

Two-dimensional politics in France

By

Anna Kononenko

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of Political Science

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Anton Pelinka

Budapest, Hungary

(2012)

Abstract

This thesis serves two goals. First goal is to find differences and similarities between xenophobic and racist rhetoric that was applied by Jean-Marie Le Pen and Sarkozy before 2007 presidential elections and before 2012 presidential elections that was applied by Marine Le Pen. Second goal is to figure out whether successful application of the anti-immigrant discourse had any implications for the French political space. Critical discourse analysis, developed by Fairclough is chosen as the most suitable methodology for the research. In particular, his three-dimensional model for analysis is used for analysing politicians' rhetoric. I found that Sarkozy borrowed and applied Jean-Marie's and Marine's Le Pen xenophobic discourse before 2007 and 2012 presidential elections. Sarkozy's extreme rhetoric has the same meaning as Le Pen's, which resulted in his shift to the extreme-right pole on ideological spectrum. This resulted in implications for the French political space that after Sarkozy's extreme rhetoric moved from three-dimensional to two-dimensional: meaning that now it has only strong left and extreme-right wing.

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to express gratitude to my supervisor professor Anton Pelinka who guided me through whole way of writing this research paper. Second, I want to say many thanks to Eszter Timar who was my academic writing teacher that helped me to make my thesis well structured. Finally, I would like to say thank you to my dearest people: Mum and David McKeever.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Methodology	6
1.1. CDA	6
1.2. Data for the Research and its Validity	7
1.3.Fairclough’s Three-dimensional Framework	8
Chapter 2: French Political Space and its Transformations.....	11
2.1. Party Politics	11
2.1.1. Left-wing Socialist Party	12
2.1.2. Right-wing Union for a Popular Movement.....	12
2.1.3 Extreme-right National Front	13
2.2. Sarkozy’s Party: Centre-right or Extreme?	16
Chapter 3: Comparison of Sarkozy’s and Le Pen’s Immigration Rhetoric before 2007 Presidential Elections.....	20
3.1. Sarkozy and the Immigration Issue	21
3.1.1. Sarkozy’s Immigration Law	22
3.1.2. Programme for Presidency 2007	23
3.1.3. Speech.....	26
3.2. Le Pen’s Immigration Discourse.....	31
3.2.1. Electoral Programme 2007	32
3.2.2. Speech.....	34
3.2.3. Pictures	35
Chapter 4: Comparison of Marine Le Pen’s and Sarkozy’s Anti-Immigration Rhetoric before 2012 Presidential Elections.....	39
4.1. Marine Le Pen’s Discourse: More Moderate than her Father’s?	39

4.1.1. Programme for Presidency 2012	40
4.1.2. Pictures	43
4.1.3. Speech.....	44
4.2. Sarkozy's Discourse before Elections 2012: Still Xenophobic?.....	47
4.2.1. Electoral Programme 2012	48
4.2.2 Picture	49
4.2.3. Speech/Comments	50
Conclusion	53
Appendices.....	57
Appendix 1	57
Appendix 2	58
Appendix 3	64
Reference list	65
Secondary sources	65
Primary sources	67

Introduction

According to the results of the first round of presidential elections that took place in France on 22 April 2012, the National Front's leader Marine Le Pen came third and gained almost 18% of votes, while former president Sarkozy attracted 27% of votes (Ministère de l'Intérieur, de l'Outre-mer, des Collectivités territoriales et de l'Immigration¹, 2012). It has been known that mostly the 'battle' in politics is between left-wing and right-wing candidates and parties. However, recently the French political space started to lose this clear distinction of left and right wings of ideological spectrum. In France, some political actors (Sarkozy) started to move toward right more and more, which resulted in implications for the French political space.

The electoral success of the extreme-right candidate Jean-Marie Le Pen in the first round of presidential elections 2002 has shown that the demand for xenophobic ideas exists. As in France, the extreme-right party National Front is gaining more and more popularity, emphasizing the immigration issue, other parties and politicians nevertheless try to include this issue to their programmes and electoral rhetoric. Some parties just briefly mention this aspect, some parties and politicians explicitly explain their position concerning immigration. The former French president Sarkozy and his party Union for a Popular Movement are the ones who take an important part in this process; applying anti-immigrant discourse. Although Sarkozy is considered as center-right among the population, some issues that he advertises put him on the extreme pole of the ideological spectrum. The research presented in this thesis is an attempt to figure out how Le Pen's and National Front's extreme-right rhetoric was applied by a seemingly non-extreme politician and what implications it had for the French political space.

¹ Ministry of the Interior.

Immigration has always been a crucial issue for France as a former colonial state. It was brought to the national agenda with the existence of the extreme right National Front. This party from the very beginning of its creation was the party that had a xenophobic and anti-immigrant rhetoric. Usually left-wing and centrist parties fail to include immigration question to their electoral programmes, just mentioning that illegal immigration is not good, not providing proper suggestions about how to reduce illegal immigration and to toughen the legal one. Though, “the notion of the FN in agenda-setting is vital; [...] the party has been effective in forcing other political formations to react to, and position themselves on, these particular issues – most notably of course, immigration (Davies, 1999, 1).

For these reasons I want to research how the anti-immigration rhetoric was borrowed and applied by Sarkozy: the leader of the most popular party, Union for a Popular Movement. This research aims to figure out the differences and similarities between the rhetoric Jean-Marie Le Pen and Sarkozy before 2007 presidential elections and between the rhetoric of Marine Le Pen and Sarkozy before 2012 presidential elections.

A lot of research has been done on the problematic of the National Front, its ideology, change and evolution of this party and the electoral success of this movement. Mostly, scholars were trying to understand how this party organized its discourse and propaganda in order to attract voters (Mayer and Perrineau, 1989; Davies, 1999; Simmons, 1996). However, not so much research in particular has been done on the problematic how the extreme-right rhetoric of the

National Front was applied by former French President: Sarkozy. Previous work mostly concentrated on the topic of the National Front and Le Pen, how this party emerged, and the history of its electoral record, its supporters and ideological position. Also, authors that have written about extreme-right showed how the National Front managed to become the third party in France and the strongest extreme-right party in Western Europe (Shields, 2007; Rydgren, 2004). Other authors concentrated more on how extreme-right movement developed through the 20th century and how the threat of extreme-right has been growing at the end of century (Merkel and Weinberg, 2003). In a broader context the issue of immigration, extreme right and their relation to Islam has been discussed in work of Zuquete (2008).

As it can be seen extreme-right candidate Le Pen and his National Front have always been popular research topic among political scientists. However, to what extent the ideas of the National Front was applied by seemingly non-extreme politician was not researched properly. My contribution to this field will address the question how xenophobic rhetoric was used by the leader of the most popular centre-right party in France. In addition this research will also bring a new insight into the current event – 2012 presidential elections and the way electoral campaign proceeded after the first round of elections, explaining what rhetoric was applied by Sarkozy before the second round of elections.

My research has two questions: first, what are the differences and similarities of applying the anti-immigrant rhetoric by Jean-Marie Le Pen and Sarkozy before 2007 presidential elections? Moreover, this research aims to investigate the differences and similarities between Le Pen's

discourse and Sarkozy's after the change of the National Front's party leader to Marine Le Pen before the presidential elections that recently took place in France in May 2012. The second question is whether the successful application of such discourse had any implications for the French political space.

In this research I investigate whether the key symbols of Le Pen's immigration and xenophobic rhetoric had the same meaning as Sarkozy's. If yes, I will argue that Sarkozy applied this rhetoric in order to weaken Le Pen and to attract more Le Pen's electorate, which had consequences for the French political space that turned to have only left pole and extreme-right pole.

For illustration of differences and similarities of extreme-right Le Pen's and Sarkozy's rhetoric I will take into consideration data from the period of 2002 to 2012. This time frame for analysing data was not chosen accidentally. First, after Le Pen's success in 2002 presidential elections, Sarkozy, being the minister of internal affairs from 2002 to 2007 and later on the leader of centre-right party started to use the anti-immigrant rhetoric. Sarkozy started to adopt measures that made this discourse more and more severe and not only populist in a negative sense, but the one that was implemented in real laws. For these reasons I want to explore how after Le Pen's electoral success as a candidate in 2002 presidential elections and after electoral failure of the National Front in 2004 legislative elections the anti-immigrant and xenophobic discourse started to be applied by seemingly non-extreme, centre-right leader: Sarkozy.

The thesis will now proceed in the following manner. The first part of this research provides the reader with information about methodological aspect of this work, explaining what methodology will be used and what kind of discourse analysis in particular will be applied for conducting the research and how. In the second part of this study I will provide the information about the main parties in France with mentioning to which part of ideological spectrum a party belongs. I will argue that with the rise of the National Front and with the emergence of the Union for a Popular Movement and Sarkozy as a candidate for presidency, the French party system was transformed from three-pole (left-right division) to two-pole (left-wing plus extreme-right pole). I will discuss that when Sarkozy was a minister of internal affairs, he started to change this three-dimensional space. The third part will be dedicated to comparison of the rhetoric of Le Pen as the leader of National Front and Sarkozy as the leader of the Union for a Popular Movement before 2007 presidential elections. The fourth part of this thesis will investigate the differences and similarities of the rhetoric of Sarkozy and Marine Le Pen before 2012 presidential elections. Special attention will be given to the discourse of Sarkozy after the first round of elections. The conclusion will show that Le Pen's xenophobic discourse was successfully applied by Sarkozy before 2007 presidential elections and played a significant role in his electoral campaign before 2012 presidential elections and in the debate after the first round of elections. Despite the fact that Sarkozy and his party are considered center-right, his rhetoric applied had basically the same as Le Pen's and is both xenophobic and extreme. Consequently, I will show that the three dimensional space in France: left-wing, right-wing and extreme-right started to turn to two-dimensional – left-wing and extreme-right.

Chapter 1: Methodology

This chapter aims to explain the methodology used in conducting this research. I use critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a theoretical framework and as a method. This part of this thesis serves two goals: first, I argue why in particular I have chosen CDA. Second, I provide the data for the research. Finally, I elaborate in what way CDA is used in this study, in particular how Fairclough's model works for analysing the discourses of the two politicians.

1.1. CDA

According to one source, there are at least 57 various types of discourse analysis. "Strictly speaking there is no single 'discourse analysis', but many different styles of analysis that all lay claim to the name" (Gill, 2000, 172-173). The CDA, developed by Fairclough (1992, 1995, 2000) and Fairclough and Wodak (1997) has been chosen as the most suitable methodology for this research because it gives a possibility to analyse the discourse of the politicians in the broadest way. "Much critical discourse analysis research in the domain of politics centres on right wing populist rhetoric [...] as this rhetoric is becoming more and more hegemonic in many European countries" (Wodak, Meyer, 2001, 18).

Moreover, I also take into consideration the use of these arguments and complement the CDA analysis with them. The "debates about immigration and nationality in France are characterised

by a frequent use of topoi, stereotypical arguments that may also be found in other genres of discourse about immigration” (Der Valk, 2009, 225). First, I demonstrate how different stereotypical arguments (topoi) reveal the real xenophobic character of politicians’ rhetoric: “the use of macro and micro argumentative features can be operationalised and integrated in the analysis of specific texts” (Wodak and Meyer, 2001, 21). Second, I include migration data that serves as a basis for the development of anti-immigrant and racist rhetoric of these politicians.

1.2. Data for the Research and its Validity

In order to conduct this research as primary sources I use:

- Written data (programmes of politicians for 2007 and 2012 presidential elections, direct comments in French newspaper Liberation before and during presidential elections 2012. Moreover, for analysing Sarkozy’s rhetoric I take his 2006 Immigration and Integration Law (May 17, 2006) that he adopted while being a minister of internal affairs. In addition I use migration data that help to show why politicians argued about immigration as an important issue for France.
- Oral (on-line videos: speeches of politicians on TV. In particular, Jean-Marie Le Pen’s speech on the debate with Sarkozy and Marine Le Pen’s discourse on television before 2012 presidential elections. For the analysis of Sarkozy’s rhetoric before 2007 presidential elections, I use his speech, delivered while being a minister of internal affairs. Sarkozy’s discourse for 2012 presidential elections is analysed with the reference to his debate with Hollande after the first round of elections).

- Visual (images and posters of electoral propaganda of Le Pen and his party during 2007 and 2012 campaign for presidency. Sarkozy's propaganda images concerning immigration are not used because of their absence before 2007 elections, though one picture is analysed from 2012 elections).

Due to the word-limit, unfortunately, I cannot use all possible data for the analysis of politicians' rhetoric. I have chosen programmes of politicians and the images of their electoral propaganda as valid sources for analysing the rhetoric. Speaking about speeches, I have taken those that were the subject of the immigration issue in France. In addition, I want to warn reader that ideological orientation of *Libération* (left-wing newspaper) does not have any impact on my analysis, because I take from it only original quotes of Sarkozy.

1.3.Fairclough's Three-dimensional Framework

First of all, Fairclough sees 'discourse' as "a form of social practice, rather than a purely individual activity or a reflex of situational variables". This means that discourse should not be analysed only as a linguistic instance, but also is analysed within broader social practice (Fairclough, 1992, 63). Second, here I try to explain which components/levels his works includes and how the discourse of politicians is analysed on every level. For the minimal unit of analysis I take the commonly used rhetoric of party leaders – political language that they use. I investigate the key symbols of the rhetoric of Le Pen and Sarkozy and find out whether the rhetoric of Sarkozy had the same meaning as the rhetoric of Le Pen and National Front. If so, I would argue that the extreme-right rhetoric was successfully applied by seemingly non-extreme candidate. The results of the analysis of Le Pen's and Sarkozy's rhetoric will show that the former French

president could not be any more considered as a moderate candidate and that such discourse had consequences for French political space.

Textual level is the first dimension of the framework. First, it is necessary to mention that by texts Fairclough understands “written or spoken language produced in a discursive event” (Fairclough, 2000, 148). Textual analysis is important because “text constitute a major source of evidence for grounding claims about social structures, relations and processes” (Fairclough, 1995, 209). The analysis of texts will be organised according to the following structure: interactional control, ethos, use of metaphors, grammar (including modality). Interactional control defines how politicians define the topic and whether their institutional positions contribute to their role in defining the agenda. Ethos demonstrates how the discourse of politicians creates identities; metaphors will reveal politicians’ desire to structure beliefs of people concerning immigration. The use of metaphors will show how politicians try to create negative image of immigrants. Finally, grammar analysis will show whether politicians’ modality (the attitude of a speaker to the statement) is objective or subjective. Modality that demonstrates how political actors see their prospective: either as universal or as those that can be pursued in a different way (Fairclough, 1992, 152, 158, 166, 194). In the case of politicians’ rhetoric, it means that the immigration issue is framed in a way that makes it a problem for France and needs to be resolved.

Discursive level is the second dimension of the framework. It deals with the production and consumption of texts. In addition, Fairclough distinguishes “other headings involved in formal features of the text: the ‘force of utterances’, the ‘coherence’ of text and the ‘intertextuality’ of

texts”. However these forms are used on the level of discursive practice (Fairclough, 1992, 75). The force of utterances will demonstrate what kind of speech acts politicians use, the coherence will show how texts are linked together to form larger texts and the intertextuality will reveal the “snatches of other texts [...] and how they constitute additions to existing ‘chains of speech communication’ (Bakhtin, 1986, 94). For instance, how electoral programmes of politicians are transformed into images, posters and speeches. This means that an intertextual chain of the same discourses can be found in politicians’ rhetoric. Also, institutional positions of actors can shape the discourse and vice versa. For example, I will show how the Sarkozy’s discourse was shaped by his institutional position and also how Sarkozy discourse affected shaping new institutions. Finally, I will investigate whether discourses of politicians have intertextuality that “sees texts historically as transforming the past [...] into present” (Fairclough, 1992, 85).

Social practice is the third dimension of Fairclough’s framework.

The general objective is to specify the nature of social practice of which the discourse practice is a part, which is the basis for explaining why the discourse practice is as it is and the effects of the discourse practice upon the social practice (Fairclough, 1992, 237).

He proposes approximate checklist that will serve as a basis for analysing social practice. It is social matrix of discourse, orders of discourse and ideological and political effects of discourse.

In my interpretation, first of all, social matrix of discourse will show how particular discourse of politician structures the relations in society and how discourse can change relations or keep the status-quo. Second, the orders of discourse demonstrate which discourse is dominant and which discourses are complementary to the main, how discourses are distributed within rhetoric. Finally, ideological and political affects of discourse deal with how discourses affect peoples’ knowledge on certain issues and transform their beliefs (Fairclough, 1992, 237-238).

Chapter 2: French Political Space and its Transformations

In this part of the thesis I will argue that the French political space before the emergence of Sarkozy as the leader of the most popular party in France and a candidate for presidency has been three-dimensional, consisting of left-wing, right-wing and extreme-right wing parties and candidates. First, I will introduce the most popular political parties that exist in France. Secondly, I will argue that the National Front before the 2002 was the only one strong extreme-right party, but after the appearance of Sarkozy on the political scene as a leader of centre-right Union for a Popular Movement, the shift to the extreme-right pole of ideological spectrum of this politician will be analysed. It will be shown based on the analysis provided in two following chapters.

2.1. Party Politics

The French political space has always had division on the left-wing and right wing parties. Moreover, the extreme-right also had a niche in French politics. Such party as National Front always pretended to play a significant role in French politics. In this part of the thesis I will show that clear division on left-right wing was present before the emergence of Sarkozy's anti-immigration and xenophobic rhetoric and that this discourse has shaped and changed this clear division, making the French political spectrum more distinctive as left-wing and extreme-right. 'The party system of Fifth Republic France has been characterised by a fine balance between the dynamics of fragmentation and bipolarity (Knapp and Wright, 2001, 264-265).

2.1.1. Left-wing Socialist Party

This party was created in 1969 by an older left-wing party dating back to the Third Republic: the SFIO (Section Francaise de L'Internationale Ouvriere²) (Howarth and Varouxakis, 2003, 73). In the 1970s, Francois Mitterand helped make a party into attractive, alternative to a conservative coalition (Krieger and Kesselman, 2010, 138). This party “is deeply divided by personal and ideological conflicts. When Segolene Royal ran for presidency in 2007 she failed to unite the party warring factions (Krieger and Kesselman, 2010, 138). Returning back to history and to the results of the legislative elections, this party for a long time was the one that could form the government without any allies, but recently started to experience electoral fall. In this thesis the rhetoric of this party and its leader is not compared to the rhetoric of Le Pen because for this party, being the left-wing is difficult to include extensive extreme-right rhetoric and xenophobic discourse of immigration. Though, the information, presented above suggests that Socialist Party was and is the most significant electoral force on the left-wing and underlines the division on left-right wing that has always existed in France. Also, the “The PS, even in darkest electoral hour, still received more support than any other left political grouping [...] [i]n this situation, the PS cannot succeed alone, but remains the most important single left grouping. The need of electoral allies is clear” (Clift, 2003, 46).

2.1.2. Right-wing Union for a Popular Movement

Despite the fact that:

The Socialist party was the largest political party in France from the 1978 to the 1993 legislative elections, in terms of membership, votes and seats in the national Assembly, [...] in terms of percentage of votes, over the past 20 years there have been two large parties of the right and one confederation of smaller center-right parties. The Rally for the Republic, created by Chirac and

² French Section of the Workers' International

the Union for a New Republic. The confederation of small parties was presented by Union for the French Democracy (Howarth and Varouxakis, 2003, 70-72).

“In November 2002, the UMP was officially transformed into an umbrella party of the mainstream right, the UMP (Union for a Popular Movement) regrouping most of the right and centre-right parties (Howarth and Varouxakis, 2003, 71). Union for a Popular Movement was created on the initiative of Jacques Chirac after his re-election in 2002 to unite the moderate, center-right in a single party:

the June election had won the UMP an undeniable legitimacy as France’s majority party; it was only the third party in the history of the Fifth Republic to commanded an overall National Assembly majority [...] the UMP electorate has skewed to conservative (Knapp, 2003, 134).

So, Sarkozy’s party from the very beginning was the one that attracted the conservative, center-right electorate. Its emergence was facilitated by the presidential elections 2002 that united several center-right and right-wing parties. According to the legislative elections 2007, Union for a Popular Movement has won the overall majority and continued to be the first party in France according to voters’ preferences (Ministère de l’Intérieur, de l’Outre-mer, des Collectivités territoriales et de l’Immigration, 2007³). Consequently, Sarkozy remained in power and was able to control the majority in the French parliament.

2.1.3 Extreme-right National Front

In addition, a key role in French political space played by an extreme-right party called the National Front. Despite gaining a considerable vote up to year 1997, the National Front cannot

³ Ministry of the Interior.

fully take part in the French political life in the national level because of their extremely right-wing ideology that uses xenophobic and racist rhetoric and because of absence of parties that can join the National Front.

Over a long period, the FN has articulated a powerful strand within French public opinion and indirectly influenced political agenda. Without allies, however, it has failed to translate its electoral potential into full political capital and has lacked second-round credibility, both in 2002 presidential contest ([...]) and in parliamentary elections where the FN usually fails to hold on to its first-round vote in those rare constituencies where it can fight the second (Cole, 2003, 25).

There is variety of political parties in France but on the elections they usually go as a block of parties in order to be stronger and gain more votes. It is more effective and rational. However, in regional elections this party has stable and rather strong positions. It can be explained that there are certain regions in France where the immigrant flow is extremely high. These are south and eastern regions with population more than 30 000 (Marignane, Toulon, Orange and Vitrolles) [...] in particular in the regions of Provence-Alpes-Cotes d'Azur (the south east region including Marseille, Nice, Toulon (Howarth and Varouxakis, 2003, 72, 76). There the Front National is quite popular because of the high density of immigrants from former colonies of France, that according to the view of this party create problems in France: "The NF is severely critical of the social costs of North African and black African immigrants, arguing that they are major contributors to unemployment, delinquency, and crime and that they impose an economic burden on French economy" (Simmons, 1996, 160). Le Pen and the National Front "always linked the anti-immigration issue to the issue of insecurity and criminality" (Rydgren, 2004, 180).

From 1988 to 1997 the French party system remained stable in terms that there were some trends in social and ideological profiles, these are subtle and do not indicate any major reconfiguration

of the French electorate views (Andersen and Evans, 2003, 185). It can be said that preferences of French people continued to be the same and that they gave their votes for these two blocks. The National Front almost always scored third in this process. Moreover, from 2002 the situation has changed. On these legislative elections the extreme-right party the National Front has experienced a considerable loss of voters and did not take the hurdle of 12,5% in order to be selected for the second tour. The perspectives for this party and its role in the French political process were under the question: “It is a little doubts that there will continue to be a political space for the FN within the French party system” (Ivaldi, 2003, 149).

Nevertheless, some scientists have doubts concerning the role of National Front in France, it should be noticed that the issue of immigration has helped the National Front to gain popularity in France. From my point of view, one of the key roles in the French political space still is played by this extreme-right party. To this regard “[t]he bipolar contours of the French party system have been challenged by the emergence of new political issues such as immigration, security and environment, and difficulties, experienced by the mainstream political parties..” (Cole, 2003, 14).

The National Front had become too distinct from the moderate right [...] However, as regard certain issues that were rising to the fore, such as immigration, crime fighting and European integration, the extreme-right electorate could no longer be considered as simply the right wing of the right. From an ideological standpoint, this electorate seemed to differ from the left-wing and moderate right electorates (Grunberg and Schweisguth, 2003, 331).

To this regard it is worth looking how the xenophobic, racist and anti-immigrant rhetoric was applied by seemingly non-extreme leader of the center-right party. I hypothesize that Sarkozy’s

extreme discourse transformed French political space from three-dimensional to two-dimensional.

2.2. Sarkozy's Party: Centre-right or Extreme?

It is difficult to argue with the existing views among scholars on the French party system. Usually it is stated that it has always had the division between left and right-wing parties. "As in most West European democracies, the mainstay of political competition is between left of centre and right of centre parties and their respective political allies" (Cole, 2003, 25). "As in the most European countries, polarization on the rough left-right ideological spectrum has shaped the French party system in the Fifth Republic (Howarth and Varouxakis, 2003, 77). France has a multiparty system in which a right-left wing division exists. "We conclude that rather artificial bipolar multipartism exists. The left and right coalitions functioning most effectively when one party assumes a dominant role..." (Cole, 2003, 25). Among a variety of parties that exist and take part in electoral process the two most important blocks of parties were the ones that represent both moderate right and moderate left-wing. These were the Socialist Party and the Union for a Popular Movement.

There is no clear division on moderate left-wing and moderate right-wing any more in French politics. With the emergence and intensification of Sarkozy's xenophobic rhetoric, the notion of the moderate right-wing has become less visible in the French political space. Moreover, the Union for a Popular Movement is a part of European People's Party, so the use of xenophobic discourse does not correspond to its position on the European space. On the other hand, the

extreme-right National Front applies its xenophobic discourse. This party is not a part of any European party and clearly it has always advertised anti-integrationist path. So, the use of extreme anti-immigrant discourse by Sarkozy clearly states his moving toward extreme-right, while Le Pen is the one that has already applied this rhetoric. Moreover, not having any representation of the National Front on European level liberates Le Pen from any obligations concerning his discourse.

However, with Sarkozy's appearance on the political scene, the rhetoric of this politician, even though at the very beginning he was supposed to represent the center-right or moderate right-wing party, later became xenophobic and racist. Especially, after the 2005, Sarkozy, who later became the leader of the centre-right Union for a Popular Movement, started to borrow the rhetoric of the National Front and apply it, had certain institutional possibilities to do so and simultaneously started to change the landscape of the French political space.

The analysis underlines the change of Sarkozy's discourse to the extreme and shows that French political space also has undergone transformations. However, it should be noticed that Le Pen and Sarkozy had the similar anti-immigrant discourse with the some differences. Though, it is highly unlikely that they will unite under the one extreme-right umbrella. Neither of the two politicians will accept such union. Nevertheless, this does not liberate French political space from turning to the one that has only strong left and extreme-right wing.

Even though all these difficulties occur on the way to taking part in policy-making process on the national level, the National Front is still is the third party in France according to voter's preferences. The impossibility to have representatives in the French parliament is explained by absence of allies and weak position in the second tour legislative elections. Despite the exclusion of this party from the policy-making process, the rhetoric of this party always had its supporters. On the topic of elections, it should be pointed out that any party that wants to be present in the Asssemblée Nationale (French parliament) needs to take the hurdle of 12,5% in the first tour in order to come to the second tour and compete and later to be elected and to represent their voters (Bell, 2002, 208). National Front never undertook this hurdle in the legislative elections. Though, its discourse is becoming more and more popular: the result of 2012 presidential elections shows this. Le Pen scored the third and gained almost 18% of votes (Ministère de l'Intérieur, de l'Outre-mer, des Collectivités territoriales et de l'Immigration⁴, 2012). Moreover, opinion polls for upcoming legislative elections, which will be held in June 2012, demonstrate that National Front is likely to overtake the electoral hurdle of 12.5%. Prognoses show that National Front can take 16% of French votes (l'Institut BVA, 2012). Moreover, after losing the president elections, the Union for a Popular Movement possibly can form local alliances with the National Front in order to prevent a leftist majority in the parliament. The *cordon sanitaire* can lose its meaning and the National Front can probably make deals with the Union for a Popular Movement.

The next part of this thesis preoccupies with the analysis of the differences and similarities of the rhetoric of Le Pen and Sarkozy, which will support my hypothesis that Sarkozy is shifting more

⁴ Ministry of the Interior.

to the right and the discourse that he applied had the same meaning as the discourse of the National Front and Le Pen.

Chapter 3: Comparison of Sarkozy's and Le Pen's Immigration Rhetoric before 2007 Presidential Elections

This chapter of the thesis is dedicated to the immigration discourse of Le Pen and Sarkozy preceding 2007 presidential elections. In this part of the study, I analyse the similarities and the differences of the immigration discourse of the two politicians. I will find the key symbols of Le Pen's and Sarkozy's rhetoric. I will state that extreme-right discourse was successfully applied by Sarkozy and had the same meaning as Le Pen's, which moved Sarkozy and his party (as he is the leader of the party that defines the party line and politics) on the extreme-right pole on the ideological spectrum. Consequently, this resulted in the change of French political space from three-pole to two-pole: the extreme-right, which was represented by Sarkozy's party – Union for a Popular Movement and Le Pen's National Front, while the left pole was mainly represented by Socialist party.

I will use Fairclough's three-dimensional model that includes textual, discursive and social level. Every type (speech/electoral programme/image) of politicians' rhetoric will be analysed on the textual dimension. The discursive and social level of Le Pen's and Sarkozy's rhetoric will be analysed taking into consideration all types of data. Stereotypical arguments that politicians use in their rhetoric also will be revealed.

3.1. Sarkozy and the Immigration Issue

The first round of 2002 presidential elections shocked France: Le Pen scored second (Berezin, 2009, 141). From my point of view, it was one of the reasons why Sarkozy started to use the anti-immigration rhetoric. The strategy of Sarkozy included weakening one of the most popular politicians on the French political scene – Le Pen. It seems that Sarkozy used xenophobic discourse during his electoral campaign and while being the minister of internal affairs because the position of extreme-right candidate - J.M. Le Pen in 2002 in presidential elections was considerably strong. “On April 21, France, which imagined itself champion of the world of democracy discovers that 16.95% of electors in the presidential cast their votes for Jean-Marie Le Pen, head of the extreme-right” (Berezin, 2009, 165).

The part of chapter that relates to Sarkozy’s rhetoric is structured as follows. First, I start from his 2006 immigration law that he has adopted being a minister of internal affairs. Second, I proceed with his electoral programme for presidency 2007. Finally, I conclude with the analysis of his speech on television. This speech has been given by Sarkozy between 2002 and 2007 when he was a minister of internal affairs. Unfortunately, the exact date cannot be found, but the timeframe for analysis of his anti-immigrant discourse falls within his period in ministerial office.

3.1.1. Sarkozy's Immigration Law

Sarkozy while being a minister of internal affairs adopted two laws concerning immigration. The first law is not analysed in this thesis because it did not have as strict suggestions concerning immigration in France as the second one. The law that I will analyse was adopted in 2006. It is known as: "his latest effort to open France for high-skilled immigration, stem illegal immigration, restrict family migration, and promote integration into French society" (Migration Policy Institute, 2007, 6).

To start with the text of this law, I turn the attention to the points that I find extreme.

First, immigration in terms of work, the priority to enter the country only for qualified workers will be much easier than for unqualified workers. Second, if third world migrants want to have family reunification, the need to live in France for is increased to 18 months instead of 12 months as it was before. If third country national is married to a person that has French citizenship, if a spouse wants to have residence permit in France, she should be married with French national for at least 3 years instead of 2 as it was before. For obtaining French nationality on the basis of marriage implies living in France at least 4 years instead of 2 as it was earlier (Legifrance, 2006).

First, the rhetoric will be analysed on the textual level of Fairclough's framework. Speaking about the interactional control, Sarkozy was the one who defined the immigration issue as crucial for France; he had legitimacy to adopt his immigration law. Therefore, he set up and framed conversational agenda by signing the law. The construction of French ethos was done in a way, which revealed the desire to have only particular type of immigrants that later on can become the part of French nation: immigrants with high intellectual abilities. The immigration law was an attempt to create the French identity that is based on the more severe conditions for obtaining French citizenship. No metaphors were used due to the fact that this is an official document, which does not allow using any unofficial language that will be politically incorrect. Such grammar instrument as modality demonstrates that Sarkozy's modality is objective,

meaning that his attitude to the statement is universal. Sarkozy's modality can only be objective in this case because this comes from the nature of the document: it is law that creates certain rules and permissions. Objective modality frames a claim in a way that implies the change based on the objective ground.

From the above analysis I have demonstrated that this law had a racist character. It mostly favoured "selective immigration", which means that highly-skilled and intelligent immigrants are more welcome to France than labour immigrants. Moreover, such rhetoric shows Sarkozy's undesirability against the immigrants from African countries, as bigger part of unqualified workers comes from there. This law favours the conditions that put foreigners in a more severe position for obtaining citizenship and residence permit.

3.1.2. Programme for Presidency 2007

Now I will proceed with Sarkozy's programme for presidency 2007. During Sarkozy's campaign he was accused of borrowing Le Pen's immigration rhetoric. For example, Jewish press accused him in "taking le Pen's favorite issues: immigration, insecurity and nationalism" (European Jewish Press, 10 April, 2007). The analysis of his programme will help to see whether such claims represent reality.

Sarkozy's main suggestions concerning immigration were the following:

First, “to make more stronger the conditions for family reunification in order for foreigners not to come to France for social benefits, but rather for work [...] to provide medical treatment only for those, who really necessarily need it” (Votonsinfo, 2007).

Second, “to adapt annual flows of immigration for capacities and needs of France [...], prohibit the foreigner to go to his own country for obtaining the new visa or residence permit after five years” (Votonsinfo, 2007).

Third, “only the best students should be attracted to come to France. Only those students are welcome that will contribute to the development of French economy” (Votonsinfo, 2007). In addition, “an immigrant can bring his family to France only if he has a decent income from a job and decent housing, requirement for immigrants to learn to read and write French, implementation of “positive discrimination”. Finally, “the State may participate in the formation and funding of religion: the immigrants should accept the superiority of French culture and integrate into it” (Débat, 2007).

On the textual level Sarkozy's discourse can be represented as follows. Interactional control shows that Sarkozy sees himself as a candidate who sets up the conversational agenda. Because his suggestions are presented in the programme and voters cannot reply immediately to him, it can be assumed that he set up this topic for agenda, but was this attempt successful or not can only be known after elections. Ethos is constructed using different criteria: having enough means to cover living expenses, complying with French laws, culture and language. No metaphors were used in electoral programme. As it was the official electoral programme available for everybody, it could become the point for attack from other candidates concerning xenophobic suggestions, Sarkozy tried to be neutral in use of language, not mentioning any metaphors. Modality shows the objectivity of his statements, meaning that no phrases like “I think” are used: his attitude toward claims is framed in a way that represents his opinion objectively.

Adding to the analysis, based on Fairclough's framework, I have revealed the use of different stereotypical arguments. As Der Valk argues, there are different stereotypical arguments (topoi) that are present in debates concerning immigration in France: for example, the topos of decline, the topos of exceptional legislation, the topos of burden and the topos of profit (Der Valk, 2009, 225-226). First, the establishment of selective immigration, proposed by Sarkozy can be seen as the topos of exceptional legislation. Second, I found that Sarkozy used the topos of burden and profit, meaning that immigrants demand more social expenditures and want to profit from this country. Third, the topos of decline (illegal immigration causes decline of French nation) was presented in the programme: this relates to complying with French culture, language and acceptance of state's role in formation religion.

From Sarkozy's programme for presidency 2007, I have found that the immigration issue was presented by Sarkozy as an obvious problem that France faces and that France needs to solve. The measures proposed by Sarkozy were quite severe and demanding for the immigrants. Basically, they were created for the purpose to make integration for immigrants more difficult.

Here I provide migration data that support the argument that Sarkozy's discourse was mainly against immigrants from North African countries. First, on the basis of family reunification immigrants from North Africa were restricted. According to the data found on immigration issue: "in 2005 more than 70 percent of family migration was from Africa. Migrants from the Maghreb (Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia) alone made up 48.6 percent of family migration. [...] In 2005, Africans made up 63.0 percent of all permanent migrants and more than half of these Africans

were from Algeria (28.9 percent) or Morocco (23.4 percent)” (Migration Policy Institute, 2007, 2-4). So, the immigration discourse, created and developed by Sarkozy basically was against migrants from North Africa, as they constituted the biggest part of immigration flow. In addition, the European education is known to be better one than African and more people that come from North Africa they work as labour force. The other aspect about reunification of family is also important because after the Second World War for immigrants from former French colonies it was not so difficult to bring a family to France, so the flow of immigrants increased. As family reunification is mostly directed toward immigrants from French colonies, the real reason for harshening French immigration policy was to decrease the level of immigrant from these countries, not from Europe.

Second, immigrants were restricted on the basis of religion. Most of immigrants come to France from Muslim countries. Consequently, state’s authority in formation and foundation of religion will definitely restrict Muslims in the expression of their religion. This aspect was emphasized as a condition for stopping the flow of immigrants from these countries.

3.1.3. Speech

In this part I analyse Sarkozy’s comment and video speech during electoral debate with Le Pen on the topic of immigration. The reason I have chosen this particular speech is because it is the one that illustrates Sarkozy’s propositions concerning immigration in the broadest way.

I propose the creation of ministry of immigration and national identity, because integration is very important to our culture. The separate ministry that will deal with immigration, integration and co-development should be created (Sarkozy’s quote in Carrera, 2009, 317). France needs foreigners, but foreigners with official documents and with evidence, which prove that they can

afford living in France. What is wrong if Romanians are sending back to Romania, Bulgarians to Bulgaria and Senegalese to Senegal? If you do not have official documents and enough money for living in France, you need to be send back to your country (YouTube, 26 November, 2011).

Analysing text and speaking about interactional level I found that Sarkozy is trying to show that it is not him, but rather French people define immigration as the topic of the discussion: (for instance: 'France needs'). French identity here is constituted in such way that only those immigrants that stay on the legal basis can be close or later can be part of France. Metaphors are not used here. The analysis of grammar reveals that the speaker has objective modality and that he percepts his claims as universal and those that should be implemented. This can be seen using the 'need to' or 'I propose the creation of ministry of immigration and national identity, because integration is very important to our culture'.

Another quotation from Sarkozy's speech emphasizes the illegal aspect of immigration to France.

Why do we have the open borders? We need to give access only to foreigners that can afford staying in France, all other countries already have done this and our country also should. French people do not want any more the passing Europe. If Europe cannot defend its borders, France will. It is necessary to have a strict control on national borders within Europe and also it is obligatory to reinforce the control on the external borders of the Schengen Area [...] we need to do this. Almost 90 000 illegal foreigners recently have passed the French border (YouTube, 26 November, 2011).

In this part of speech Sarkozy points out that French people define the topic of discussion, by using words 'French people, France...'. French ethos is constructed around the principles of financial situation of foreigners: only those, who are rich, can enter France and are allowed to stay there, no other foreigners, are allowed. The use of metaphors is absent. Analysis of modality

focuses on Sarkozy's high affinity with his statement. Sarkozy in this speech operates with numbers, which show that his modality can be universal and true, based on real numbers. These numbers show the illegal aspect of immigration that creates negative images of immigrants.

Adding more to the analysis, now I concentrate on the use of different stereotypical arguments that are present in Sarkozy's speech. First, as Der Valk argues, the topos of abuse is usually used: they are abusing laws and rules and we should not trust them (Der Valk, 2009, 225). Sarkozy's speech includes the topos of burden and the topos of profit, which mean that immigrants cause extra expenditures from the French government and that come to France for profit as much as possible from it. In addition, the topos of exceptional legislation is present. It implies that France should be more severe concerning the immigration issue. This stereotypical argument leads us to another one: the topos of decline: the growth of illegal immigration will provoke the decline of French nation and illegal immigration should be stopped (Der Valk, 2009, 225).

On the level of discursive practice Sarkozy uses in his speech threats and promises. Sarkozy's rhetoric is full of threats that migrants cause to France and is full of promises that he will follow if he will be the next elected president. Moreover, signing the immigration law in 2006 is kind of proof that he is the one that keeps promises and that more severe measures concerning immigrants are adopted. This law can be seen as an instance that was produced in the environment that was conducive for such practice: before adopting the law, some events happened in French suburbs that created a precedent and a hint to create and adopt this law. In addition, this law was adopted because in 2005 there were riots in French suburbs made by

immigrants from Africa. These riots surprised the entire world (Kokoreff et al, 2006). Sarkozy being Minister of Internal affairs at that time tried to do two things simultaneously. First of all, he tried to create an immigration discourse that will see immigrants from North Africa as the most dangerous and unrespectful, using his institutional power to do that, legitimizing it by making more order in the French suburbs. And, secondly, he used this 'law and order' discourse, which was always used by Le Pen and the National Front (Rydgren, 2004, 180).

It can be seen that to a certain extent Sarkozy's discourse is coherent, because he continues to speak about the same issues in his rhetoric: protection of national borders, sending illegal immigrants back and acquiring only legal, high-skilled ones. This can be found in his speech and in the quote; though this coherence is not so visible with the link to his programme, because there he speaks about the rules of entering France, which implies his protectionist position concerning French borders. Sarkozy's discourse is intertextual: the chain about the same issue - immigration can be found in law, programme and speech. Even after adoption of the law, Sarkozy continued to have anti-immigrant character of his rhetoric, which means that the application of the same xenophobic discourse continues. Speaking about consumption of text, it should be said that Sarkozy was appealing to wide audience: French nation, so the consumption was collective. There was no particular emphasis on special niche of audience. His texts, speeches and comments were an attempt to lead to the changing of people's attitude toward immigration in France: by advertising the bad nature of immigrants for France, this politician was trying to persuade people to take his side concerning this issue.

On the level of social practice Sarkozy's discourse was trying to structure the relations in society by giving negative image on immigrants. His electoral programme served as an instrument to create the clear distinction between foreigners and French citizens. This means that Sarkozy was trying to bring changes into French immigration policy, making restrictions for foreigners more severe. In addition, the orders of discourse show that Sarkozy's rhetoric was xenophobic in general, without emphasis on the discourse of law and order or on the discourse of Islam. However, his discourse was not only xenophobic, but also racist, because it was against immigrants from North African countries.

Ideological consequence of Sarkozy's discursive practice is his shift to the extreme-right on the ideological spectrum. To this regard it can be seen that French political space started to have only strong left-wing and extreme-right poles. From my perspective, political effects of Sarkozy's discourse helped him to attract more Le Pen's electorate before presidential elections 2007, which resulted in a bigger support for Sarkozy and lesser support for Le Pen.

On the level of social practice, some events happened in France that influenced the construction of more severe immigration discourse. These events Sarkozy used in order to legitimate the adoption of the 2006 Immigration and Integration law. As "a dialectical relationship is a two-way relationship: the discursive event is shaped by situations, institutions and social structures, but it also shapes them (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, 258-259). On one hand, the discursive event (immigration policy) was shaped by Sarkozy, because he, being the Minister of Internal Affairs, had an institutional power to adopt this law, shaped the form in which this immigration

policy was developing. On the other hand, the discursive event also shaped the institution and social structure: the French Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Codevelopment was created in 2007 by already elected Sarkozy as a French president (Legifrance, 2007). The purpose of this ministry was to make the immigration policy clearer and more coordinated. However, the real reason was to decrease the immigration flow from former colonies to France.

No Sarkozy's propaganda pictures were analysed. No xenophobic pictures were found. However, analysing the other types of data led me to the conclusion that his rhetoric was racist. As it can be seen, Sarkozy's immigration discourse before 2007 presidential elections was extreme and xenophobic. From my point of view, the purpose of all these efforts was used in order to weaken one of his main rivals: extreme-right candidate Le Pen and Sarkozy applied xenophobic rhetoric. In the following part of this chapter I will analyse the discourse of Le Pen and I will see whether the discourse of Sarkozy had the same meaning as the discourse of Le Pen.

3.2. *Le Pen's Immigration Discourse*

At this point I want to turn to Le Pen's xenophobic discourse in order to show that his immigration rhetoric is quite similar with the one proposed by Sarkozy. While analysing Le Pen's discourse before 2007 presidential elections I, first, will start from Le Pen's electoral programme. Secondly, I will proceed with the analysis of Le Pen's position concerning immigration on the debates with Sarkozy and finally I will finish with the pictures that were advertised by the National Front and Le Pen during the electoral campaign for presidency 2007.

The part of this chapter that relates to Le Pen's rhetoric is structured as follows. First, I start from his programme for presidency 2007. Second, I proceed with his speech on the television. Finally, I conclude with the analysis of images that were distributed during electoral campaign.

The National Front and its leader have been known from the very beginning as those who have been advocating anti-immigration rhetoric.

The National Front does not officially advertise the hierarchy of races, however it advertises difference: necessity for every nation to live separately from each other on the basis of impossibility of different cultures to coexist [...] The National Front demands to stop immigration because the existence of French nation is in danger (Camus, 1989, 26).

The campaign for presidency 2007 shows that the basic ideas about immigration have not been changed. Main suggestions, proposed by Le Pen in his programme can be seen below:

3.2.1. Electoral Programme 2007

Immigration policy proposed by other governments is one of evils from which France suffers. It is necessary to start though policy that will stop migration flows [...] For National Front it is the *raison d'être* (Election présidentielle, 2007, Programme, 5). *Jus soli* right should be cancelled and only *jus sanguinius* right should remain. All treaties that open French borders to other countries should be abridged (Schengen, Maastricht, Amsterdam...) (Votonsinfo, 2007). It is necessary to decrease residence permit from 10 to 3 years and to prohibit the family reunification", [...], cancel all social aid to foreigners and organize their return back to their countries of origin (Election présidentielle⁵, 2007, Programme, 6).

Text analysis shows that on the interactional level Le Pen is seen as defender of French nation and as the one, who defines the subject of the discussion: changes in French immigration policy. However, whether the application of such rhetoric was successful can only be shown after

⁵ Presidential election.

elections. His programme sets the French identity as totally constituent only from French people without any immigrants that later can become citizens. Moreover, Le Pen denies the *jus soli* right, speaking only about *jus sanguinius* right, which accepts French citizens as those, who are only French by blood. The use of metaphors is present: ‘immigration policy is evil, proposed by others is one of the evil’, stopping migration flows is ‘*raison d’être*’ of this party. These metaphors are an attempt to justify Le Pen’s suggestions and make his rhetoric legitimate. The analysis of modality unleashes Le Pen’s high affinity to his statements: he completely commits himself to the suggestions and presents his claims as undeniable truth. It is shown with the reference to using such modal word as ‘should’ and the construction ‘it is necessary’.

Speaking about the use of different stereotypical arguments, I have found that his electoral programme is full of them. His propositions include the topos of decline. This suggestion explains that the growth of illegal immigration comes through the open borders with France and that French nation because of this is in danger, so if France wants to remain on the map of Europe it should be stopped. The language of Le Pen is openly xenophobic. It is also racist from the point when he speaks about the cancelling of *jus soli* right, because usually there are immigrants from North African countries that come to France for the purpose of family reunification and later live in France and give birth to more children who automatically according to the French rules become French citizens. His suggestions also include the topos of burden, meaning that immigrants are burden for French economy and come to France only for profit.

3.2.2. Speech

Now I would like to turn to the Le Pen's speech that was produced during the debates with Sarkozy on the issue of immigration. Unfortunately, the exact date cannot be found. However, this debate was given after 2002 and Sarkozy was the minister of internal affairs at that time, so Le Pen's discourse falls within timeframe before 2007 presidential elections. I have chosen this speech because here this politician particularly addresses the issues that should be changed in the French immigration policy and because I faced difficulties with finding other videos, where Le Pen openly speaks about immigration in such passionate manner. The reason for that can possibly be aware of attacks on this basis and his suggestions concerning immigration are explicitly present in his programme in a less radical way.

There are different forms of racism that people speak about: Jewish racism, black racism, however nothing was mentioned about the racism that is practiced in France: anti-French racism. Millions of our people sacrifice their workplace for immigrants that come to France. 100000 of immigrants every year come to our country [...] The needed measures are: cancel the *jus soli* right and leave only *jus sanguinius* right, meaning that you need to have one of parents of French nationality in order to become French [...] Illegal immigrants come to our country and install here, giving birth to children and they become later French nationals (YouTube, 16 November, 2011).

Textual analysis demonstrates that the interactional control shows that Le Pen sets up the agenda, using such phrases as 'millions of our people sacrifice...'. He is the one, who is responsible for putting this immigration question on the agenda. In addition, it cannot be visible from the quote, but it is visible from the video-translation that Le Pen always interrupted Sarkozy and did not give him possibility to say something, by providing more arguments in the support of his position. This implies Le Pen's desire to set the conversational agenda. Ethos is constructed on the basis of *jus sanguinius* right only. This means that if you have at least one parent, who is French, then you can also be considered as French. Any other possibilities to obtain French

citizenship are declined. No metaphors were found. Analysis of modality demonstrates that Le Pen completely commits himself to the claims: the use of numbers expresses his high certainty in facts about migration flows to France. This means that Sarkozy sees his statement as universal and the one that represents reality in an objective way.

3.2.3. Pictures (see Appendix 1)

Finally, I would like to turn to the images, which were advertised by the National Front and its leader.

Picture 1. This poster shows us a mosque and a woman, wearing nighab. The titles: “Stop or again?” and “Marseille – capital of countryside?” appeal to French people by asking them whether they want the immigration to be stopped or their city to change its appearance and to become unrecognizable like countryside in North African countries. The translation of the word “bled” in particular applied to the countryside in North Africa, so this advertisement is clearly racist and is made against black people and Arabs that come from Maghreb countries. French flag is in the hand, which shows that France can resist the immigration flow from these countries and that it is possible to stop such immigration if you will vote for the National Front.

Picture 2. It is different from first two ones because it says “Not friend, not black, not white, not Arab (in particular Arab from the second generation of immigrants from North African countries), FRENCH!”. Here it can be seen that Le Pen was trying to hide the racist character of

its rhetoric, though applying to all immigrants no matter what origin do they have.

On the level of discursive practice Le Pen's rhetoric is consumed collectively, by his supporters. He knows his audience and openly speaks about excessive immigration as the main argument for stopping the flow of immigrants. Mainly, the audience to which this programme is addressed is working-class and people, who do not in general have higher education. Such rhetoric is applied because such people mostly can have unqualified jobs, and immigrants that usually come from North African countries are preoccupied with such types of jobs. So, Le Pen tried to argue that such immigrants are taking jobs from French workers which implies using the topos of unemployment: immigrants cause it and in order for French people (mainly – working class) to have more possibility to get access to jobs, the immigration must be stopped at all (Votonsinfo, 2007). Though, he tries to use as many arguments as possible to attract new voters, to change the people's attitudes and beliefs and turn those people into supporters of Le Pen.

The sorts of speech acts Le Pen uses can be characterized as threats and promises. First, he provides excessive threats that immigrants cause to France. Second, this serves as a legitimate reason for him for stopping immigration to France. This he does through promises. His rhetoric is coherent and intertextual. Pictures of electoral propaganda constitute the part of larger texts that are presented in the speech and in the electoral programme. The intertextuality is demonstrated by the fact that Le Pen uses the same arguments in his rhetoric. Intertextual chain demonstrates that the same rhetoric is seen in different versions: in electoral programme it is presented more officially, in speech in a more passionate manner, with the use of the topos of

decline: immigrants put French nation in danger and, finally, in images the anti-immigrant discourse is openly revealed.

Speaking about social practice, Le Pen's discursive practice is in a certain way a subject to changing social relations in France: his rhetoric suggests that bad economic conditions in France are the result of the presence of immigrants. It also means that social expenditures from budget go on immigrants and that immigrants create higher rate of unemployment, which result in the lost of workplaces for French people. This discourse also tries to question power relations in society by promoting Le Pen as a candidate for presidency, who can represent ideas about immigration in his own way. Though, his discursive practice did not have political effects because Le Pen did not succeed in becoming a president. Le Pen's immigration rhetoric demonstrates that anti-immigrant discourse is prioritised under the discourses of religion/culture or under the discourse of law and order. Anti-immigration discourse is linked to the discourse of law and order: "In fact that the statistics for the crimes committed by the foreigners is absent, however this is undeniable fact" (Election présidentielle⁶, 2007, Programme, 8). Le Pen elaborates stereotypical argument about the level of crimes and links it to the immigrants without any evidence provided. Orders of discourse show that the anti-immigrant discourse is seen as major, though other discourses (discourse of law and order and discourse of Islam) are complement to it. Ideological effect points on the adoption of his rhetoric by other political actor – Sarkozy, whose extreme rhetoric have implications for changes in the French political space.

⁶ Presidential election.

I have demonstrated the analysis of Sarkozy's and Le Pen's immigration rhetoric. The main similarity that I found is that both of politicians want to control French borders despite the existing Schengen Agreement. On one hand, Le Pen wants to cancel the Schengen Treaty and wants France to leave this zone. On the other hand, Sarkozy is just trying to make suggestions for controlling national borders within European Union is not very satisfied with the current situation with Schengen Agreement. Basically, Le Pen's rhetoric is against all immigrants that come to France; however, particular emphasis is on immigrants from Muslim and North African countries. To compare, Sarkozy's discourse is against poor, not poorly skilled immigrants that mostly come from North African countries. Both politicians have objective modality that represents their claims as objective reality. Finally, they both use such sorts of speech acts as threats and promises, which help them to give the immigration issue a negative connotation and helps them to show themselves as those who places this issue on the agenda.

Chapter 4: Comparison of Marine Le Pen's and Sarkozy's Anti-Immigration Rhetoric before 2012 Presidential Elections

In this chapter the analysis of Sarkozy's and Marine le Pen's discourse is conducted. I demonstrate that the key symbols of their rhetoric had the same meaning. This serves as a support to my hypothesis concerning the change of French political space from three-dimensional to two-dimensional. In addition, the results of presidential elections will serve as an additional supportive argument for changes that French political space has undergone the space that turned to have only strong left-wing and extreme-right dimension. The roadmap for this part of the chapter is the following. First, I analyse Le Pen's programme for presidency 2012. Second, I proceed with images, which were distributed during electoral campaign. Finally, I conclude with the analysis of her speech concerning immigration issue in France.

4.1. Marine Le Pen's Discourse: More Moderate than her Father's?

Marine Le Pen became the leader of the National Front in 2011. Some people believe that she is much more democratic than her father. However, the analysis of her rhetoric shows that her discourse is not more democratic, but had the same meaning as her father's.

4.1.1. Programme for Presidency 2012

First, I will start the analysis from the Marine Le Pen's programme for presidency 2012. On the website, which is dedicated to her electoral campaign I found her thoughts concerning immigration in France.

Immigration is the source of many problems, in particular for destabilizing our society and reducing the average salaries. Assimilation is not possible for massive immigration. Both legal and illegal immigration is a danger and it should be stopped. Under Sarkozy's presidency the immigration is the most visible. Illegal immigration continues because canals that absorb these illegal immigrants have not been deleted [...] Communitarianism is the poison for national cohesion [...] Lionel Jospin was the one who opened State Medical Aid specially for illegal foreigners and this year more than 600 million Euros were spent on that from the budget [...] Immigration has increased under the presidency of Nicolas Sarkozy and this is one cause that provoked financial crisis and increased the level of unemployment in our country. Under Sarkozy's presidency France has delivered 203 000 residence permits in 2010 in comparison with 28 000 in 2009 (Programme électorale⁷, Marine Le Pen, 2012).

The textual level demonstrates that it is Le Pen, who defines the topic of the discussion and puts the immigration issue on the top of agenda. By blaming previous governments for worsening the migration situation in France, Le Pen sees herself as a defender of the French nation and the one who can tackle this question on the conversational agenda. French identity is defined by those people who are French citizens now. No immigrants are allowed to become French citizens. Different metaphors such as “canals that absorb” or “poison for national cohesion” are used in Le Pen's discourse that point to the necessity to stop immigration. I think that metaphors are strong because they help to accuse previous governments with unsuccessful French migration policies. The analysis of modality reveals Le Pen's objective modality. She is confident that immigration causes much harm to France and to the French nation. She does not say ‘probably’ or ‘I think’, she just says it does: for instance ‘Immigration is the source of many problems’. It demonstrates that Le Pen frame her rhetoric in a way that represents reality objectively. She

⁷ Electoral programme.

expresses her thoughts in claims that can be true. The construction of such reality includes the use of numbers: ‘Under Sarkozy’s presidency, France has delivered 203 000 residence permits in 2010 in comparison with 28 000 in 2009’ (Programme électorale⁸, Marine Le Pen, 2012).

Speaking about stereotypical arguments, the use of the topos of decline and unemployment is present: because of immigrants, French people lose their workplaces and the French nation is in danger. Here the topos of burden is combined with the topos of unemployment and the topos of complicity, meaning that immigrants take social expenditures from the budget and they increase the level of unemployment in France because there are fewer workplaces. Moreover, the topos of complicity includes the accusation of the left-wing politicians, who favour immigration to France and favor not only legal immigration, but also illegal. The use of these stereotypical arguments strengthens the negative impact of immigrants on French economy.

Now, let us turn attention to the particular propositions made by Marine Le Pen.

First, in 5 years reduction of legal immigration that favours only highly-skilled immigrants who can make a contribution to the development of our country. Moreover, cancelling any family reunification and not giving refugees place for staying in France. Thirdly, the *jus soli* right and Schengen agreements that allow free movement of people should be cancelled. France will control its borders by herself. [...] Anti-French racism like a motivation for crime will be considered as the one that will have serious and aggravated consequences and France through bilateral agreements with countries, which figure the most in the list of delinquency in France, will organize the transportation of these people to their home countries with making sure that these people will be put in prison [...]. In addition, a New Ministry of Interior, Immigration and Secularization should be created [...] the enforced cooperation with African countries should be developed (Programme électorale⁹, Marine Le Pen, 2012).

⁸ Electoral programme.

⁹ Electoral programme.

The first dimension of Fairclough's framework describes Le Pen as the one who raises the immigration issue and puts it on the national agenda. Though, because voters cannot reply to her suggestions immediately, to see whether agenda setting was successful or not will be possible only after elections. French ethos is constituted as desire to be free from immigrants (both legal and illegal) and can only consist of those people who possess *jus sanguinius* right. French citizenship will not be given any more to immigrants who give birth on French territory and thus automatically receive the citizenship. Beyond this *jus sanguinius* right Le Pen stresses the necessity to stop migration flows from North African countries, as mostly they come from that part of the world to be united with their families. In this part of Le Pen's programme I have not found the use of metaphors. This can be explained by providing a potential voter with more neutral information, not giving him a possibility to see the extremity of the discourse. The analysis of grammar demonstrates that the speaker has objective modality with the use of strong modal word 'should'.

Consequently, Le Pen's discourse is openly racist and xenophobic because it emphasizes particularly on the cooperation with North African countries. This cooperation will allow having certain agreements that will reduce and stop flow of immigrants from those countries. So the stress is against people coming from Maghreb countries. The xenophobic character of her discourse also is included in the idea of creation of a ministry which will deal in particular with secularization that demonstrates Le Pen's concerns with Islamisation of France.

4.1.2. Pictures (see Appendix 2)

Now I proceed with the analysis of pictures that were distributed during Le Pen's campaign for presidency 2012. Regarding the fact that the pictures are big, I insert them into Appendices.

Picture 1.

On this image the report on immigration demonstrates that for the last four years the level of immigrants has increased by 203 000 per year and there is the image of residence permit, which were given to immigrants during Sarkozy's presidency. Sarkozy on this picture is accused of both legal and illegal immigration. Moreover, the question of Islamisation of France is tackled: Muslims demand more and more rights in France). Also there are suggestions concerning immigration on this picture. However, they are the same as presented in the electoral programme, but they are in more brief form, so they will not be analysed. To this extent Le Pen's rhetoric is intertextual because the same key symbols are reproduced in different documents.

Picture 2. This image has the title: "Denmark controls its borders... Why not us?". This implies the use of the topos of legislation: other countries are stricter, so we also should be strict: "More than Demark, our country needs to control its borders because it will help to preserve our workplaces and cancel social aide for foreigners". This quotation repeats Le Pen's concern about evil that immigration causes for France and French nation. "Marine Le Pen wants to protect France and French!".

Picture 3. “Double nationality: we should stop it! [...] Numbers of French are shocked by the fact that French minister can be simultaneously French and Tunisian”. Here open racism concerning immigrants that come from Maghreb countries can be seen. Moreover, these people even though they have French nationality are not desired to have official positions in government. This creates not only xenophobic character of Le Pen’s rhetoric, but also racist.

Picture 4. “Radical Islam. It is necessary to stop permissiveness of UMP”. “Fundamental Islamism has developed in France and is a real danger for the French. Political authorities did not keep their words [...] UMP favours Islam in France by creating French Council for Muslim cult, where the non-French Muslims are present, [...] Muslims emphasize on the importance of their mosques and receive financial support from rich Muslims that live abroad”. As it can be seen, here the use of topoi of culture and advantage are present. Topos of culture means that their culture is different from French and they cannot be integrated harmoniously into French culture. The topos of advantage implies that by first of all, creating this council, and, secondly, by allowing them to build mosques and minarets, they make the French disadvantaged concerning the decisions that are made in Muslims’ favour.

4.1.3. Speech

Now I will analyse the speech, given by Le Pen during campaign for presidency 2012.

We have five million of unemployed in our country and if we continue to favour legal immigration the situation will not become better. 200 000 of immigrants every year want to come to our country for the search of jobs and receive residence permits. They want more workplaces and more social expenditures. Our social system cannot afford this: today we do have a big deficit. Our social budget is unstable. 70 millions of euros are needed for the expenses concerning immigration. Multicultural society is always a society that has lots of problems. Multiculturalism

has mixed French laws and French identity. For the sake of France we should stop immigration both legal and illegal. In addition, *jus soli* right should be cancelled because it is the prior interest of our country. It is necessary to create some order in our country, which will preserve cultural values, values of republic and French identity (YouTube, 11 September, 2011).

On the textual level the discourse of Le Pen demonstrates her responsibility for setting such vital issue on the national agenda, the issue that should be resolved, according to her. For instance, ‘we have five million of unemployed’, ‘for the sake of France’ demonstrate that she is seen as a defender of French people and that she puts this issue on the agenda. French identity is constructed upon the principle of *jus sanguinius*, excluding the *jus soli* right. No immigrants are allowed to receive French citizenship, except those who have French parents. French identity should be based only on the republican principles. I did not find the use of metaphors in this speech. Speaking about grammar, the analysis of modality shows Le Pen’s absolute commitment to the statements she makes; this is shown in her body language and in her suggestions to stop immigration at all. Her modality is objective: the use of ‘it is necessary’, ‘we should’ and ‘our system cannot’ demonstrates this. Moreover, certain stereotypical arguments are used: the topos of burden, the topos of unemployment, the topos of abuse.

On the level of discursive practice, Le Pen’s rhetoric contains such speech acts as accusations. Such discourse creates the negative image of immigrants that makes them to be a threat for the French nation. With these accusations Le Pen tries to create herself an image, which will legitimize her actions. Moreover, recent events in March 2012, which happened in French cities: Toulouse and Monatanban, where French citizens of North African origin committed crimes by organizing shooting people on streets (BBC, March 22, 2012). These events contributed to more severe and strict discourse of Marine Le Pen concerning immigrants. Marine Le Pen’s discourse

is coherent and intertextual. The intertextual chain of texts was found in images, which were advertised during the campaign and in propositions made in the electoral programme. Intertextual chain showed that content was transformed and structured differently: pictures included more facts and discourse was organized in a clearer manner, pointing at key suggestions. On the other hand, in Le Pen's programme fewer facts were present about immigration, Islam and crimes committed, however the emphasis was on using in general anti-immigrant discourse, without any particular emphasis on the discourse of Islam or on the discourse of law and order.

With the regard to recent shootings in French cities, Marine Le Pen intensified her rhetoric: she did not hide the racist and xenophobic character of her discourse, in which she was attacking Sarkozy and his party on the basis of allowing more immigrants to come to France. In my interpretation, the consumption of her rhetoric was collective, though, it mostly appealed to a certain audience. In particular to those French citizens who are unemployed or mostly to workers without full higher education, who can possibly be in danger of losing workplaces because of immigrants.

On the level of social practice, Le Pen's rhetoric can be seen as one that leads to social change: changes in French immigration policy. Le Pen's discourse was distributed across texts with the main emphasis on discourse of immigration that was linked to the discourse of Islam and to the discourse of law and order. The orders of discourse show that before 2012 presidential elections, the anti-immigrant discourse in general was dominant, while the discourse of Islam and the

discourse of law and order also played a significant role. The political consequences of such discursive practice resulted in almost 18% support for Le Pen in the first round of presidential elections 2012. The ideological consequences of Le Pen's discursive practice resulted in applying the same rhetoric by another candidate – Sarkozy, which in the result changed the power positions in France: socialist candidate Hollande became president. This, from my perspective, is the supportive evidence that France now has two-dimensional politics, which consist of left-wing (represented by Hollande) and extreme-right wing (represented by Le Pen and Sarkozy). Moreover, Sarkozy's shift to the extreme-pole resulted in the disappearance of right-wing pole in the French political space.

To conclude, from the analysis above Marine Le Pen cannot be considered as more democratic than her father. No major differences from the rhetoric of Jean-Marie Le Pen and Marine Le Pen were found. Moreover, most of suggestions of both Le Pens had the same key symbols and meaning: stop both legal and illegal immigration, restrict family reunification and abridge European treaties.

4.2. Sarkozy's Discourse before Elections 2012: Still Xenophobic?

In the previous chapter it was shown that Sarkozy's discourse when he was the minister of internal affairs and before 2007 presidential elections was racist and anti-immigrant. Thus, this probably helped him to attract more votes from Le Pen. This part of the chapter proceeds with Sarkozy's immigration discourse before 2012 elections, reveals that he continued to apply such rhetoric and points to differences and similarities which it had with Le Pen's discourse. The roadmap for this part of the chapter is the following. First, I analyse Sarkozy's programme for

presidency 2012. Second, I proceed with the analysis of a picture, which I found on the website of his campaign. Finally, I conclude with the analysis of his speech concerning immigration in France given before the second round of presidential elections.

4.2.1. Electoral Programme 2012

Propositions made concerning immigration:

First, decrease the amount of residence permits given every year from 180 000 to 90 000. Second, demand from European Union to control its migration and asylum policies. If European Union will not follow these instructions in one year, France will start to control its own borders by itself. Third, the ultimate conditions for family reunification should be stricter: an immigrant should possess a good knowledge of French language and agree with the values of the Republic. Moreover, in order to have access to social benefits an immigrant should live in the country no less than ten years which includes five years of working experience. It is not needed again to immigrate to France for receiving social benefits. Finally, for fighting the illegal immigration, the special separate Court should be created. The creation of such court creates the necessity to change the constitution. If it is not possible through parliamentary decision, I will address this question to the French people (Le Programme de Nicolas Sarkozy, 2012).

On the textual level the interactional control defines that this is Sarkozy who sets immigration on the agenda, because he says: ‘I will address the question to the French people’. The French ethos is based on the immigrants’ possibilities to comply with French values: men and women should be treated the same. No metaphors were used. As electoral programme is considered to have official language, the metaphors were not revealed there. Such grammar instrument as modality shows that Sarkozy has objective modality. This is demonstrated with the reference of using such modal word ‘should’ several times.

In this part of his programme I have found the use of certain stereotypical arguments. For instance, the topos of exceptional legislation: if Europe will not comply with French

propositions, France will be forced to control its own borders by itself. The topos of culture is also present: foreigners need to accept the values of the Republic, including the same attitude toward men and women. This contradicts Muslim culture where different sexes are treated differently in a society. It can be seen that Sarkozy is opposed to this attitude and his propositions can be obstacles for Muslims to immigrate to France. Strengthening asylum policies across Europe also demonstrates that Sarkozy is basically against immigrants from third world countries as they are known to be asking for asylum in well-developed countries such as France. Consequently, Sarkozy's discourse can be seen as both xenophobic and racist.

4.2.2 Picture (see Appendix 3)

Picture 1

This picture presents efforts made by Sarkozy and his agents concerning immigration from 2002 to 2011. From year 2007 the number of foreigners that were deported decreased from 140 000 to 30 000 per year. The number of immigration organizations which help foreigners illegally to come to France started to reduce from 2010. Picture does not promote at any stage legal immigration, mentioning only achievements of Sarkozy concerning illegal entry. Emphasizing the negative aspect of immigration, the creation of negative image of France as a country that does not want any foreigners at all is constructed.

4.2.3. Speech/Comments

For analysing Sarkozy's rhetoric I found data that will in particular interest because this is the debate between Hollande and Sarkozy given after the first round of elections 2012. This shows how, after Le Pen's exclusion for the second round Sarkozy applies extreme-right rhetoric.

I am opposed to Islam in France; I am opposed to Islamisation of our country. Foreigners do not need to have a right to vote. Immigrants from North African countries constitute the first community of foreigners. First of all, these are Algerians, Tunisians, Moroccans, Somaliland. This is reality. North Africa is Muslim or not? Algeria, Morocco – for sure, Tunisia – it is similar. This is from where the problem appears. We cannot just wear a masque and do not see this problem. Problems come from North and Sub-Saharan Africa. Islam has become the second religion in France. It should be stopped (YouTube, 2 May, 2012).

There are too many foreigners on our territory, our system functions worse and worse, because we cannot find apartment, workplace, and school for them. By welcoming too many immigrants we have paralysed our system of integration. This is reality (Liberation, 2 May, 2012).

The textual level shows Sarkozy's enormous desire to reduce the flow of immigrants. During his speech he interrupts Hollande and does not allow him to express himself, which demonstrates that Sarkozy is the one who defines the topic of discussion and makes an emphasis on the immigrants from North African countries. French ethos is constructed on the openly racist principles, against people coming from North Africa. Furthermore, discrimination on the basis of religion is revealed. Though, Sarkozy does not use metaphors. Sarkozy has subjective modality in this case: the use of personal pronoun 'I' points on this, meaning that this Islamisation can only be stopped if Sarkozy will become a president, not if someone else. His words 'I am opposed' also show that modality is subjective.

The level of discursive practice demonstrates that Sarkozy uses different kind of speech acts. Except commonly used threats (e.g. immigrants cause harm for France and are a threat) and promises (e.g. family reunification rules should be changed), Sarkozy used certain numbers in the propaganda picture to show the progress. In particular, such numbers were shown for creating the better image of him. These numbers revealed that under his presidency achievement concerning flow of immigrants took place. As Sarkozy was the president of France, he could have manipulated migration data and provide more suitable data for him. Data were taken from the Ministry of Interior, where Sarkozy worked before 2007 as a minister. This creates also the possibility of providing migration data different from reality. The analysis shows the coherence and intertextuality of texts. The intertextual chain shows that the content is not similar in the electoral programme and in the picture. Programme includes more general information about immigration, while picture emphasizes the number of illegal immigrants. At the level of consumption, this rhetoric applies to a broad audience: the French people, though the emphasis is on the very religious people for whom the importance of what faith France will have.

The level of social practice demonstrates that Sarkozy's rhetoric is preoccupied with an anti-immigrant character which is linked to a discourse of Islam. The social matrix of discourse shows that the rhetoric of this politician leads to potential changes in society: in particular the changes in French migration policies can lead to the more severe distinction between who can be considered as a foreigner and who as a national. The orders of discourse demonstrate that anti-immigrant discourse in general and Islam discourse have an equal contribution for placing Sarkozy on the extreme pole of French political space. This especially was demonstrated with the reference to Sarkozy's debate with Hollande after the first round of presidential elections.

Ideological consequence of Sarkozy's discursive practice results in the transformation of the French political space from three-pole to two-pole. Political effects of his rhetoric have changed the power relations in society: the change of political elites took place: from Sarkozy to left-wing president Hollande. This means that people changed their attitude and did not want to accept extreme-right president.

To conclude, the rhetoric of Marine Le Pen and Sarkozy was racist and xenophobic. To a certain extent Le Pen's suggestions concerning immigration were more severe and radical. His discourse implies stopping both legal and illegal immigration and abridging European treaties, especially those that allow free movement of people within Europe. While Sarkozy's rhetoric did not clearly advocated the anti-Islamisation of France, it was presented in a hidden manner. In general both politicians showed a strict opposition toward immigrants. Both politicians had interdiscursive rhetoric: for Sarkozy the discourse of immigration was linked to the discourse of Islam, while for Marine Le Pen it was linked also to the discourse of law and order. Though, Sarkozy has taken part of Marine Le Pen's rhetoric, he also was trying to appeal to her electorate after the first round of 2012 elections: "According to study Viavoice for *Liberation* 49% of voters will support Sarkozy in second round" (*Libération*, 29 April, 2012).

Conclusion

This research served two goals. The first question was about the differences and similarities of applying anti-immigrant and xenophobic rhetoric by Le Pen and Sarkozy before 2007 presidential elections. Moreover, I investigated how the discourse of extreme-right National Front differed with the change of the party leader from Jean-Marie Le Pen to Marine Le Pen before 2012 presidential elections and compared it to Sarkozy's. Second, I figured out what implications Sarkozy's xenophobic discourse had for the French political space. Critical discourse analysis was chosen as the theoretical framework and methodology for analysing Le Pen's and Sarkozy's rhetoric. In particular, Fairclough's three-dimensional framework served as a model for analysing politicians' discourse. This model was complemented with the revelation of stereotypical arguments (topoi) that helped to identify what were beyond Le Pen's and Sarkozy's words, meaning what these politicians tried to show using these stereotypical arguments.

In this thesis I have demonstrated that Le Pen's and National Front's distinctive anti-immigrant and racist rhetoric has been applied by seemingly non-extreme political actor: Sarkozy. I argued that key symbols of Le Pen's rhetoric had the same xenophobic meaning as Sarkozy's. This resulted in implications for French political space, which due to application of such discourse has been transformed from three dimensional to two dimensional. Consequently there is no more right wing pole, only left-wing pole that is represented by socialists and extreme-right that is represented by Le Pen and Sarkozy.

On the one hand, in this research I have found that Sarkozy's discourse had xenophobic and racist character. This rhetoric was advocated by Sarkozy when he was a minister of internal affairs between 2002 and 2007 and a leader of the most popular party in France, Union for a Popular Movement. This was shown with reference to his 2006 immigration law, electoral programme, speech and the creation of special ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Codevelopment. The analysis of Sarkozy's discourse indicated that his language was full of different stereotypical arguments that had sometimes open, sometimes hidden anti-immigrant character. Sarkozy was promoting only selective immigration based on the financial status of immigrant, religion, intellectual skills and accepting values of the republic. Moreover, before 2012 presidential elections, Sarkozy's discourse continued to be xenophobic. I have demonstrated this with the reference to the analysis of his electoral programme, picture, speeches, comments and the fact that Sarkozy was appealing to Le Pen's supporters after the first round. Sarkozy mostly had anti-immigrant discourse, which was linked to the discourse of Islam. French ethos was constructed on the basis of financial situation of immigrant and his working skills. Only those immigrants who correspond to such criteria can later become French citizens.

On the other hand, this study has shown that Jean-Marie Le Pen's rhetoric before 2007 presidential elections and Marine Le Pen's rhetoric before 2012 elections was both xenophobic and racist. This was demonstrated based on electoral programmes, pictures and speeches. The analysis of Le Pen's rhetoric revealed its intertextuality. In the case of Le Pen it was xenophobic discourse, linked to the Islamisation of France and to the discourse of law and order. The Islamisation of France was a key aspect of programmes. Le Pen's rhetoric was more extreme

than Sarkozy's because it advertised stopping both legal and illegal immigration. The construction of French identity was based only on *jus sanguinius* right.

The important difference is that Sarkozy's institutional position allowed him to apply and implement xenophobic rhetoric while Le Pen has never had the possibility to implement it and turn his ideas into reality. Sarkozy's discourse was less xenophobic during two electoral campaigns, while Le Pen's was more severe. However, before 2012 elections Sarkozy's rhetoric was more racist and extreme, than before 2007 elections. This was shown with the reference to the discourse of Islam that he linked to the discourse of immigration.

Consequently, the discourse of both politicians concerning immigration in France had the same meaning with some differences. Both advocated stopping the Islamisation of France, reducing illegal immigration, preventing immigrants from receiving social benefits from the state, making family reunification difficult or impossible, and self-controlling the borders of France. Speaking about differences, I have found that Le Pen's Islam discourse was openly advocated and linked to the discourse of law and order, while Sarkozy's discourse mainly concerned immigrants in general, though with further investigation it was found that this discourse was also against Muslims and immigrants from Maghreb countries.

As I have demonstrated Sarkozy's xenophobic rhetoric had implications for the French political space. After the first round of 2012 elections Sarkozy appealed to Le Pen's electorate. The

second round of presidential elections 2012 has demonstrated that French people in majority do not want to accept the extreme-right president and that 52% of votes were given to left socialist candidate Francois Hollande (Ministère de l'Intérieur, de l'Outre-mer, des Collectivités territoriales et de l'Immigration, 2012). Sarkozy with its anti-immigrant rhetoric cannot be seen as the representative of the French nation. So, some can argue that there is still three-dimensional political space in France, but with the analysis of his rhetoric I showed that with the emergence of Sarkozy as a candidate for presidency on the political scene the French political space has undergone some major transformations that made it into two-dimensional, consisting of left-wing and extreme-right.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Picture 1



(Source: EMAJ Magazine, 2007).

Picture 2



(Source: Reuters, 2007).

Appendix 2

Picture 1 (Page 1)

www.marinelepen2012.fr

LA VOIX
DU PEUPLE,
L'ESPRIT
DE LA FRANCE

MARINE LE PEN

REJOIGNEZ-NOUS !

Nom
Prénom
Adresse
Ville [] [] [] []
Tél.
Mail @

☐ je soutiens l'action de Marine Le Pen
☐ je souhaite adhérer au Comité de soutien de Marine Le Pen
☐ je souhaite rencontrer un représentant local de Marine Le Pen

COUPON À RENVOYER À :
CMLP 2012 - 78, rue des Suisses - 92000 Nanterre - 01 41 20 26 26

**IMMIGRATION OFFICIELLE
(2007-2011)**

**+ 203 000
par an**



**SARKOZY A-T-IL ÉTÉ
ÉLU POUR ÇA ?**

**REJOIGNEZ
MARINE LE PEN**

(Source: Marine Le Pen. 2012).

Picture 1 (Page 2)

LES PROMESSES DE SARKOZY

« Si je suis élu, **je conforterai la politique d'immigration choisie** que j'ai engagée en tant que ministre de l'Intérieur. **J'instaurerai des plafonds annuels d'immigration.** La laïcité, l'égalité entre la femme et l'homme, la liberté de conscience sont des principes avec lesquels je ne transigerai jamais. Je demanderai à ceux qui veulent venir s'installer en France de faire l'effort d'apprendre le français avant, parce que c'est une condition essentielle d'une intégration réussie et parce que cela sera un signe de leur volonté de respecter notre culture. **Le regroupement familial ne sera possible que si la personne a un logement et un travail** lui permettant de faire vivre sa famille sans prise en compte des allocations familiales ».

PROJET DU CANDIDAT SARKOZY (2007) - « ENSEMBLE TOUT DEVIENT POSSIBLE »

L'ÉCHEC DE SARKOZY



IMMIGRATION LÉGALE

Alors que notre pays compte 5 millions de chômeurs, Sarkozy a permis une immigration massive : 203 000 immigrés légaux supplémentaires en 2010 sans compter les mineurs. En 2000, avec Jospin, l'immigration légale représentait 114 000 personnes par an. Sarkozy avait promis l'immigration « choisie ». Or, 5 % seulement des immigrés qui s'installent légalement en France ont un contrat de travail, le reste étant intégralement à la charge des contribuables français.



IMMIGRATION CLANDESTINE

Malgré quelques actions exclusivement médiatiques concernant les Roms, le problème est toujours là : des centaines de milliers d'immigrés clandestins entrent chaque année sur le territoire national et le gouvernement se félicite des 28 000 expulsions annuelles... L'Aide Médicale d'État (AME), réservée aux immigrés clandestins et leur permettant de se faire soigner gratuitement en France, coûte plus de 600 millions d'euros par an.



COMMUNAUTARISME ISLAMIQUE

Jamais les revendications communautaires islamiques n'ont été aussi fortes et le gouvernement cède à toutes les exigences des groupes politico-religieux (mosquées à minaret, nourriture Hallal, etc).



- ➔ **Arrêt de l'immigration légale**, utilisée pour peser à la baisse sur les salaires.
- ➔ **Expulsion immédiate** de tout étranger entré illégalement en France.
- ➔ **Application de la préférence nationale** pour les emplois, les logements et les aides sociales.
- ➔ **Déchéance de leur nationalité française** pour les délinquants ou criminels récemment naturalisés.
- ➔ **Suppression de la double-nationalité** (sauf pour les ressortissants d'un autre pays européen).
- ➔ **Réforme du code de la nationalité** en supprimant le « droit du sol » qui procure automatiquement la nationalité française à toute personne née en France.
- ➔ **Refus des revendications communautaristes** visant à contourner ou à modifier nos lois. Inscription des mots suivants dans la Constitution : « la République ne reconnaît aucune communauté ».
- ➔ **Interdiction du financement des mosquées par des pays étrangers** et application stricte de la laïcité.

(Source: Marine Le Pen. 2012).

Picture 2

LE DANEMARK CONTRÔLE SES FRONTIÈRES... POURQUOI PAS NOUS ?

Le gouvernement danois vient de prendre des décisions visant à rétablir des contrôles à ses frontières terrestres et maritimes. Face à l'afflux de migrants tunisiens et libyens, le Danemark ne fait que défendre légitimement ses intérêts nationaux.

Voilà qui tranche avec le **blabla permanent et la totale inaction du gouvernement Sarkozy-Fillon**. Pendant que le pouvoir sarkozyste multiplie les discours électoralistes sans lendemain, certains autres pays européens agissent vraiment.

Plus exposé que le Danemark, notre pays a besoin de reprendre d'urgence le contrôle de ses frontières que ce soit pour faire face à l'immigration ou aux importations de produits provenant de pays à très bas coût de main d'œuvre face auxquels nos industries et nos emplois sont condamnés.

Marine Le Pen propose de protéger notre peuple, notre économie et nos emplois :

- ➔ Retrouver la **maîtrise de nos frontières** nationales.
- ➔ **Suspendre d'urgence l'application du traité de Schengen** autorisant la « libre circulation des biens et des personnes » puis envisager sa renégociation.
- ➔ **Supprimer les pompes aspirantes de l'immigration** (aides sociales, soins gratuits, etc.).
- ➔ **Protéger nos entreprises et nos emplois** en rétablissant des taxes douanières.

MARINE LE PEN VEUT PROTÉGER LA FRANCE ET LES FRANÇAIS *Rejoignez le Front National !*

CONTACT

Nom : _____ Prénom : _____

Adresse : _____

Code Postal : _____ Ville : _____

Courriel : _____ Téléphone : _____

☐ Je soutiens l'action du FN pour le rétablissement de nos frontières

☐ Je souhaite **adhérer au Front National** (chèque à l'ordre de « FN ») :

Adhésion : ☐ jeunes (15 €) ☐ sociale (30 €) ☐ simple (50 €) ☐ soutien (90 €)

COUPON À RETOURNER À :

FN - 78, rue des Suisses - 92000 NANTERRE
Tél. : 01 41 20 20 00 - www.frontnational.com



FN

(Source: Marine Le Pen. 2012).

Picture 3

DOUBLE NATIONALITÉ : IL FAUT EN FINIR !

L'explosion du chiffre des binationaux pose aujourd'hui des problèmes dont les Français sont de plus en plus conscients. La multiplicité des appartenances à d'autres nations contribue aujourd'hui, et d'une manière de plus en plus préoccupante, à affaiblir chez nos compatriotes l'acceptation d'une communauté de destin, et par là-même à miner les fondements de l'action de l'Etat.

Nombre de Français ont ainsi été choqués du fait qu'un ministre français soit à la fois tunisien et français, surtout lorsque ce ministre déclare, en pleine répression « béaliste », que : « dire que la Tunisie est une dictature univoque me semble exagéré ». N'y a-t-il pas dans ces circonstances un risque de collision entre des intérêts nationaux divergents ?

Dans l'intérêt de la France et des autres nations, il est nécessaire d'engager une démarche authentiquement républicaine en mettant fin à la double nationalité et de demander à chacun de nos compatriotes placés dans cette situation, de choisir son allégeance : la France, ou un autre pays.

Devant l'inaction du chef de l'Etat et du gouvernement, le FN veut porter haut et fort les aspirations du peuple français, qui n'est pas réellement représenté à l'Assemblée Nationale. **Le Front National lance une pétition pour l'abolition de la double nationalité.**

Marine Le Pen et le FN proposent :

- ➔ La suppression de la double nationalité en laissant à chaque binational un délai raisonnable pour choisir le pays auquel il souhaite appartenir.
- ➔ La déchéance de leur nationalité française pour les binationaux condamnés pour des faits délictuels ou criminels.
- ➔ La réforme en profondeur du code de la nationalité en supprimant notamment le droit du sol qui permet à n'importe quelle personne née en France de bénéficier de la nationalité française.

MARINE LE PEN DÉFEND LES FRANÇAIS Rejoignez le Front National !

CONTACT

Nom : _____ Prénom : _____

Adresse : _____


Code Postal : _____ Ville : _____

Courriel : _____ Téléphone : _____

☐ Je soutiens l'action du FN pour la suppression de la double-nationalité

☐ Je souhaite adhérer au Front National (chèque à l'ordre de «FN») :

Adhésion : ☐ jeunes (15 €) ☐ sociale (30 €) ☐ simple (50 €) ☐ soutien (90 €)



COUPON À RETOURNER À :
FN - 78, rue des Suisses - 92000 NANTERRE
Tél. : 01 41 20 20 00 - www.frontnational.com

(Source: Marine Le Pen. 2012).

Picture 4 (Page 1)

ISLAM RADICAL

IL FAUT EN FINIR AVEC LE LAXISME DE L'UMPS

Les horribles massacres qui ont eu lieu en mars à Montauban et à Toulouse ont apporté la preuve de ce que Marine LE PEN avait déjà souvent dénoncé : le fondamentalisme islamique s'est développé dans notre pays et constitue un péril pour les Français. La situation est d'autant plus préoccupante que les autorités politiques font preuve d'un laxisme total, les promesses électorales n'étant jamais suivies par des actes.

DÉVELOPPEMENT DU FONDAMENTALISME ISLAMIQUE EN FRANCE

Au pouvoir depuis 5 ans, l'UMP a favorisé le développement d'un « islam en France » plutôt que d'un « islam de France », en créant le Conseil français du culte musulman (CFCM) et en permettant aux musulmans non français d'y être représentés. De plus, **les différentes tendances de l'islam bénéficient, au sein du CFCM d'une représentation proportionnelle à l'importance de leurs mosquées.** Ainsi, celles qui reçoivent des soutiens et des financements provenant de puissances étrangères, sont favorisées.

LAXISME DU GOUVERNEMENT FACE À LA MENACE TERRORISTE

En 2007, le candidat Sarkozy s'était engagé à traquer toute forme de criminalité, notamment « en nettoyant les caves » dans certains quartiers. Comme toutes les autres, ses promesses n'ont été que des mots.

Depuis 5 ans, le gouvernement n'a pris aucune mesure pour éradiquer la menace terroriste. Le cas de Mohamed Merah est emblématique : condamné 15 fois par la justice, s'étant manifesté par des propos favorables à Al Qaida et ayant effectué plusieurs « stages » de formation au combat en Afghanistan, il restait libre de ses faits et gestes alors même que les services de renseignements l'avaient repéré !

M. Beschizza, conseiller de M. Sarkozy pour les questions de Sécurité, indiquait le 22 mars que **le gouvernement avait expulsé en 2011 « 10 personnes » liées à la mouvance islamiste !** Un chiffre dérisoire par rapport à l'ampleur du phénomène.

D'autre part, **Sarkozy et le gouvernement, ont supprimé 15 000 postes de policiers et de gendarmes depuis 5 ans** ce qui prive les forces de sécurité des effectifs suffisants pour mener à bien leurs missions de renseignement et de maintien de l'ordre.



AU VERSO LES PROPOSITIONS DE MARINE LE PEN POUR LA SÉCURITÉ DES FRANÇAIS

(Source: Marine Le Pen. 2012).

Picture 4 (Page 2)

IL EST URGENT D'AGIR CONCRÈTEMENT CONTRE L'ISLAMISME :

- **Expulsion de tous les délinquants étrangers.**
- **Fouilles et contrôles systématiques de tous les quartiers susceptibles d'abriter des individus ou des mouvements islamistes.**
- **Contrôle très strict des mouvements politico-religieux et de leurs prêches, notamment dans les prisons.**
- **Interdiction de tout financement des activités culturelles par des puissances étrangères (Qatar, Arabie Saoudite, etc.).**
- **Reconstitution des moyens et des effectifs de police affectés à la lutte contre toutes les formes de criminalité.**



LE 22 AVRIL, VOTEZ

MARINE LE PEN

LA CANDIDATE QUI DÉFEND LE PEUPLE FRANÇAIS

Nom Prénom

Adresse

Ville

Tél. Mail @

☐ je soutiens l'action de Marine Le Pen

☐ je souhaite adhérer au Comité de soutien de Marine Le Pen

☐ je souhaite rencontrer un représentant local de Marine Le Pen



COUPON À REMETTRE À :
CMLP 2012 - 78, rue des Suisses - 92000 Nanterre - 01 41 20 26 26

(Source: Marine Le Pen. 2012).

Appendix 3



(Source: La France forte. NS. 2012).

Reference list

Secondary sources

Andersen, Robert and Jocelyn Evans. 2003. Contemporary developments in political space in France. In *The French Party System*, ed. Evans, Jocelyn. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. ed. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

BBC. 22 March, 2012. "Shooting in Tolouse and Montauban. What we know". <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-17428860> Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Bell, David. 2002. *French Politics Today*. Manchester University Press: Manchester

Berezin, Mabel. 2009. *Illiberal Politics in Neoliberal Times. Culture, Security and Populism in the New Europe*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

Camus, Jean-Yves. 1989. Origine et formation du Front National in *Le Front National à Decouvert*, ed. Mayer, Nonna and Pascal Perrineau. Presses de la fondation nationale des sciences politiques.

Carrera, Sergio. 2009. *In Search of the Perfect Citizen?: the intersection between integration, immigration, and nationality in the EU*. Brill: The Netherlands.

Clift, Ben. 2003. PS intra-party politics and party system change. In *The French Party System*, ed. Evans, Jocelyn. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Cole, Alistair. 2003. Stress, strain and stability in the French party system. In *The French Party System*, ed. Evans, Jocelyn. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Davies, Peter. 1999. *The National Front in France. Ideology, discourse and power*. Routledge: London and New York.

Der Valk, Ineke. 2000. Parliamentary Discourse on Immigration and Nationality in France. In *Racism at the Top. Parliamentary Discourses on Ethnic Issues in Six European States*. Ed. Ruth Wodak and Teu Van Dijk. Klagenfurt, Austria: Drava Verlag.

European Jewish Press. 10 April, 2007. *France's extreme-right candidate evokes Sarkozy's immigrant roots*.

<http://www.ejpress.org/article/15764> Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Evans, Jocelyn. 2003. *The French Party System*. Manchester University Press: Manchester

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.

- Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2000. in *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. ed. Titscher, Stefan, Michael Meyer, Ruth Wodak and Eva Vetter. SAGE Publications.
- Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Discourse as Social Interaction*. ed. Teun A. Van Dijk. SAGE Publications.
- Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Ed. Teun A. Van Dijk. SAGE Publications.
- Gill, Rosalind. 2000. Discourse Analysis. In *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound : A Practical Handbook*. ed. Bauer, Martin and George Gaskell. SAGE Publications.
- Grunberg, Gerard and Etienne Schweisguth. 2003. French Political Space: Two, three or Four Blocs? *French Politics*. November 2003, Volume 1, Number 3 (331-347).
- Howarth, David and Georgios Varouxakis. 2003. *Contemporary France: An Introduction to French Politics and Society*. Arnold.
- Ivaldi, Gilles. 2003. The FN split: party system change and electoral prospects. In *The French Party System*, ed. Evans, Jocelyn. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Kesselman, Mark, Krieger, Joel and Joseph, William. 2010. *Introduction to Comparative Politics: political Challenges and Changing Agendas*. Cengage Learning: Wadsworth
- Knapp, Andrew. 2003. From the Gaullist movement to the president's party. In *The French Party System*, ed. Evans, Jocelyn. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Knapp, Andrew and Vincent Wright. 2001. *The Government and Politics of France*. London, Routledge.
- Kokoreff, Michel, Steinauer, Odile and Barron Pierre. 2006. *Les émeutes urbaines à l'épreuve des situations locales. Récit d'enquête et dimensions d'analyse*. Sociologies.
<http://sociologies.revues.org/index254.html>
- Libération, 29 April, 2012. *Le vote Front national supprime ses frontières*.
- Mayer, Nonna and Pascal Perrineau. 1989. *Le Front National à Decouvert*. Presses de la fondation nationale des sciences politiques.
- Merkel, Peter and Leonard, Weinberg. 2003. *Right-Wing Extremism in the Twenty-First Century*. FRANK CASS PUBLISHERS.
- Rydgren, Jens. 2004. *The Populist Challenge*. Berghahn Books: New York, Oxford.
- Sahlins, Peter. 2006. *Civil Unrest in the French Suburbs*, November 2005. Social Science Research Council.

<http://riotsfrance.ssrc.org/> Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Shields, James. 2007. *The Extreme-right in France: from Pétain to Le Pen*. Routledge: London and New York.

Simmons, Harvey. 1996. *The French National Front. The Extremist Challenge to Democracy*. Westview Press.

Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer. 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. SAGE Publications.

Zuquete, Jose Pedro. 2008. The European Extreme-Right and Islam: New Directions? *Journal of Political Ideologies*. Volume 13, Number 3, October 2008 , pp. 321-344(24).

Primary sources

Débat 2007. *Electoral programme of Sarkozy. Fiche résumé, Nicolas Sarkozy – UMP*. http://www.debat2007.fr/wiki/index.php/Fiche_r%C3%A9sum%C3%A9:_Nicolas_Sarkozy_-_UMP#Immigration_et_int.C3.A9gration

Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Election présidentielle. 2007. *Programme de gouvernement de Jean-Marie Le Pen*. <http://www.lepen2007.fr/pdf/Programmejmlp2007.pdf>

Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Legifrance. 2006. *Loi n° 2006-911 du 24 juillet 2006 relative à l'immigration et à l'intégration*. <http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000266495>

Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Legifrance. 2007. *Décret n° 2007-999 du 31 mai 2007 relatif aux attributions du ministre de l'immigration, de l'intégration, de l'identité nationale et du codéveloppement*. 2007.

<http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000822866&dateTexte=&categorieLien=id>

Last accessed May 27, 2012.

Le Programme de Nicolas Sarkozy, 2012. (11). *Accueillir moins d'immigrés pour mieux les intégrer*. La France forte. - <http://www.lafranceforte.fr/programme>

Last accessed May 27, 2012.

Libération. 2 May, 2012. *Un débat qui tombe à piques. Immigration*.

Programme electorale: *Fiche résumé, Nicolas Sarkozy – UMP*. 2007.
http://www.debat2007.fr/wiki/index.php/Fiche_r%C3%A9sum%C3%A9:_Nicolas_Sarkozy_-_UMP

Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Programme electorale. Marine Le Pen. 2012. *Immigration. Stopper l'immigration, renforcer l'identité française*. <http://www.marinelepen2012.fr/le-projet/autorite-de-letat/immigration/>

Last accessed May 27, 2012.

Votons info. 2007. *Comparer les propositions de Nicolas Sarkozy, Jean-Marie Le Pen sur le themes : Société, Immigration, Famille*.

<http://presidentielle2007.votons.info/2007/election-presidentielle/comparer/candidats-sarkozy-le-pen/9-33/theme-societe-immigration-et-famille/18>

Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Pictures

EMAJ Magazine. 20 January, 2011. *Anti-Islam: New recipe of French right-wing*.

<http://emajmagazine.wordpress.com/2011/01/20/anti-islam-new-receipt-of-french-right-wing/>

Last accessed May 25, 2012.

La France forte. NS 2012. 2012. Infographies. *Immigration*.

<http://www.lafranceforte.fr/medias/infographies/immigration> Last accessed May 27, 2012.

Marine Le Pen. 2012. Tractes et affiches. *Double Nationalité. Il faut en finir!*

http://www.marinelepen2012.fr/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/tract_double-nationalite.indd_.pdf

Last accessed May 25, 2012.

Marine Le Pen. 2012. Tractes et affiches. *Immigration Officielle*.

http://www.marinelepen2012.fr/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/depliant_cmlp_immigration.pdf

Last accessed May 25, 2012.

Marine Le Pen. 2012. Tractes et affiches. *Islam Radical*. http://www.marinelepen2012.fr/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/tract_islamisme.pdf Last accessed May 25, 2012.

Marine Le Pen. 2012. Tractes et affiches. *Le Danemark Contrôle Ses Frontières. Pourquoi Pas Nous ?*

http://www.marinelepen2012.fr/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/tract_danemark.indd_.pdf

Last accessed May 25, 2012.

Reuters. 2007. *Le Pen gains as French presidential campaign starts*.
<http://www.reuters.com/article/2007/04/09/us-france-election-idUSL0910033220070409>

Last accessed May 25, 2012.

Speeches

YouTube. 11 September, 2011. *Très bon discours de Marine Le Pen sur l'immigration*. Nice.
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sKtXgefhCIw> Last accessed May 27, 2012.

YouTube. 16 November, 2011. *Jean-Marie Le Pen vs Nicolas Sarkozy sur l'immigration*.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6VCze_MpKso Last accessed May 27, 2012.

YouTube. 26 November, 2011. *Nicolas Sarkozy en débat à la télévision sur immigration*.
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hsRqXbwcQY4> Last accessed May 23, 2012.

YouTube. 2 May, 2012. *Débat entre Sarkozy et Hollande: Immigration et Islamisation*.
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x0vpKN2Eweo> Last accessed May 27, 2012.

Statistics

L'Institut BVA. 2012. *Intention de vote aux élections législatives de 2012 et questions d'actualité*.

http://www.bva.fr/data/sondage/sondage_fiche/1136/fichier_intention_de_vote_legislatives_et_questions_dactualite_bva-orange-spqr-rtl10f8d.pdf Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Migration Policy Institute. 2007. *Immigration and the 2007 French presidential elections*. No.3.
http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/France_Elections050307.pdf Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Ministère de l'Intérieur, de l'Outre-mer, des Collectivités territoriales et de l'Immigration. 2007.

Résultats de l'élection législative 2007.

http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/sections/a_votre_service/elections/resultats/accueil-resultats/downloadFile/attachedFile_2/Leg_07_FE_METRO_OM.xls Last accessed May 27, 2012.

Ministère de l'Intérieur, de l'Outre-mer, des Collectivités territoriales et de l'Immigration.

Résultats électoraux en France.

[.http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/sections/a_votre_service/elections/resultats](http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/sections/a_votre_service/elections/resultats)
Last accessed May 23, 2012.

Ministère de l'Intérieur, de l'Outre-mer, des Collectivités territoriales et de l'Immigration. 2012.
Résultats de l'élection présidentielle 2012.

<http://elections.interieur.gouv.fr/PR2012/FE.html> Last accessed May 23, 2012.