l’armée française, et que les recrutements allaient passer 16.000 en 2016 (Guibert, 2015). L’intérêt par les jeunes Français à se joindre aux forces militaires montre le sens de nationalisme exprimé dans tout le pays après les deux attentats. Ce nouveau sens de nationalisme a commencé après Charlie Hebdo, où les parisiens ont mobilisé autour de la Place de la République.

4.1.2 - SOUCIS DE SÉCURITÉ


Le Monde a classé aussi les réponses par le parti politique avec lequel les sondés s’identifient, et les résultats sont intéressants. Le parti de l'extrême droite, le Front National, et aussi le parti de droite, Les Républicains, classaient la sécurité et la défense comme les soucis les plus importants, en comparaison aux autres partis politiques qui considèrent le chômage comme le souci le plus grave en France. De plus, le Front National considère l’immigration comme un problème très important plus que les autres partis combinés.

Figure 4.2


La sécurité n’est pas seulement un souci pour la France après les grands attentats terroristes dans les années passées, mais en Suisse aussi. En 25 septembre 2016, les Suisses ont voté par référendum sur une loi qui permettait au gouvernement suisse et aux services secrets de surveiller les communications téléphoniques et les activités sur Internet (Le Monde, 2016). Les Suisses ont dit “oui” à la loi, avec 65,5% des suisses acceptant la nouvelle loi. Ce résultat exprime les soucis du peuple suisse contre le terrorisme et les attentats possibles, et leur consentement au gouvernement de combattre ces forces négatives, même si cette loi peut violer leur intimité. Est-ce qu’une telle loi peut être faite en France? Pour la défense de l’état, la surveillance est cruciale, mais ce niveau de sécurité viendrait avec le prix de moins d’intimité pour le peuple français.

Tandis que le gouvernement peut voir la surveillance comme une mesure pour améliorer la sécurité d’un
pays, il est certain que les attentats récents ont eu des conséquences pour des groupes religieux spécifiques. Les attentats terroristes ont eu des conséquences pour la population de France, spécifiquement pour la population juive. Dans cette population, estimée à un demi-million de personnes dans ce pays, près de 40.000 Juifs sont partis de France depuis 2006, avec près de 5.000 qui ayant quitté l’Hexagone en 2016 (Le Parisien, 2017). Leur sens de sécurité peut avoir un effet sur le grand départ, après l’attentat à Charlie Hebdo et le ciblage de l’épicérie juive. Il est clair que la peur du djihadisme et les actes antisémites potentiels ont un grand effet sur la population juive de France, et qu’ils se considèrent peu sûrs.

Le gouvernement français doit créer un sens de sécurité pour les citoyens du pays. Après trois grands attentats en dix-huit mois, la France a subi une crise terrible, et la souffrance d’une nation entière est visible par tout le monde. Comme une réponse aux attentats, le Président François Hollande a commandé à l’armée française de se déployer vers le pays. Il a déclaré que le pays était “en guerre”, et il a autorisé une opération militaire à mobiliser après l’attentat à Charlie Hebdo en janvier 2015 (Chrisafis, 2016). Cette opération, appelé Opération Sentinelle, a déployé 10.000 soldats vers la France, avec 6.500 de ces soldats à Paris, la ville où deux attentats se sont passés (Chrisafis, 2016). Leur but est de protéger des sites importants à la république, qui incluent des sites touristiques comme la tour Eiffel et des musées d’art et d’histoire, et aussi d’autres sites vulnérables comme les stations de métro et des synagogues.

Cette réponse forte par le gouvernement et le Président Hollande montre l’engagement de l’état à protéger le pays contre le terrorisme et les attentats possibles. Les patrouilles régulières de l'armée ont aussi l’intention de donner un sens de stabilité et d’ordre aux citoyens français, mais bien que leur présence donne un meilleur sens de sécurité, la même présence a transformé le pays en un état vraiment “en guerre”, comme Hollande a déclaré. On peut voir les soldats avec de grandes mitrailleuses dans les rues ou les stations de métro, et c’est un rappel constant du danger possible en France aujourd’hui.

4.1.3 - CRITIQUE DU GOUVERNEMENT DANS LA LUTTE CONTRE TERRORISME

Les trois grands attentats terroristes mettent en doute le gouvernement français et ses efforts pour combattre le terrorisme. Après l’attaque de Nice, la France avait subi trois attentats en deux années, et la critique du gouvernement augmentait. Selon un sondage Ipsos, après l’attentat de Nice en juillet 2016, 71% des Français étaient “sceptiques quant à l’action de l’exécutif contre le terrorisme,” et un autre sondage fait par Elabe montrait que “deux Français sur trois (65 %) estiment en effet que François Hollande et Manuel Valls ‘ne mettent pas en oeuvre tous les moyens nécessaires à la lutte contre la menace terroriste’” (Ouest France, 2016). Par conséquent, 77% des sondés pensent que le gouvernement est inefficace dans la lutte contre le terrorisme (Ouest France, 2016).

Ce sondage Ipsos montre le sentiment public envers le gouvernement et la façon dont il lutte contre le terrorisme et les attentats par les djihadistes en France. Comme résultat, le gouvernement a été victime de critique par la presse française, qui exprime les sentiments quelquefois les plus extrêmes du peuple. Le gouvernement français a été examiné à la loupe après les événements qui se sont passés en 2015 et 2016 dans le pays. Le Figaro, un journal conservateur français, a appelé la situation, “la crise de la régime” après l’attaque à Nice (Théas, 2016). C’est l’opinion du Figaro et de l’auteur, Alexis Théas, que le gouvernement a unifié le pays après l’attentat à Charlie Hebdo avec “l’esprit Charlie”, en référence au grand nombre de Parisiens qui se sont réunis à la République avec des drapeaux tricolores pour une cérémonie de commémoration des victimes (Welch & Perivolaris). Après trois attentats dans deux ans, et la souffrance d’un pays entier, Alexis Théas a fait l’argument que les citoyens de France et “l’esprit Charlie” senti par des millions après la première attaque sont usés.

Théas écrit qu’il y a une “crise” du régime en France, et le peuple français critique les actions du gouvernement après les attentats. Il y a d’autres écrivains qui pensent que la lutte contre le terrorisme est plus présent en France qu’en Moyen-Orient. Selon Renaud Girard, un journaliste au Figaro, il y a trois erreurs que le gouvernement français a fait dans la lutte contre le djihadisme, et il pense que le “combat essentiel contre le djihadisme ne se livre pas en Syrie, mais en France” (Girard, 2016). À son avis, la réaction immédiate du gouvernement n’a pas été assez forte ou montré assez de force. “Là où nos adversaires ont des kalachnikovs,
nous avons des bougies, des hashtags, des commémorations et des minutes de silence” (Girard, 2016). Ici, il fait l’argument que le gouvernement n’a pas fait les actions nécessaires contre les forces du djihadisme après la première attaque en janvier 2015.

Deuxièmement, il suggère que la stratégie du gouvernement, l’Opération Sentinelle, n’est pas assez pour protéger le pays entier. Il argumente que la stratégie est efficace, mais seulement après un attentat vers un cible le gouvernement protège-t-il les cibles de la même sorte. Par exemple, il écrit “Après le 14 juillet 2016 sanglant à Nice, nous parlons des camions,” en référence aux efforts pour défendre des sites possibles ouvertes aux attentats (Girard, 2016). Tandis que Sentinelle, ou le “véritable ligne Maginot du XXIe siècle” est une grande mesure effective contre le djihadisme et des attentats possibles, c’est une réaction défensive prise par le gouvernement après la violence.

Le troisième erreur dans l’opinion de Girard est les pensées du gouvernement que la destruction de Daech ou l’État Islamique dans le Moyen Orient est la seule mesure de sécurité dans la guerre contre le djihadisme. Oui, il y a des djihadistes en Syrie et d’autres pays, mais le menace existe en France aussi, et il faut lutter contre les forces Daech domestiquement. “Certes, certains terroristes islamistes étaient passés par la Syrie. Mais hélas, le noyau de la menace terroriste qui vise la France n’est pas en Syrie, mais en France même” (Girard, 2016).

En conclusion, Girard écrit avec une attitude très conservatrice, mais il reflète une attitude d’un grand nombre des Français. Après les trois grands attentats, et beaucoup de problèmes avec l’Union européenne, il y a un mouvement vers les partis politiques de droite, spécifiquement les Républicains, et le parti de l’extrême droite, le Front National (FN).

4.1.4 - UN SENTIMENT “ANTI-IMMIGRÉ”

Comme un résultat des attentats terroristes en France, il développe un sentiment “anti-immigré” dans le pays. Une étude de l’institut Ipsos a trouvé que 57% des Français “estiment qu’il y a trop d’immigrés dans leur pays, et seulement 11% trouvent que l'immigration a un impact « positif » en France” (Ouest France). 63% des Français pensent que les réfugiés “ne pourront pas s’intégrer” et 45% voulaient la fermeture des frontières aux réfugiés, donc il est clair que le sentiment public vers les immigrés, et en particulier les réfugiés, est amélioré depuis les attentats (Ouest France).

Le sondage Ipsos publié dans Le Monde indique que le chômage est le plus grand souci des Français, sauf la sécurité et la défense brièvement en novembre 2015. Yves Bardon, directeur du programme Flair au Ipsos Knowledge Center, pense que les interviewés dans l’étude “se sentent menacés aussi bien par des immigrés susceptibles d’occuper les emplois peu qualifiés que par une immigration choisie, en mesure de les priver de métiers pointus en lien avec leur formation” (Ouest France). Comme le chômage est le plus grand souci parmi les Français, il existe un “menace” des immigrés et réfugiés qui peuvent occuper les postes qui “appartenaient” aux employés Français.

La presse de droite a écrit beaucoup d’articles concernant les mauvaises actions des immigrés et réfugiés, mais il y a aussi des articles qui décrivent la vraie vie d’un immigré français qui habite en France depuis longtemps, et qui veut la paix.

Tandis que le sentiment envers les immigrés et réfugiés est devenu mauvais, c’est peut-être les immigrés légaux qui se sentent le moins à l’aise dans le pays. Par exemple, Le Maine Libre, un journal régional français, a fait un entretien avec un Français musulman, qui s’appelait Omar. En référence aux attentats, il a dit “J’ai de la peine deux fois. Comme citoyen français et comme musulman. C’est de la barbarie, ce n’est pas l’islam. Un vrai musulman ne doit faire de mal à personne. Ce qui s’est passé hier, mardi, près de Rouen est dramatique. On est tous touchés en France par ce qui arrive. Je suis vraiment malheureux” (Le Maine Libre).

Omar pense qu’il reflète un bon exemple d’un immigré qui a réussi en France après qu’il est venu dans le pays. “J’ai travaillé toute ma vie. Et mes enfants ont tous du travail. La France est un pays magnifique, celui des droits de l’Homme. Moi, je me sens d’abord français, avant d’être musulman” (Le Maine Libre). La marque d’infamie vers les immigrés et les réfugiés est senti par les Français qui sont venus dans le pays légalement, et
qui ne veulent pas la violence en France, leur pays adoré.

Le sentiment anti-immigré et les soucis de sécurité transforment la France dans un pays "en guerre", et ces effets ont des répercussions négatives pour les touristes qui voulent visiter le pays. Est-ce qu'une touriste veut visiter un pays qui a été ravagé par des attaques terroristes constantes? Cette question est dans les pensées de toutes les touristes du monde depuis la première attaque, et si ces touristes ne viennent pas en France, le tourisme va souffrir.

4.2.1 - RÉACTION INTERNATIONALE - PAYS QUI FRÉQUENTENT LA FRANCE


L’Allemagne a vu les attentats en France en 2015 et 2016, mais le pays a subi ses propres attaques pendant le même temps (Strack, 2015). En réponse aux attentats, la Première Ministre, Angela Merkel, a mentionné la nécessité de la sécurité, mais il existe “un conflit entre la liberté et la sécurité” (Strack, 2015). Est-ce qu’un niveau de sécurité plus élevé peut contrevenir les droits des allemands? Ce n’est pas un débat pour l’Allemagne seulement, mais c’est une question à laquelle tous les gouvernements en Europe doivent répondre.


Figure 4.3

Le décembre 19 2016, Anis Amri, un citoyen tunisien, a tué un chauffeur de camion et a volé son camion, qu’il a conduit vers un marché de Noël à Berlin dans l’attaque la plus sanglante en Allemagne depuis le bombardement de Munich en 1980 (Schuster-Craig, 2017). La peur des attentats faits par des réfugiés existe beaucoup en Allemagne, et le gouvernement continue à être examiné à la loupe à cause de leur politique vers les réfugiés. En septembre 2015, Madame Merkel a ouvert les frontières aux réfugiés comme un geste humanitaire et elle a essayé de guider l’Europe dans l’effort à aider des réfugiés (Schuster-Craig, 2017).

Selon un sondage par l’Institut Forsa, 68% des allemands pensent qu’il n’est pas un lien entre la politique des frontières de Merkel et l’attentat à Berlin, mais 76% indiquent que le terrorisme et la sécurité seront très importants dans les élections en Allemagne en 2017 (Schuster-Craig, 2017). Cependant, pas tous en Allemagne sont d’accord avec Madame Merkel et ses politiques.


L’Allemagne voit la France comme peu sûr, et c’est important quand on considère que l’Allemagne est le pays qui fréquent la France le plus. Si l’Allemagne ne la voit pas comme sûr, est-ce que d’autres pays penseront le même chose? Le tourisme et les revenus associés va se beaucoup blessés si c’est le cas.
Cependant, le risque du terrorisme est plus élevé en France qu’en Allemagne, donc les Allemands se sentent plus sûrs que les Français.

L’Angleterre a vu les attentats en France et en Allemagne, et le pays a pris ses propres mesures de sécurité comme une réponse. Theresa May, la secrétaire domestique, a autorisé une nouvelle loi s'appelé le “Investigatory Powers Bill”, qui augmente la surveillance en Angleterre. Avec cette loi, les entreprises de communications doivent aider le gouvernement à pirater les portables et les ordinateurs des suspects (Lomas, 2015). La loi rend possible pour les agences de renseignement de retrouver des messages SMS et appels, donc cette loi est cruciale pour la prévention des attaques possibles, mais l'intimité des anglais peut être compromis. Il y a un loi similaire en Suisse, qui a été voté par référendum par les citoyens suisses.

Le risque d’une attaque est toujours présent, en France et en Angleterre aussi. En France, il y a le système Vigipirate, qui suit le niveau de terror. Immédiatement après l’attentat au Bataclan, le premier ministre d’Angleterre David Cameron a exprimé que le niveau de terreur en son pays va rester au “plus élevé” que les cinq niveaux, indiquant un attentat immédiat potentiel et le risque senti par les citoyens anglais et le gouvernement (Crossley, 2015). Ses mots après l’attaque ont montré la solidarité avec la France, comme il a dit “Your values are our values, your pain is our pain, your fight is our fight,” (Crossley, 2015).


Après les attentats, les vies des citoyens en Europe ont beaucoup changé. Les mesures de sécurité est élevée dans presque tous les pays, les partis politiques sont fracturés à cause des grands problèmes de sécurité, le chômage, et le développement économique, et l’ascension d’un parti politique de l'extrême droite est présent partout. Particulièrement, la vie est changé pour les musulmans en Europe après les attentats, selon des musulmans qui habitent à Londres. Ils ont dit que le média a dénaturé eux, et la représentation de la culture musulmane est pervertie comme la culture de l’état islamique (Fishwick, 2015). Sharma, une jeune anglaise qui habite à Londres, a dit que le public associe la communauté musulmane au terreur et à la violence, et que les musulmans sont vus comme des étrangers (Fishwick, 2015). Elle dit que les médias n’ont pas fait une distinction entre une groupe de terreur, qui est une très petite section des musulmans qui avaient été radicalisés, et la vaste majorité des musulmans qui pratiquent la paix dans leur religion, et cet échec par les média a dénaturé la communauté musulmane entièrement (Fishwick, 2015).

Le portrait tendancieux des musulmans par les médias en Angleterre a des conséquences pour la vie quotidienne des anglais musulmans. Selon Sarah, qui habite aussi à Londres, elle sent qu’elle n’est pas citoyen d’Angleterre à cause du portrait tendancieux des musulmans, et qu’elle a peur de se promener dans le rue seule (Fishwick, 2015). Sarah ressent beaucoup d'anxiété, et elle sort seulement où il y a beaucoup d’autres
Il est clair que les médias en Angleterre inspire la peur des musulmans comme une groupe entière, et que les vies des anglais musulmans sont très impactés par le portrait peint par les journaux.

L’Italie est aussi un pays où ses citoyens fréquentent la France le plus. Après l’attaque au Bataclan, la réponse des Italiens est une de solidarité et préoccupation croissante. Le gouvernement italien a élevé le niveau de terreur, mais les réactions des citoyens italiens à l’attaque sont mixtes. Laura, une jeune étudiante, a dit que plus de sécurité est absolument nécessaire, et l’Italie doit peut-être rejeter des migrants qui veulent entrer dans le pays (Browne, 2015). Ernesto, un homme de 60 ans, dit que les migrants ne sont pas le problème, comme les attaquants à Paris était la deuxième génération des migrants, donc la fermeture des frontières ne peut pas faire une différence dans la lutte contre le terreur (Browne, 2015).

L’attentat à Nice a plus de conséquences pour l’Italie que les autres attentats à Paris, parce que Nice est très près de l’Italie, spécifiquement 35 kilomètres. Comme un résultat, les contrôles à la frontière entre la France et l’Italie ont été augmentés, et le niveau de terreur en Italie est resté à 2, le niveau le plus élevé sans un attaque dans le pays (Owen, 2016). Le ministre de l’intérieur italien Angelino Alfano a dit que l’Italie doit maintenir la vigilance et améliorer les mesures de sécurité dans le pays entier, spécifiquement aux cibles potentiels (Owen, 2016). Tandis que l'Italie n’a pas subi un attentat comme ceux en France et en Allemagne, le menace de terreur et la possibilité d’une attaque encouragent le gouvernement italien à prendre des mesures pour combattre le terrorisme et les attaques potentielles. Tandis que l’Italie n’a pas subi un grand attentat terroriste, mais le pays est plus proche à la France et à l’Allemagne que l’Angleterre, donc les Italiens se sentent moins sûrs que les Anglais. Le pays n’a pas fait des grands mesures pour combattre le terrorisme sauf que l’augmentation des frontières, un réponse populaire des pays européens.

Aux Pays-Bays, un autre pays dans lequel ses citoyens fréquentent la France, les réactions des officiels sont mixtes, car les attentats terroristes depuis les deux dernières années ont contribué à l’ascension des parties politiques de l’extrême droite. Le chef de ce parti, Geert Wilders, a dit que les frontières doivent être fermées aux immigrants des pays musulmans, et il veut que les Pays-Bas sortent de l’Union Européen entièrement (Dutch News, 2015). Un imam, Yassin Elforkani, a exprimé que la communauté musulmane néerlandaise doit lutter contre l’interprétation du Coran par l’état islamique, et qu’il est important que les parents conseillent les enfants dans ces temps durs (Dutch News, 2015).

Il est clair que les événements et attaques qui se sont passés en France ont des conséquences sévères vers l’Europe. En Allemagne, il y a des appels pour plus de sécurité après les attentats là, pendant “l’été de la peur” de 2016, où plusieurs attentats se sont passés en dix jours. En Angleterre, le gouvernement a pris des mesures pour augmenter la surveillance, avec la loi “Investigatory Powers Bill”, et le niveau du terrorisme est le plus élevé possible. En Italie, les frontières ont été augmentés, et tandis qu’un attentat ne s’est pas passé dans le pays, le niveau de terreur reste au plus élevé que possible. Les appels pour la sécurité et la défense ont créé l’ascension des partis politiques de droite, comme Marine Le Pen et le Front National en France, Geert Wilders et son “Partie pour la Liberté” aux Pays-Bas, et le “Mouvement de 5 étoiles” en Italie.


4.3 - CONCLUSION
Il est incontestable que les attentats terroristes ont des conséquences graves en France et en Europe entièrement. La sécurité et la défense sont les plus grands soucis des pays dans l’Union Européen, comme les gouvernements de France et d’Italie ont augmenté la sécurité des frontières après les attaques, et que l’Allemagne, spécifiquement le gouvernement régional de Bavière a demandé plus de sécurité. Les soucis de sécurité et de terrorisme ont aidé l’ascension des partis politiques de droite sur tout le continent. En Angleterre, les citoyens ont voté le “Brexit”, qui va retirer le pays de l’Union Europeen; en Italie, un référendum qui
pourrait rendre le gouvernement plus efficace (Béraud, 2017). Le populisme et l'identité nationale a été mise en question dans tous ces pays, et l'attitude envers les immigrés et réfugiés s'est dégradé. Les médias français et anglais ont été accusé de faussement presenter les immigrés comme dangereux, et leur réaction est forte mais tranquille. La communauté musulmane en Europe veut se tenir à distance de l'état islamique, mais quelques politiciens groupent les musulmans avec les djihadistes, qui est une comparaison très injuste et irrespectueux.


Si Madame Le Pen gagne les élections présidentielles en 2017, il y aura beaucoup de changements en France, peut être commencé par le “Frexit” ou le sorti de France de l’Union Européen. Si elle gagne les élections ou pas, les attentats de 2015 et 2016 en France ont plusieurs effets sociaux et économiques, et le pays changera beaucoup comme résultat.

Est-ce que les politiques de Madame Le Pen peuvent affecter le tourisme en France? Les frontières fermées aux autres européens vont diminuer le nombre des touristes qui vont visiter le pays. Le sentiment anti-immigré aussi peut baisser le nombre des étrangers qui peuvent voyager en France. Si ces touristes voient comment les étrangers sont traités en France sous un gouvernement de l'extrême droite, est-ce qu'ils veulent visiter le pays? Quelles répercussions est-ce que la France, l'économie, et l'industrie du tourisme vont sentir dans les ans prochains à cause de ces politiques?

Chapter Five: Social Analysis
5.1 - DOMESTIC REACTIONS: THE PUBLIC AND THE FRENCH PRESS

The reactions of the French news outlets and the public show how the horrific terror attacks of 2015 and 2016 transformed France into a state currently at war with terrorism. The worries of the French people include
concerns about security, a critique of the government and their effort in combating terrorism, an anti-immigrant sentiment felt by a large number of the French, sparking a debate over the subject of immigration, and a sense of nationalism as a reaction to the three large attacks.

5.1.1 - A SENSE OF NATIONALISM

The terror attacks in 2015 and 2016 were the deadliest attacks in France since the Second World War, and a sense of nationalism developed amongst French citizens. The French President, François Hollande, declared that the country was at war, and the citizens of the country rallied behind the flag.

After the first attack on the offices of the Charlie Hebdo newspaper, Parisians gathered at the Place de la Republique, a historic symbol of French power and the citizens of the country; it was the location of the protests of May 1958 during the fall of the Fourth Republic, and where Charles de Gaulle presented the new constitution of the Fifth Republic in September of the same year (Welch & Perivolaris, 2016). The forms of protest appearing in the streets after the attack on Charlie Hebdo reflected the demonstrations of May 1958 and 1968, with protesters climbing the monument in the square while flying the French flag (Welch & Perivolaris, 2016).

The demonstrations in this legendary place in French history demonstrate the feelings of the people after the Charlie Hebdo, and how the country unified around the flag. It is clear the protesters moved to honor the victims of the attack, and that they rallied in a fashion only seen in the greatest protests in the proud history of the country.

In remembrance of the victims of the Charlie Hebdo and Bataclan attacks, the French have become more interested in joining the country’s armed forces. After the Bataclan attack in November 2015, which was the deadliest attack in France since World War II, internet traffic on the site S’engager.fr, which is the recruiting website of the French military, has vastly increased. The number of requests for more information on the website tripled after the Bataclan attack, as the site received 500 requests per day before the attack and 1,500 per day after (Guibert, 2015).

After the second attack, President Hollande stated his desire to expand the French army, as the number of recruitments will pass 16,000 in 2016 (Guibert, 2015). The interest shown by the young French population in joining the armed forces shows the sense of nationalism felt by the entire country after the two attacks.

5.1.2 - SECURITY CONCERNS

Concerns about security in France drastically increased after the terror attacks in the country. The French newspaper, Le Monde, published a survey with the question, “in your opinion, what is the most important for France today?”. The survey was published in February 2015, November 2015, and September 2016, to show the reaction of the public to the attacks.

According to Le Monde, security and defense are main concerns among French people, along with unemployment and immigration. In February 2015, unemployment ranked first, followed by security and defense, then immigration. In November 2015, after the large attacks on the Bataclan and the Stade de France, which was the second large attack of the year, security and defense ranked first among public concerns. In September 2016, a few months after the Nice attack, security and defense ranked second again, after unemployment, but only by a small margin.

Le Monde also classified the survey responses by political party affiliation of the participants, and the results are very intriguing. The party of the far-right, the National Front, and also the main right-wing party, Les Republicains, ranked security and defense as the most important concerns in France, in comparison with the other parties, which ranked unemployment as the top problem in France. In addition, the National Front considers immigration as a very important problem more than all other parties combined.

While the government may take actions such as increased surveillance over terrorism suspects, it is certain that the recent attacks have had consequences for specific religious groups in France.

The Jewish population in France, estimated at a half-million people, has been leaving the country in large numbers as close to 40,000 Jews have left France since 2006, with approximately 5,000 who left the country in 2016 (Le Parisien, 2017). The sense of security among this group could have an effect on the large emigration, especially after the Charlie Hebdo attack and the targeting of a Jewish grocery store. It is clear that
The fear of jihadism and potential anti-Semitic acts have a large effect on the Jewish population in France, and that this group considers themselves unsafe.

The French government must create a sense of security for the citizens of their country. After three large attacks in 18 months, France has endured a terrible crisis, and the suffering of an entire nation is clear to the entire world. As a response to the attacks, President Hollande ordered the army to deploy across the country. He stated that the country was “at war”, and authorized a military operation after the Charlie Hebdo attack in January of 2015 (Chrisafis, 2016). The operation, called Operation Sentinel, deployed 10,000 soldiers across France, with 6,500 of these soldiers stationed in Paris alone, the site of two of the attacks (Chrisafis, 2016). The goal of the operation is to protect important sites across the country, including tourist attractions like the Eiffel Tower and art and history museums, as well as other vulnerable sites such as metro stations and synagogues.

This strong response by the government and President Hollande shows the commitment of the state to protect France from terrorism and potential attacks. Regular patrols by the army through the streets also has the intention of giving a sense of stability and order to the French people, and while the presence of soldiers gives a better sense of security, the same presence has transformed the country into a state truly “at war”, as Hollande declared. One can see soldiers with automatic rifles in the streets or in metro stations; a constant reminder of potential danger in France today.

5.1.3 – CRITICISM OF THE GOVERNMENT IN THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

While the government has taken measures such as Operation Sentinel to protect the country from terror attacks, criticism over the effectiveness of these measures has increased after 3 attacks in 18 months. According to an Ipsos survey after the Nice attack in July 2016, 71% of French people are skeptical of the action taken by Hollande against terrorism, and another survey done by Elabe shows that two in three (65%) estimate that President Hollande and Prime Minister Manuel Valls do not put the proper and necessary means in place in the fight against terrorism (Ouest France, 2016). By consequence, 77% of those surveyed believe that the government is inefficient in this fight against terror (Ouest France, 2016). The Ipsos survey shows the public sentiment towards the government and their fashion in which it fights terror and potential jihadist attacks, however the survey failed to describe what actions the citizens would like the government to take.

5.1.4 – ANTI-IMMIGRANT SENTIMENT

As another result of the terror attacks in France, an anti-immigrant sentiment has developed in the country. According to another Ipsos survey, 57% of French people estimate that there are too many immigrants in the country, and only 11% find that immigration has a positive impact in France (Ouest France, 2016). About 63% of French believe that refugees are not able to integrate into French society, and 45% wish to close the borders to refugees, therefore it is clear that public sentiment towards immigrants, and in particular refugees, has deteriorated since the attacks (Ouest France, 2016).

The Ipsos survey published in Le Monde indicates that unemployment is the biggest concern among French people, except for security and defense briefly in November of 2015. Yves Bardon, Director of the Flair Program at the Ipsos Knowledge Center, thinks that the participants in the study feel threatened by immigrants who may take unskilled labor jobs away from French workers (Ouest France, 2016). As unemployment is the biggest concern among French people, there exists a “menace” of immigrants and refugees who could take jobs that “belong” to French employees.

The rightward-leaning press has written many articles concerning negative actions of refugees and immigrants. However, there are also articles that describe the true life of French immigrants who have now lived in France for a long time, and who want peace.

While the public sentiment towards immigrants and refugees has deteriorated, it is perhaps the legal immigrants who feel the least at-ease in France today. Le Maine Libre, a French newspaper, conducted an interview with a French Muslim, named Omar. In reference to the attacks, he stated that he feels the pain twice-over, as a French citizen and also as a Muslim, that a true Muslim would never wish pain on another person, and that he was very upset by the attacks (Le Maine Libre, 2016).

Omar believes that he reflects a good example of an immigrant who has succeeded after he came to
France. He stated that he had worked all his life, that his children have all found work, and that he feels first as a French citizen, before being a Muslim (Le Maine Libre, 2016). It appears that the mark of infamy felt by refugees in the country also is shared by French who came to the country legally, and do not want violence in France, their beloved country.

5.2.1 – INTERNATIONAL REACTION

It is clear that the attacks must have international consequences, specifically in the countries whose citizens visit France the most. These countries are Germany, England, Belgium, Italy, and the Netherlands (OECD). The Paris and Nice attacks affected the countries around France, many of whom have their own problems with other attacks and the refugee crisis, specifically in Germany.

Germany watched the attacks in France in 2015 and 2016, but the country suffered their own attacks during the same time (Strack, 2015). In response to the attacks, Prime Minister Angela Merkel emphasized the necessity for security, but there exists a conflict between freedom and security (Strack, 2015). Is there a higher level of security that would not infringe on the rights of Germans? This is not a question for Germany alone, but one that all governments of Europe must respond to.

Germany suffered similar attacks to those that happened in France, but on a smaller scale. In 10 days, there was a hatchet attack on a train in Wurzburg, a suicide bombing in Ansbach, a shooting in Munich in which 9 people were killed, and also a machete attack on a Polish woman (Connolly & Willsher, 2016). While these attacks were much smaller than those that happened in France, the rapid succession of events and their horror was called the “summer of fear” by journalists (Connolly & Willsher, 2016). Connolly and Willsher interviewed citizens of Germany and England, and they paint a picture of uncertainty and panic due to the quick succession of attacks.

In September 2015, Angela Merkel opened the borders to refugees seeking asylum as a humanitarian gesture as she tried to lead Europe in the effort to help the refugees. According to a survey conducted by the Forsa Institute, 68% of Germans believe that there is no correlation between Merkel’s open border policy and the attacks, but 76% of those surveyed indicated that terrorism and security would be very important in the 2017 German political elections (Schuster-Craig, 2017).

England looked on at the deadly attacks in France and Germany, and the country has taken its own measures to strengthen security as a response. Theresa May, the Home Secretary, authorized a new law, the “Investigatory Powers Bill”, which increased surveillance in England. With this law, communications companies are required to help the government hack into phones and computers of terror suspects (Lomas, 2015). The bill makes it possible for surveillance agencies to access text messages and calls, showing the importance of this law in the fight to stop attacks before they happen. The privacy of English citizens, however, is at stake.

According to terrorism experts, France has fallen victim to terror attacks for several reasons. First, a number of young Muslims have been radicalized as a result of racial tensions in urban neighborhoods called banlieues where many immigrants live in poverty, and youth unemployment is high (Allen, 2016). Bombing runs made by the French government against the Islamic State in Syria also added to motivations for domestic terror in France (Allen, 2016). French history of colonialism is also important when one considers the question of terrorism in France. According to John R. Bowen, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Washington at St. Louis, the French never fully left their colonies, and the country continues to intervene in the affairs of the Middle East (Allen, 2016). As a result, according to Bowen, when young French Muslims listen to jihadist broadcasts, they hear other French-speaking Muslims who portray their hate of the French government and the crimes of that government against their “brothers and sisters” in Syria and Iraq (Allen, 2016). When one considers the situation of immigrants in the banlieues, the bombing runs ordered by the French government, and the history of colonialism of France, the possibility of domestic terrorism in France is very high.

After the attacks, life changed for Muslims living in London, as the Muslim population living there felt that the media had shamed them, and that the representation of Muslim culture had been perverted into the culture of the Islamic State (Fishwick, 2015). Sharma, a young English woman from London, said that the
public associates the Muslim community with terror and violence, and that Muslims are viewed as foreigners, no matter where they are originally from (Fishwick, 2015).

Italy is another country where the effects of the attacks are being felt, specifically the Nice attack of July 2016. Nice is very close to Italy, approximately 35 kilometers, thus border controls between the two countries were increased, and the threat level in Italy remained at 2, the highest possible level in the absence of an attack on home soil (Owens, 2016). Italian Minister of the Interior Angelino Alfano said that Italy must maintain vigilance and strengthen security measures across the entire country, specifically at potential targets (Owens, 2016). While Italy has not suffered an attack like France or Germany, the menace of terror and the possibility of an attack made the Italian government take precautionary measures to defend against terror.

5.3 – CONCLUSION

It is irrefutable that the terror attacks had grave consequences in France and in all of Europe. Security and defense are among the most important worries of the countries in the European Union, as the French and Italian governments bolstered border security after the attacks, and in Germany, the regional government of Bavaria demanded that additional security measures be taken. Worries over security and terrorism have helped the ascension of far-right political parties throughout the continent. In England, citizens voted for “Brexit,” which will take Britain out of the European Union; in Italy, a referendum that would have streamlined the government to make it more efficient failed (Béraud, 2017). Populism and the question of national identity were challenged in many countries, and the attitude towards immigrants and refugees has worsened through it all.

The French and English media outlets have been accused of falsely presenting immigrants as dangerous, and the immigrants’ reaction has been strong, yet peaceful. The Muslim community in Europe wants to distance themselves from the Islamic State, despite some politicians’ efforts to group ordinary Muslims with jihadists, which is a very unjust and disrespectful comparison.

In France, the attacks of 2015 and 2016 had very significant social effects, and also will play a large part in the presidential elections of 2017. The candidate of the far-right, Marine Le Pen of the National Front, has rallied much support due to her hard-line policies on immigration and the security of the country. Le Pen is considered as radical by the established political order, and current French President Hollande stated tha a Le Pen victory would be “a menace”, however he is confident that France will not cede to the National Front during the elections (La Provence, 2017). The President made a reference to the American Donald Trump in his words, as he exclaimed the objective of all populists (in Europe) is to leave the EU, close themselves to the world, and to put up barriers of all kinds around the country (La Provence, 2017).

If Marine Le Pen wins the presidential elections in 2017, there will be a lot of change in France, perhaps started by a “Frexit”, or France’s leaving of the European Union and the return of a unique nationa currency. If she wins the elections of not, it is clear that the terror attacks in France in 2015 and 2016 had several social and economic effects, and the country has already changed as a result.

Based on the empirical results obtained in this study, I would propose tighter border controls by the French government, increased surveillance measures, and the continuation of Operation Sentinel. While tighter border controls are difficult to enforce due to the European Union’s “open border” policy, the security of the nation and its citizens are at risk. Increased surveillance measures could help to stop attacks before they happen, and the presence of soldiers in the streets due to Operation Sentinel helps to ease the fears of the public and tourists by making them feel more secure.
Chapter Six: Conclusion

This research aimed to identify key determinants of tourism in France, and from those results, determine whether any of these variables were affected by the terror attacks in France during 2015 and 2016 in order to assess the economic effect of terrorism via the tourism industry. The regression results suggest that special events and exchange rates do play a role in determining tourism and travel’s contribution to Gross Domestic Product in France, however terrorism does not seem to explicitly influence tourism revenue.

Special events such as the Euro 2016 soccer tournament are important to account for when considering determinants of tourism, as the event draws millions of tourists from many countries in Europe, thus boosting arrivals in the country as well as revenue from inbound tourists. Exchange rates were also found to be significant, as a cheaper Euro will make travel to France and other Euro Area countries more attractive for potential tourists. While the Vigipirate threat levels in the first regression model were statistically significant, they were based off of a full-year scoring system, whereas the threat level often changes multiple times in a year, contradicting the ranking system.

This research also analyzed the social effects of the terror attacks by identifying domestic reactions of the French public and their media outlets. It is certain that concerns about security and the current government’s effectiveness in the fight against terrorism are among the top worries of French people. It is also interesting to see how the French as a whole have rallied around the victims of the attacks with a growing sense of nationalism, however this national pride comes at the expense of immigrants and refugees, many of whom are viewed unfavorably within French borders.

In addition to discussing the domestic social reaction to the attacks, the countries around France were also affected by the recent attacks. Countries such as Germany, Italy, and England have taken steps to combat the threat of terrorism at home, some of which came as direct responses to the three attacks which occurred in France. Germany and Belgium have had their share of terror attacks, however England, Italy, and the Netherlands remain unscathed from major jihadist attacks, and thus view the risk of terror as a greater threat than in the other countries of study.

Overall, the social reactions in France and other European countries indicate a strong will for security and defense, and tighter borders, leading to the rise of far-right political parties such as the National Front in France, the Party for Freedom in the Netherlands, and the Five Star Movement in Italy. With presidential elections on the schedule for 2017 in France, the recent memory of the large terror attacks in Paris and Nice are sure to play a large role in who voters will choose during the two rounds of elections.

The movement towards populism in Europe will be interesting to follow, and will provide opportunities for further study of tourism determinants and economic activity, especially if populist leaders decide to withdraw their countries from the European Union, following the actions of Great Britain and “Brexit”.
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