This article discusses the political rhetoric regarding immigration and the presence of immigrants declared by the French presidential candidates in the 2017 French presidential election. The issue of immigration is one of the most important aspects of French domestic and foreign policy. The purpose of this study is to determine the perceptions and acceptance of immigrants from the 2017 French presidential candidates, and their impact on the French public. The theory used in this research is Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional models, namely the microstructural, mesostructural, and macrostructural dimensions. The data taken is the first source in the form of newspapers, online media, books, and journal articles. The results of this study indicate that the political rhetoric by presidential candidates in the 2017 French presidential election campaign forms its own identity and acceptance of immigrants in the French public view. Five French presidential candidates presented rhetoric related to immigration and the existence of immigrants with different framing according to the party ideology they adhere to. However, the rhetoric presented by presidential candidate Macron from En Marche! is more acceptable to French society than other presidential candidates.
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INTRODUCTION

Immigration is one of the consequences of globalization. Immigration will always involve state institutions when it comes to national security and stability issues (Sassen, 1998). Immigration in Europe is described as a mass movement of people from developing countries who move to more developed countries (Van Mol, 2016). France was one of the developed countries in Europe that granted permanent immigration permits after the second world war (Vickstromm, 2019). However, from 1973 to 1990, immigration policy in France focused on reducing the number of immigrants entering. This was due to socioeconomic restructuring and the oil crisis of the 1970s.
which resulted in business owners or companies in France no longer needing foreign workers (De Haas, 2018). The condition caused high unemployment rates and gave room to xenophobic sentiment to influence public opinion over the presence of immigrants living in France at the time (Edo, Giesing, Öztunc, Poutvaara, 2019).

The issue of immigration is the most important aspect of public policy instruments in France. Political party leaders are trying to use campaign rhetoric attributed to immigration policy to get closer to the public. It is inseparable from the causal relationship with the French presidential election system that allows the winner to lead the government completely, so that political partisan groups in France are actively using social, economic, cultural issues in gathering supporters in presidential elections (Murray, 2010). Then, the debate over national identity and immigrants took a new chapter after the rejection of the Ratification of the European Constitution-building Treaty Referendum or the constitution on ratification of the treaty on the establishment of the European constitution by France in 2005 (Mazzucelli, 2007). The ratification aims to simplify a series of overlapping agreements, provide a legal basis, establish the basic rights and obligations of EU society, clarify the relationship between member states, and improve the decision-making process in the EU. In short, this ratification is a mandate to grant more powers to the E.U., so that member states do not have absolute sovereignty. As a result, emerging new generation of presidential candidates such as Nicolas Sarkozy from Union pour un Mouvement Populaire (UMP party), and François Holland from Parti Socialiste (PS). They used the momentum to gain sympathy from the public by using issues related to the impact of ratification of the treaty on the establishment of the European constitution, such as borders, national identity, immigration, and the economy (Hobolt, Brouard, 2011).

The campaign debate over the concept of national identity took place during the 2017 French presidential election campaign, especially since the immigration crisis in Western Europe and France in 2015. The immigration crisis is a crisis over quotas of migrants and refugees that are not on par with the aid prepared by the EU. From July 2015 to May 2016, over 1 million people have applied for asylum in Europe (Connor and Krogstad, 2016; Eurostat, 2016). That figure is huge when compared to the previous two years. Immigrant arrivals numbered 431,000 in 2013 and 627,000 in 2014 (Council of The European Union, 2016; Eurostat, 2016). Most of the international protection requests came from asylum seekers from Syria: 125,000 in 2014, and 363,000 or 29 percent of total asylum applications in 2015. This wave of asylum seeker immigrants requires E.U. member states to overhaul border control agencies, inspection officers, humanitarian services and budgets. Based on these conditions, in April 2015, the United Nations referred to the immigrant crisis as "A Tragedy of Epic Proportions". France agreed to accept 6,700 asylum requests in 2015, and pledged to take in 24,000 refugees over the next two years (Binneh, 2015). Therefore, during the 2017 French presidential election campaign, the narrative on immigration, especially with regard to terrorism, religion, and integration became one of the main themes in political campaign
rhetoric in France. Political rhetoric is the art of persuasion that uses grammar and logic to shape a discourse and policy. Rhetoric aims to inform, persuade or motivate a particular audience in certain situations (Cockcroft, 2015).

The study analyses speech rhetoric that talked about immigration policies and issues from right, center and left parties in the French presidential election in 2017. The study includes an analysis of marine Le Pen's speech rhetoric from Front National; Emmanuel Macron of En Marche!, Benoît Hamon of Parti Socialiste; François Fillon of Les Républicains; Jean-Luc Melenchon of La France Insoumise. Previous research on immigration issues has been conducted. One is about negative attitudes towards the wave of immigration. People who feel they don't get the things they deserve from the government are more likely to have concerns about immigration (Poutvaara & Steinhardt, 2015). Several empirical studies document that immigration led to an increase in the political success of extreme right parties in Spain (Mendez & Cuitillas, 2014), in Germany (Otto & Steinhardt, 2014), in Denmark (Gerdes & Wadensjo, 2010), in Austria (Halla et al, 2013), and in the United States (Mayda et al, 2016). Some studies have also shown that extreme right parties such as the Front National (Carvalho, 2014) and the main left populist party La France Insoumise (Ivaldi, 2019) have an impact on the establishment of France's immigration policy. However, to date no research has been found that uses Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1995) to analyze political rhetoric, as well as its relation to political ideology and immigration issues strategically raised by the five 2017 French presidential candidates.

METHODOLOGY

Discourse Analysis (CDA) by Norman Fairclough (1995) is used in this study. Ideology has been an important part of Fairclough's development of the CDA. He sees ideology as an important element of the process by which power relationships are established, maintained, enforced, and transformed. For him ideology and language are unity. In his study, Fairclough used a three-dimensional framework to analyze the relationship between social practice and political discourse. In the first dimension (microstructural), Fairclough analyses texts about its grammatical structure, one of which is in the form of words used. In the second (mesostructural) dimension, it connects the text with its discursive practices, namely: a set of practices related to the reproduction of knowledge (discourse) and state power. It relates to the production, distribution, and context of the text. In this layer the discourse of the text is very important, because it shows how the text contributes to the entire discourse. The third dimension is social practice (macrostructural). This relates to text and discourse as an overall social practice.

Fairclough also stated that there are three important scalpels used by the CDA to see the dominance of political ideology manifested in people's lives created by political power leaders through rhetoric, namely: word choice, position of power, and identity. Furthermore, this research
uses the first and second sources. According to Topolski (1976), the source-based or first source is data in the form of chronicles, autobiographies, memoirs, newspapers, public publications, personal letters, diaries, meeting minutes, and literature for analysis. The second is a non-source-based source or the second source is a book or journal article that provides ideas in the research process (Sjamsuddin, 2007). In this study, the authors used newspapers and public publications from various media in France such as Le Figaro, Le Monde, France 24, RTL, and so on as the first source. Previous scientific research on French immigration, rhetoric and politics, sourced from scientific books and journals such as Ipsos, SAGE Publications, and others were used as a second source. In the end, this article shows why French presidential candidates during the 2017 French presidential election campaign used the issue of immigration and the presence of immigrants as one of the political tools, as well as the impact of that rhetoric on the French public. The three-dimensional framework by Fairclough is used as an approach to look at the political ideology and immigration discourse embraced by the five French presidential candidates in 2017. The three-dimensional framework is also used to study how French 2017 presidential candidates view the status quo (temporary state) of immigration issues, and the immigration policies implemented (open, controlled, and closed).

POLITICAL PARTY BACKROUND OF THE 2017 PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Table 1.
Five Parties and Their Candidates in the 2017 French Presidential Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Parties</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front National</td>
<td>Marine Le Pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Républicains</td>
<td>François Fillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Marche!</td>
<td>Emmanuel Macron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parti Socialiste</td>
<td>Benoît Hamon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La France Insoumise</td>
<td>Jean-Luc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mélenchon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Front National

Front National is an extreme right political party in France. Since its inception in 1972, the party has been known for its anti-immigration discourse. Another key policy is the rejection of
France's membership in NATO, the European Union, the Schengen area, and the eurozone. The party also supports economic intervention and protectionism. The party has managed to unite various French nationalist movements since then. Front National was one of the parties that did not have strong public vote support during the first ten years it was formed, but since 1984 it has been a major force of French nationalist groups (Ivaldi, 2005). In 2015, the Front National successfully placed its position as a major political party in France. This is evidenced by municipal elections held on March 23 and 30, 2014. Front National won mayoral elections in 12 cities. National Front also received 4,712,461 votes in the 2014 European Parliament elections, with 24.86% of the vote and 24 of the 74 seats in parliament. For the first time in the history of politics in the European Union, the anti-immigrant, anti-EU party won national elections in its four-decade history (Quencez, Michelot, 2017). Reported by online media France 24, on March 11, 2018, Marine Le Pen proposed renaming the party to Rassemblement National, and the renaming of the party was confirmed with the approval of 80.81% of party members in the congress on June 1, 2018.

Les Républicains

Les Républicains is one of France's conservative-liberal parties or it can also be classified as a center-right party of the political spectrum. François Fillon, the party's presidential candidate, is a veteran conservative politician who was prime minister under former president Nicolas Sarkozy who was defeated by Hollande in 2012. Fillon's victory over Sarkozy and Alain Juppé in the party's candidate exchanges at the end of 2016 was a surprise, given Sarkozy and Juppé have always been strong candidates in the electoral market record. Fillon's victory was inseparable from the notion that he was the breather of the policy differences offered by Sarkozy and Juppé. In his candidate's proposal, Fillon advocated significant cuts in public spending, including cuts to 500,000 civil servant jobs. He also called for the lifting of economic sanctions against Russia and more cooperative relations with Moscow (Belkin, 2017).

En Marche!

En Marche! founded by Emmanuel Macron on April 2016. Macron was a former French economy minister during the leadership of the French president, François Hollande, in 2012-2017. He was a pioneer of Hollande's economic policies that liberalized the labor market and deregulated several sectors of the economy. In August 2016, Macron resigned from the government to lead a centrist political movement, a movement based on alternative political views that illustrates acceptance or support for a balance between egalitarianism and a particular social hierarchy or
response (Fougère, Barthold, 2020). This view shifts people's political position not to be left or right, even sometimes voicing the dualism of political tradition (Mastropaolo, 2008). En Marche! Focusing almost exclusively on plans to restore economic, social growth, and reduce unemployment. Macron is a strong supporter of free trade and the European Union (Belkin, 2017).

**Parti Socialiste**

Parti Socialiste is France's largest center-left party and one of the main political parties in France (Sawicki, 2013) with Benoît Hamon being the sole candidate of Parti Socialiste in the 2017 presidential election. Hamon had previously resigned as education minister in Hollande's government in protest against Hollande. It was reported by online media, the BBC, on 24 January 2017, that Hamon called for a universal basic income policy of around €750 for all French, a reduction in mandatory working hours from 35 hours to 32 hours, a tax on robots, and the legalisation of marijuana.

**La France Insoumise**

According to publication published on August 1, 2016 on La France Insoumise's official website, the extreme left-wing party was formed on February 10, 2016. Jean-Luc Mélenchon, the party's 2017 French presidential candidate, declared: "I want to represent and embody a rebellious and proud France, which has no straps". He stated that the goal is in the public interest of humans, and climate change has begun, now is the time to change the way production, exchange, and consumption patterns. He also opened a portal to his aspirations on the internet to lead a radical citizen revolution.

**ANALYSIS: SELECTED RETHORIC SAMPLES BY FIVE FRENCH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES 2017**

The first candidate is Marine Le Pen of Front National. In the first round of the presidential election debate, Marine Le Pen hardened her views on immigration policy at the time. Front National as a right-wing political party is well known as a party that has always placed the theme of immigration as the main focus of its attention for nearly forty years (Carter, 2005). A previous empirical study found that right-wing political parties in Western Europe tend to implement policies of protectionism of local culture and economy, and right parties have always associated this policy with the presence of immigrants who are considered to be able to disrupt economic stability and cultural homogeneity (Shehaj, Ronald, J Shin, 2019). The first presidential candidate
debate broadcast on TF1 on March 20, 2017 demonstrated Le Pen's vision and mission by submitting a referendum proposal to leave the European Union. He considers Schengen mobility access to be one of the easy accesses that make it easier for immigrant groups to enter France. He uses the nationalist power narrative as a cornerstone of populist rhetoric. Here's an excerpt of the rhetoric:

"Je vous suggère de vous rendre compte que la plupart des promesses faites ce soir ne peuvent être mises en œuvre, à cause de l'Europe, qui empêche la mise en œuvre de bonnes mesures. Vous, Français, vous avez le droit de décider par vous mêmes. L'indépendance consiste à décider par nous-mêmes. Vous avez le droit de vous protéger du pluralisme-insécurité qui est la conséquence de l'ouverture totale de nos frontières. La mondialisation sauvage a été un cauchemar pour vous. Il est temps de retrouver la protection de la Nation. Je ne ferai rien contre votre volonté. J'organiserai un référendum [pour quitter l'UE], je ne sais pas pourquoi vous voterez, mais ce qui est sûr, c'est que je respecterai l'issue de ce référendum. (...) J'appelle à remettre la France dans l'ordre. Il suffit de faire les bons choix politiques pour que la situation s'améliore immédiatement pour vous, pour vos enfants".

"I suggest you to realize that most of the promises made this evening cannot be implemented, because of Europe, which prevents the implementation of good measures. You, the French, have the right to decide by yourselves, an independence, to decide for ourselves. You have the right to protect yourselves from pluralism-insecurity which is the consequence of the total opening of our borders. Unbridled globalization has been a nightmare for you. It is time to regain the protection of the Nation. I will not do anything against your will. I will organize a referendum [to leave the EU], I do not know why you will vote, but what is certain is that I will respect the outcome of this referendum. (...) I call for putting France back in order. It is enough to make the right political choices for the situation to improve immediately for you, for your children ".

Figure 1
Excerpts of Le Pen's speech at the 2017 French presidential debate and its translation.

In an effort to make her agenda is more appealing, she held a meeting in Zénith in Paris in front of more than 5,000 people on April 17, 2017. Here's a summary of the speech on immigration policy proposals delivered that day:
Excerpts of Le Pen’s speech at a campaign rally in Zénith in Paris on April 17, 2017 and with translations.  


In the vision and mission delivery session, Le Pen used the word "madness" to describe the uncontrollable conditions of immigrants out there, so drastic new regulations were needed to address those conditions. Le Pen has portrayed herself as a hard-liner and is not easily influenced by external forces, comparing her stance to that of several presidential candidates. She also glorifies her own actions, by giving a foreseen of the future, this can be seen in part, "as president, the reassignment of the border will take effect the day after I take office". She was determined to remind people in France that the state of the country was not as expected, so France needed a change. "This uncontrollable situation brings us down". The lexicalization of the two adjectives 'out of control’ and “fall” illustrates that the ruling government has not been able to carry out the mandate of the people in stabilizing the country's problems caused by the migrant crisis in Europe and France. Le Pen regards people from abroad as a "field of votes" or a source of support for presidential candidates from right and center parties. She also wanted to show empathy to the
public and create consensus to reassure the public that her political rivals in presidential elections never prioritize local people first.

Le Pen created this consensus as if the 2017 French presidential candidates who side with immigrant groups are considered opportunists as they only think about voting for them. In ensuring national security, she negatively likened her competitors to trying to influence the minds of listeners to doubt the strength of her rivals in leading France forward. The rhetoric above was enough to make the crowd of supporters cheer happily, which was revived with slogans of the era of Jean-Marie Le Pen by singing: "France for France!". Then, on April 18, 2017, Marine le Pen reaffirmed her immigration policy rhetoric and proposals on a major French radio called RTL (Radio Télé Luxembourg). One of the key policy proposals is the establishment of a moratorium through reducing immigration quotas to 10,000 people a year. Here's a snippet of her immigration rhetoric:

"La réalité est que l'immigration est massive dans notre pays et que la submersion migratoire que nous vivons n'est pas un fantasme. C'est peut-être le secret le mieux gardé de la mondialisation : c'est son principe, son moteur. C'est un sujet dont aucun candidat n'a parlé et qui est un sujet de très vive inquiétude. (...) L'immigration pèse sur notre pays, elle n'est pas une chance, elle est un drame. Nous ne voulons plus de 230 000 immigrants légaux qui rentrent dans notre pays chaque année. Nous devons nous occuper des clandestins régularisés avec vengeance ".

"The reality is that immigration is massive in our country and that the migratory submersion we are experiencing is not a fantasy. It is perhaps the best kept secret of globalization: it is its principle, this is a subject that no candidate has spoken of and which is a subject of very great concern. Immigration weighs heavily on our country, it is not a chance, it is a tragedy. We no longer want 230,000 legal immigrants who return to our country each year. We need to take care of illegals who are regularized with a vengeance ".

Figure 3

Le Pen again used the immigration issue as a platform to position herself as the leading candidate in addressing domestic issues rather than any other candidate. Furthermore, as in her previous rhetorical summary, she portrayed the issue of immigration as something that deeply destabilizes the country and the dynamics of society. National Front candidate also no longer wants
230,000 official immigrants, regardless of whether they have an official residence permit to stay in France. In a meeting a day earlier in Paris, Marine Le Pen insisted that the 2015 terrorist attacks would not have happened in France if she had been in power, and she stated that the terrorist attacks were strongly related to open border policy.


"With the measures that I want to implement, [Chérif and Saïd] Kouachi and [Amedy] Coulibaly would not have obtained French nationality. Because when they were 18, they had a long criminal record and because they were delinquents, they would have been sent back from France. I intend to immediately expel all foreigners for links with jihadism. There is no reason why we should keep on the territory people who represent a danger to the safety of the French. The immediate reestablishment of the borders, with the help of the reservists who will be recalled, is an integral part of its plan to fight against this immigration. We cannot in particular against the major danger which weighs on us, which is terrorism, without controlling our borders ".

Figure 4.


In the rhetoric above, she was very persuasive in using the 2015 terrorist attacks and the presence of jihadist militiants as reasons that the border should be closed and heavily guarded. She mentioned two names of terrorist perpetrators to specifically reinforce evidence supporting the anti-immigration narrative. Le Pen wants to create the imagination in the minds of her supporters that she knows exactly the details of every immigration issue. Listeners will believe that Le Pen is clinging to concrete evidence. On the other hand, Le Pen created the imagination of the audience by using some dialectics, such as “they will be sent out of France” in the future. Using this strategy, Le Pen created the idea that terrorism has created a frightening situation, so that in particular it
must be resolved. With regard to her aspirations, this terrorism problem can only be solved by implementing her immigration proposal policy which is considered as the most accurate and solution to eradicate the basis of the problem.

The second presidential candidate in the 2017 French presidential election is François Fillon of Les Républicains. On a trip to Alpes-Maritimes, Nice on January 11, 2017, Fillon delivered an immigration speech proposing a quota system, selection of immigrants by region of origin, and an overhaul of the asylum system. Below is an excerpt from the immigration speech:

"La France doit non seulement lutter contre l'immigration clandestine mais elle doit aussi réduire son immigration légale au strict minimum. Nous ne devons pas céder aux injonctions de la bonne pensée, qui nous envoie toujours le même message, qui se veut angélique et qui est... en réalité, inconscient: liberté pour les migrants et honte aux frontières. 6 millions de chômeurs et près de 9 millions de pauvres en France, l'immigration doit être fermement maîtrisée et réduite au minimum. La France a le droit de choisir qui peut y adhérer. Les pays d'origine dans notre politique d'immigration sont une condition de l'aide au développement que nous leur versons et du nombre de visas que nous délivrons à leurs ressortissants. Il s'agit d'assurer une forme de réciprocité pour assurer le respect de notre souveraineté. Reconstituer le système d'asile pour mettre fin à tous les abus. Les demandeurs d'asile seront tenus de présenter une demande dans les 15 jours suivant leur entrée sur notre territoire, 120 jours au total, recours compris. En détention administrative lors de l'examen de leur demande, un délai maximum sera porté de 45 à 180 jours. En cas de rejet définitif, les candidats seront impérativement expulsés du territoire. Pour mener à bien son programme, je propose de réviser la Constitution mais aussi de changer les lignes d'interprétation que la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme donne à la Convention européenne des droits de l'homme".

unconscious: freedom for migrants and shame at the borders. 6 million unemployed and nearly 9 million poor in France, immigration must be firmly controlled and reduced to a minimum. France is entitled to choose who can join it. The cooperation of the countries of origin in our immigration policy to be a condition of the development aid that we pay them and of the number of visas that we issue to their nationals. It is a question of to ensure a form of reciprocity to ensure respect for our sovereignty. Rebuild the asylum system to put an end to all abuses. Asylum seekers will be required to submit an application within 15 days of entering our territory, 120 days in total, including appeals. In administrative detention during the examination of their application, a maximum period will be increased from 45 to 180 days. In the event of final rejection, the applicants will imperatively be removed from the territory. To carry out his program, I propose to revise the Constitution but also to change the lines of the interpretation that the European Court of Human Rights gives to the European Convention on Human Rights".
Unlike Le Pen who uses nationalist rhetoric and carries sentiments of instability in the country's security, Fillon blames immigrant groups for the economic downturn. This is supported by another interview on France 2 television, about the presence of too many immigrants in an interview. Fillon said, "Yes. France is currently unable to accept immigrants in decent conditions, everyone wants to come and live here. Therefore, we must reduce the number of immigrants" (source: https://www.france24.com/fr/20170112-quotas-choix-immigres-le-programme-tres-radical-fillon-matiere-immigration). Fillon's statement also proves some research, that some European countries confirm the competition of immigrants from countries that have low regional wages in an effort to find work in the destination country led to the populism of the right party (Malgouyres:2017; Colantone and Stanig:2018).

However, despite Fillon and Le Pen's political right view, they have different views on border policy. At the first round of presidential candidate debates, Le Pen sought to exit the European Union, the Schengen area, and limit the number of legal immigrants to 10,000 a year, while Fillon chose not to be too extreme in his repatriation policy. He continues to support the Schengen policy by proposing an overhaul of the system that benefits France at its borders (source: https://www.publicsenat.fr/article/politique/immigration-proposent-les-candidats-58929).

Earlier on January 2017, in southeastern France in front of about 2,000 supporters, Fillon also campaigned on immigration and terrorism, "France is generous, but that doesn't mean France is a region without borders. France has the right to choose who can join and that migrants must follow its rules and customs. In the context of the fight against Islamic totalitarianism, as long as Europe's borders are not controlled by the European Union, France will re-enforce its strict controls on its borders" (source: https://www.europe1.fr/politique/fillon-limmigration-doit-etre-fermement-controlee-et-au minimum-2948003). Based on the rhetoric, it is concluded that Fillon admits immigration contributes positively to the economic sector in France, even though he uses economic motives such as unemployment as an excuse to reduce the influx of immigrants to a minimum. Further, he exploited the terrorist narrative and linked it to the presence of immigrants to prove selectively controlled border policies.

The immigration policy that Fillon wants to implement is nothing new. Earlier in 2005, about 3,000 migrants left France voluntarily under a return fee scheme. In 2007, France under President Nicolas Sarkozy, a former French president who came from the same right party as Fillon (Les Républicains) offered €6,000 per immigrant family to return to their home countries. France has also deported large numbers of illegal immigrants in 2011 under the same president. 32,912
illegal immigrants were expelled in 2011, a 17 percent increase from the previous year. According to Claude Gueant, who was then French Interior Minister, the crackdown on illegal and legal immigration makes sense (source: https://www.challenges.fr/politique/observatoire-2012/les-objectifs-en-terme-d-immigration-ont-ils-ete-tenus_8791). Instead, he believes that it makes no sense to accept unemployed immigrants in France. Based on the rhetoric of the two far-right party candidates, although Fillon and Le Pen are both from the right party, it is clear that there are still differences between the two. Le Pen is extreme right, while Fillon is not very extreme. This can be seen from the proposed immigration policy, especially the border open-close policy. Fillon still has a motion of confidence in the acceptance of immigrants in France as long as they follow strict rules that have been set, and he still believes in the existence of the European Union and the Schengen Area, whereas Le Pen is the opposite.

The third French 2017 presidential candidate is Emmanuel Macron of En Marche! as the centrist party. In 2016, Angela Merkel as German Chancellor faced a wave of criticism over open border policies. Emmanuel Macron then took the opposite view from Manuel Valls as French Interior Minister who stated that "Europe cannot accept more refugees". On April 2016, Macron backed Merkel's decision on the grounds that "refugees are power" or "les réfugiés sont une force" when interviewed by a Belgian media outlet called Le Soir. Then, on January 2017, Macron reaffirmed his views on immigration in The World forum, that:

"La chancellerie Merkel et la société allemande dans son ensemble ont été à la hauteur de nos valeurs communes en accueillant des réfugiés en détresse. La menace terroriste doit nous conduire à mieux surveiller nos frontières, sans les fermer. Nous sommes tous berlinois, nous sommes tous européens".

"Chancellor Merkel and German society as a whole have lived up to our common values by welcoming refugees in distress. The terrorist threat must lead us to better monitor our borders. We are all Berliners, we are all European".

Figure 6
Macron's rhetorical quote in a column in Le Monde newspaper in 2017.

The above rhetoric refers to citizens, Europeans, and Berliners. Macron favors immigrant groups positively, as they are mentioned in the context of a strong force of solidarity. Reflecting on the migration issue, Macron implicitly stated that French and German society is one unity. In the sense
that this unity must be understood as respecting the other and its interests. Then, in his interview with the weekly media Réforme on March 2, 2017, Macron clearly expressed his views on immigration. Here is Macron's quote:

"Contrairement à ce que certains disent, nous ne sommes pas confrontés à une vague d'immigration. Le sujet de l'immigration ne devrait pas inquiéter la population française. L'immigration fait partie du monde dans lequel nous vivons. De surcroît, l'immigration se révèle être une chance d'un point de vue économique, culturel, social".

“Contrary to what some people say, we are not facing a wave of immigration. The subject of immigration should not worry the French population. (...) Immigration is part of the world we live in. In addition, immigration is proving to be an opportunity from an economic, cultural and social point of view”.

**Figure 7**


The first presidential candidate debate between the five candidates sparked opposition on immigration and secularism, especially between Emmanuel Macron and Le Pen. Through his official campaign website, Macron refuted Le Pen's restrictive and closed-door immigration policy proposals to immigrant groups by declaring the following speech:
“Le devoir de l’Europe est d’offrir l’asile à ceux qui sont persécutés et demandent sa protection. Il est aussi d’aider à traiter les causes des mouvements migratoires - sous-développement, famines, désordres climatiques. Mais l’Union européenne ne peut accueillir sur son sol tous ceux qui sont en quête d’une vie meilleure. Dans ce contexte, la France doit prendre sa juste part dans l’accueil des réfugiés. Elle doit délivrer des titres à tous ceux dont elle juge qu’ils ont droit à l’asile sur son territoire. Ceux qui en revanche ne remplissent pas les conditions pour se voir attribuer un tel titre et, en conséquence, demeurer sur notre territoire doivent pouvoir être effectivement reconduits à la frontière. Nous proposerons que chaque étranger en situation régulière arrivant en France ait droit à une formation linguistique suffisante pour atteindre le niveau B1 (niveau qui permet la naturalisation). Nous mettrons en place des programmes locaux d’intégration. L’immigration ne se résumant pas à la question des réfugiés, la priorité doit être portée par ailleurs sur l’intégration, dans le respect des équilibres locaux et nationaux. Nous allégeons les procédures et réduisons les délais d’obtention des visas « talents », pour améliorer l’attractivité de la France dans la compétition internationale pour attirer les talents étrangers (créateurs d’entreprises, d’investisseurs, de chercheurs ou d’artistes). Nous renforcerons le corps de police des frontières européen, en lui donnant une capacité de surveillance et de protection durables des frontières extérieures. Il faut fixer une ambition de 5 000 hommes mobilisables par la nouvelle Agence européenne de garde-frontières et de garde-côtes. Nous développerons des actions et des projets dans les principaux pays de départ et de transit des migrants, de manière complémentaire et additionnelle à notre aide au développement, en appuyant également l’installation de points de contrôle dans ces pays avant l’arrivée dans l’UE, l’aide à la lutte contre les passeurs et le retour des migrants non autorisés à entrer dans l’UE”.
“The duty of Europe is to offer asylum to those who are persecuted and ask for its protection. It is also to help address the causes of migratory movements: underdevelopment, famines, climatic disorders. But the European Union cannot welcome on its soil all those who are in search of a better life. In this context, France must take its fair share in welcoming refugees. It must issue titles to all those whom it deems to be entitled to asylum in its territory. Those who, on the other hand, do not meet the conditions to be granted such a title and, consequently, to remain in our territory must be able to be effectively returned to the border. We will propose that each foreigner in a legal situation arriving in France has the right to sufficient language training to reach level B1 (level which allows naturalization). We will put in place local integration programs. As immigration is not limited to the issue of refugees, priority must also be placed on integration, while respecting local and national balances. We are reducing procedures and reducing the time it takes to obtain “talent” visas, to improve the attractiveness of France in the international competition to attract foreign talents (business creators, investors, researchers or artists). We will strengthen the European border police force, giving it a capacity for lasting surveillance and protection of the external borders. We need to set an ambition of 5,000 men who can be mobilized by the new European Border and Coast Guard Agency. We will develop actions and projects in the main countries of departure and transit of migrants, in a complementary and additional way to our development aid, by also supporting the installation of checkpoints in these countries before the arrival in the country. EU, help in the fight against smugglers and the return of migrants not authorized to enter the EU.”

Figure 8
Rhetorical quotes from Macron in the official publication of En Marche! in 2017.

Emmanuel Macron as leader of the En Marche! in his policy proposals and rhetoric are very Euro-optimistic, liberal, advocates of reform, and further integration in the issue of the
immigration crisis. In several of his published speeches and interviews, he glorified the discourse of France and Europe that must safeguard its values, such as respecting human rights in dealing with immigration issues. He also called on the French people to ally in the fight against illegal immigration without negatively disregarding them. Referring to immigrant groups as a threat to France is not represented in Macron’s rhetoric. In contrast to Le Pen and Fillon, who position immigrant groups as security, socially, and, culturally dangerous. The immigration policies presented refer to the consensus of openness, but remain highly selective through integration class policies, and the establishment of a heavily guarded border control base. Therefore, Macron manifests the rhetoric of humanity, brotherhood, state security, solutions, integration, immigration groups in a combination of moderation, and stability.

The fourth French president of France 2017 is Benoît Hamon of Parti Socialiste. Unlike Le Pen, Fillon and Macron, Hamon’s rhetorical publications on immigration are met on average through live interviews in the media, unlike other candidates who tend to be on stage in front of supporters. Here is an interview conducted by Le Monde to Hamon in April 2017:

“Rappelons qu’en France, la solde migratoire n’a pas bougé depuis les années 1930. La crise des réfugiés à laquelle les Européens font face depuis 2015 est d’abord une crise de solidarité, y compris à l’égard des pays de premier accueil, la Grèce et l’Italie principalement. Je propose donc de travailler à une plus juste répartition des réfugiés entre nos pays. La France a accueilli moins que ce à quoi elle s’était engagée. La Commission européenne a mis sur la table une proposition, mais celle-ci est aujourd’hui bloquée en raison des réticences des uns et des autres, mais aussi, nous devons le dire, en raison de l’attentisme de la France. Mais cette solidarité s’adresse d’abord aux migrants. Il est inadmissible que des personnes continuent de mourir en Méditerranée en fuyant la misère et la guerre. Je propose donc la mise en place de visas humanitaires dans le cadre d’une politique globale d’amélioration des conditions d’accueil. Nous devrions aussi accorder une aide plus massive aux pays tiers directement affectés par cette crise comme le Liban, la Jordanie, la Turquie ou la Tunisie”.

“It should be remembered that in France, net migration has not changed since the 1930s. The refugee crisis that Europeans have been facing since 2015 is first and foremost a crisis of solidarity, including with regard to the first countries, mainly Greece and Italy. I therefore propose to work for a fairer distribution of refugees between our countries. France has welcomed less than it had committed to. The European Commission has put a proposal on the table, but it is now blocked because of the reluctance of each other, but also, we must say, because of the wait-and-see attitude of France. But this solidarity is aimed primarily at migrants. It is unacceptable that people continue to die in the Mediterranean fleeing poverty and war. I therefore propose the establishment of humanitarian visas as part of an overall policy of improving reception conditions. We will also have to grant more massive aid to third countries directly affected by this crisis, such as Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey or Tunisia”.
Benoît Hamon at his campaign meeting in Captieux on April 16, 2017 stated that he submitted a proposal for the establishment of humanitarian visas on a European scale. In 2015, France allocated 0.37% of gross national income for immigration needs and Benoît Hamon wants to reevaluate its value so that it will not be less than 0.7%. He also wants to revise Dublin’s policy of applying the principle on which asylum destination countries are fully responsible for the conditions of immigrants, he said "solidarity with EU countries" (source: https://www.publicsenat.fr/article/politique/immigration-que-proposent-les-candidats-58929).

Based on Hamon's discourse, his rhetoric resembles Macron's. Presenting the word, “French and Europeans” referring to unity as responsible for the migrant crisis from countries that are raging because of the war. In line with the above, Hamon is eager to highlight diversity in France. He is aware that France’s great power is the desire to reach agreement and compromise. He also refers immigrant groups neutrally and positively. It shows that he upholds humanist values. The acceptance of refugees in France provoked a mixed reaction. Solidarity to work together is the most needed as a solution to answer the problem. In Hamon's rhetoric, he summed up the combination of stability, centrality, and called for the introduction of a unified immigration policy. Based on his rhetoric, it can be concluded that Hamon tends to favor a controlled open border policy.

The fifth French 2017 presidential candidate is Jean-Luc Mélenchon of La France Insoumise. In Le choix de l’insoumission published on September 8, 2016, Jean-Luc Mélenchon expressed his views on immigration, that:
Immigration is a sensitive subject for Jean-Luc Mélenchon, himself an immigrant from Morocco. In the first round of presidential candidate debates, he dominated the debate on immigration. He denied to Le Pen and Fillon that:

“If we don’t want people to come, it is better that they don’t leave (...). We have to stop believing that people are leaving for pleasure. So let’s extinguish one after another the causes of their departure. They are very simple, it is war and misery. Once the people are there, what do you want to do? Throw it back into the sea? No, it is absolutely impossible. So it would be better if they stayed at home. I am tired of these discussions where fantasies clash with each other. Between those who scream without thinking and rely on unsubstantiated security expediens and those for whom it is normal that everyone can come where they want when they want”.

Figure 10
Excerpts from Mélenchon's opinion on Le Choix de l'insoumission on September 8, 2016.
Figure 11.
A speech excerpt from Mélenchon at the first round of presidential debates in 2017.

In April 2017, Jean-Luc Mélenchon delivered his campaign speech in Marseille in front of thousands of his supporters, saying:

“Puisque je venais à Marseille, on comprenait ce que j’ai dit naguère, il y a cinq ans, sur la plage du Prado à ce que je dirais aujourd’hui. Eh bien, hier comme aujourd’hui, je me réjouis que la France soit métissée et tous les enfants sont mes enfants. L’immigration est toujours un exil forcé, une souffrance. Éradiquer la cause des maux et mettre un terme aux guerres qui ravagent ces pays”.

“Since I was coming to Marseille, you understood what I said once, five years ago, on the Prado beach, to what I would say today. Well, yesterday as today, I am delighted that France is mixed and all children are my children. Immigration is always a forced exile, a suffering. To eradicate the cause of the evils and put an end to the wars which ravage these countries”.

“On propose des épuisettes qui ont des trous dedans. Vous pouvez inventer des quotas, des tickets. Celui qui passe à travers les mailles du filet, vous le jetez à la mer? Vous le frappez?
Ce n'est pas sérieux. L'immigration est un exil forcé. En Europe, en Espagne, en Grèce : un million de personnes sont parties. Croyez-vous que ça nous donne le droit de regarder tout ça de haut ? Si nous étions dans leur condition, alors nous partirions. Les miens sont partis de la misère. Voilà pourquoi je suis français et fier de l’être à présent”.

“We offer landing nets that have holes. You can invent quotas, tickets. The one that goes through the cracks, you throw it into the sea? Do you hit it? This is not serious. Immigration is forced exile. In Europe, Spain, Greece: a million people have left. Do you think that gives us the right to despise all of this? If we were in their condition, we would leave. Mine was born out of misery. This is why I am French and proud of it now”.

In April 2017, Jean-Luc Mélenchon delivered his campaign speech in Marseille in front of thousands of his supporters, saying:
Based on the three rhetorical quotes above, Mélenchon is determined to conquer the hearts of voters who are defensive on the issue of migration. Mélenchon never used negative connotation adjectives to describe immigrants. If compared to campaign rhetoric by candidates from center and left parties, candidates from far-right parties tend to still give distance when identifying immigrants in French society. Candidates from the right party use more adjectives, so it appears to have a more negative bias towards immigrants. Mélenchon of the leftist La France Insoumise party more often uses the presupposition of situation associated with humanist logic to appeal to the emotions of his listeners, such as describing the worst consequences if France does not help immigrants. Mélenchon also repeatedly stressed the root of the problem of the immigrant crisis, that not everyone is happy to leave their home country. Furthermore, he rejected Le Pen's policy proposals that wanted to implement a quota of immigrants as minimum as possible, he stated that:

"Mais est-ce que s'il venait 10,000 médecins s'installer en France, ce serait une chance? Oui".
"But would it be a chance if 10,000 doctors came to settle in France? Yes".

In that short answer, Mélenchon hints that not all immigrants coming to France had no talent and caused an economic downturn. He urged listeners to think positively rather than negatively to immigrant groups. Then, in La France Insoumise's presidential campaign program book, Mélenchon offers a wide range of programs to deal with the immigration crisis. He wants more ways of rescuing in the Mediterranean, an aid program in returning refugees who want it, banning the placement of immature immigrants in the country, and wants to build a new immigration crisis center that conforms to international standards in France. Based on the description of the program, it can be concluded that Mélenchon's immigration policy proposal is a controlled open border. That is in line with what Macron wants to implement as well. If Macron wants to address immigration issues by implementing strong integration policies through language and cultural classes, Mélenchon pays more attention to maintained security for incoming immigrant groups.
THE RHETORIC IMPACT OF THE 2017 FRENCH PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

The chosen words by 2017 French presidential candidates to describe the presence of immigrants and immigration problems in France has its own pattern. Presidential candidates from far-right parties (Le Pen and Fillon) use it to connect immigrant groups with negative representation, hence it shows the status quo how vulnerable France is to immigration issues. On the other hand, the election of words by three candidates from left and center-left parties tends to be close to humanitarian agenda. It gave rise to a motivation or humanitarian call to help immigrant groups as a French society. If associated with populism that has the main characteristic, namely antipluralism or antiinstitution, and as a concept that has adverse consequences of domestic and international politics for the rise of conflict and crisis in international politics (Metawe, May 2020; Gidron & Bonikowski, 2013), a characteristic of populism mentioned cannot be attributed to some candidates. However, those characteristics are very similar to the characteristics of Le Pen who is skeptical of the European Union, the Schengen area, and is tough on handling immigration issues.
Table 2
Words that refer to the immigrant condition of the rhetoric of five presidential candidates (2016-2017).
The choice of words in the political campaign rhetoric used by French presidential candidates represents that immigration is an important commodity in the presidential campaign. Some words hint that they see immigrants as a problem for France. Immigrants are seen as a marginalized group because they have no legal rights. One example was a speech in which two far-right party candidates (Le Pen and Fillon) used negative nationalism, terrorism and economic reasons to discredit the existence of immigrant groups. And three candidates from right and center parties used humanitarian reasons and the war crisis to help them. The precedent words used by all candidates show how powerless immigrants are because they have never had the full rights and obligations of citizenship. Furthermore, the rhetoric also raises the idea that immigrants have always been treated as an unequal group. However, there are also statements from Mélenchon about him who was once also an immigrant. This statement diminishes his superiority over immigrants, as he is considered to be able to understand the status quo of immigrants. On the other hand, Le Pen used words that demeaned the position of immigrants, by acknowledging her discomfort over the existence of immigrants. The results showed that Le Pen described immigrants’ identities as terrorists. Fillon described immigrants as the cause of the economic downturn, while Macron, Hamon and Mélenchon described the presence of immigrants as an oppressed group in desperate need of humanitarian assistance. Le Pen and Fillon unequivocally use negative words to describe immigrants. France's ideology as a multicultural country for immigrants is clearly revealed in the rhetoric of Macron and Mélenchon. They say it at least once in every speech. However, based on the political rhetoric of the five candidates above, there is basically one explicit equation. For the five presidential candidates, only law-abiding and integrated immigrants can become French citizens. This can be seen from the proposed immigration policy. Regardless of the proposed policy on open or closed borders, candidates have their own criteria for forming structured and law-abiding immigrant groups. From the obligation to pass a criminal background check, to having to attend a cultural integration class.

Furthermore, rhetorical words used from right parties such as oppression, nightmares, and shame to refer to the existence of immigrants, implying there is indeed a motion that French unity can be changed by the presence of immigrants. For the right parties, immigrant groups have their own power to change the French order socially, economically, and culturally. It can therefore be concluded that they view immigrants as a threat. This is evidenced by the closed border policy and the desire to leave the EU and Schengen areas proposed by Le Pen, and the selective and tightly controlled borders by Fillon without considering social and cultural integration programs. Regarding the identity findings, Le Pen described the identity of immigrants as terrorists, while Fillon cited immigrants as the cause of the economic downturn. Le Pen uses negative words like nightmares and tragedies as if to shape the delusion to her listeners that immigrants are a nightmare for France. In one of his rhetoric, she issued an example of the Charlie Hebdo terrorist attacks that took place in 2015 carried out by descendants of immigrants with Muslim backgrounds, namely:
Chérif and Saïd Kouachi and Amedy Coulibaly. This was done by Le Pen as a rhetorical tactic to stir up the emotions of her listeners that the existence of immigrants was harming France at the time.

In contrast, for two candidates from leftist parties: Hamon and Mélenchon, they propose an open controlled border policy. They offer several integration programs to help immigrants enter and integrate safely and comfortably. They also tend to use emphatic words in speech rhetoric to describe massive immigration causes such as war, misery, forced exile, crime, and humanitarian pressure. As for centrist Macron, he uses emotionally evocative phrases like "they're in trouble and we have to help them". He also sees immigrant groups as an economic opportunity and recognizes that the terrorist threat coming from them is inevitable, so there is an urgency to implement a conditional and tightly controlled open border and integration class policy.

Based on the explanation above, it concludes that left and center candidates saw immigrants as a group marginalized by unfavorable circumstances and had a position under French society. French 2017 presidential candidates from center and left parties pledged to help and control the presence of immigrants on humanitarian and solidarity grounds. In this section, it can be seen that the relationship of power and identity has an important role as one of the narratives of the campaigns of the five French presidential candidates of 2017. The power relationship disguised as rhetorical words from the five 2017 French presidential candidates is targeting supporters and could affect how society defines immigrants. Ultimately, it shapes immigrant identity among the public. Supporters of presidential candidates from far-right parties have negatively and cynically identified the existence of immigrants for the creation of disintegration and terrorism in France, so a motion to close the border is strictly and selectively voiced. On the other hand, presidential candidates from left and center parties actively identify the presence of immigrants as something that must be understood on humanitarian principles, so that solutions that can accommodate all parties without having to close borders must be implemented.

FRENCH SOCIETY’S PERCEPTION OF IMMIGRANTS IN 2017

The Arab Spring in the Middle East since 2015 has created a refugee crisis phenomenon in Europe. The issue has polarized views among EU member states. The number of illegal and legal immigrants in the EU continues to grow. That led to changes in the composition of society, and upheaval on the political stage of most European countries, especially in border countries that are under pressure. During the decade of 1990, the popularity of the party and the radical right movement grew, which was largely a reaction to the increasing number of illegal immigrants and terrorism of the time (Mudde, 2012). Post-2015 national elections across Europe in particular have confirmed the victory of anti-immigration trends fuelled by populism (Dennison, 2019). However, the trend of winning was not further confirmed in the French presidential election in 2017.
In July 2017, Ipsos as a research institute in France conducted an opinion survey on immigration issues in France. It found that 16% of French people believe immigration has a good impact on the French economy. 55% of the French public are worried about immigration putting pressure on public services, and 14% of French people believe the positive impact of immigration on France. Based on this empirical study, it was found that the acceptance of immigrants in France was very complex. Negative perceptions of immigrant groups in France are inevitable. But the reaction to the proposed border closures on refugees and migrants was also rejected by 46% of French people, which is slightly higher than the 40% support for closed borders (see image below).

Figure 14.
An opinion survey of the presence of immigrants for the French economy.
Opinion surveys of public concerns about the presence of immigrants are putting pressure on public services.

Figure 16
Opinion surveys of the changes caused by immigrants in society.

Figure 17
Opinion surveys on the positive impact of immigration in France.
Figure 18
A survey of support for closed border policies.


The results of research of the opinions of the French public on the presence of immigrants tend to be negative. However, the French public ultimately took an accommodating policy in addressing it. They not only rejected the populist motions of extreme right parties that demand closed-border policy and blame immigrants for problems in France, but also rejected an extreme left party motion allowing immigrant groups to enter without strict screening at the same time. The French chose to accept immigrant groups, but had to be with strong regulation through immigration policy proposals by Emmanuel Macron of En Marche! who was selective and chose open but strict controls on the border (controlled-open-border). The French agreed not to completely close the gap on immigrant groups who want to enter France and integrate through Macron's strict integration policies. The findings are consistent with previous findings that French society's attitude towards immigrants and refugees is closely related to the more general context in economic and political issues (IFOP & MIC, July 2017).
Unlike other political parties that already have ideological bases, En Marche! began by filtering French public’s opinion to formulate its own political principles and progress. The difference with other political parties is more on the innovation of "de l'engagement politique" or reform of political commitments. En Marche! adopts a centrist or middle principle or dualistic political conception. Regarding centrism, Duverger argues that political rivalry always occurs between left and right parties. At the same time, there may be centrist parties that unite the right and left moderates under one policy umbrella and put aside the extreme right and left. Duverger believed that in France, moderate elements of left and right would be divided, having opposing political ideologies (Duverger, 1951, 1964, 1965, 1967). Duverger's assumptions are evidenced by the emergence of En Marche!, and the election of Emmanuel Macron as French president in 2017. Indeed since the founding of En Marche!, the principles held firmly by this movement, are liberal and pro-European (Bugeau, 2017; Delaurens, 2018; Weber, 2017).

The 2017 presidential campaign is one of the most important political events. For the first time in the history of France's Fifth Republic, two candidates from the main parties did not qualify in the first round. The candidate who qualified for the second round was a young politician from a new party as well, Emmanuel Macron and En Marche!. Macron won (66.1% of the vote) over Le Pen (33.9%) in the last round has been widely predicted by political observers. One of them by an expert on European studies named Paul Belkin (April, 2017) in his research entitled “France's 2017 Presidential Election: In Brief”. Macron's social policies are considered far more progressive than Le Pen's. Macron has a more liberal stance on immigration while remaining selective, especially for immigrants from the Middle East and Africa, because he thinks immigration will have a positive impact on the economy (Dragvigny, 2017; Hewlett, 2017; Macron, 2017).

According to En Marche!, their policy represent groups of left and right moderates to fight extreme right and extreme left parties. En Marche! prefer to call itself a political movement rather than a political party, since its formation is not based on political ideological principles, such as republicanism and socialism. En Marche! was formed based on the principle of equality and the desire to overcome divisions (Elgie, 2018). According to Delaurens (2018), the mention of movement instead of party is a political revolution because it aspires to reform the country. In addition, divisions in major political parties, such as Parti Socialiste (PS), position En Marche! as a political movement capable of attracting a majority of French voters.

This phenomenon that occurred in the French presidential election in 2017 basically justifies that the political orientation of the left, right, center is strongly related to the main supporting variables for the establishment of immigration policy (Hix & Noury, 2007). The impact of immigration redistribution has made society increasingly partisan and ideologically divided (Gimpel & Edwards, 1999), and the orientation of the left tends to be more sympathetic to the rising tide of immigration (Milner & Tingley, 2008).
CONCLUSION

This study answers the three-dimensional framework by Fairclough for analyzing the relationship between social practice and Fairclough political discourse. In the first dimension (microstructural), Fairclough analyzes the text regarding word selection. The study found that right-wing parties tend to use negative and frightening connotations when describing immigrants. Le Pen and Fillon cannot identify immigrants as part of French society in absolute terms, while candidates from center, and left parties are willing to make them a unity. Candidates from center and left parties use more actual and humanist connotations to represent the migrant situation. In the second (mesostructural) dimension, Fairclough connects text with its discursive practice. It is related to the production, distribution, and context of the text. This second dimension is found in the findings of the impact of the rhetoric of the 2017 French presidential candidate's campaign speech that shaped the perception of immigrants in public view. Presidential candidates from far-right parties have established the identity of immigrants as a detrimental group, while Macron has succeeded in mitigating the identities of Europeans, French, and immigrants simultaneously. Macron established an immigrant identity as an opportunity to shape France's developed, open, and multiculturalist society. On the other hand, candidates from leftist parties through very humanist and concerned words shape the identity of immigrants as a highly marginalized group.

Then, the third dimension (macrostructural) is social practice. This relates to text and discourse as an overall social practice. In a sense CDA can be critical, if associated with full social practice. This third dimension is found in the link between the French presidential election and the very complex perception of the issue of immigrants in France in 2017. Despite the fact that the number of negative perceptions of French society towards the existence of immigrants was considerable at the time, the French public ultimately chose a selective and accommodating immigration policy through the victory of Emmanuel Macron of the centrist En Marche!.

The study also answers research questions as to why 2017 French presidential candidates are using the issue of immigration and the presence of immigrants as one of the political tools. Immigration is a sensitive topic and has always caught the attention of the French public based on a perception of immigration survey conducted by the Ipsos research institute in 2017. Through campaign rhetoric, the study acknowledges that immigration is an important issue in France. However, the approach to solving immigration problems differs from each party and candidate. This research only focused on the discussion of immigration discourse from the point of view of the ruler or stakeholders (politicians) of French politics and society. Further research is expected to examine discourse through perspective as a group of immigrants, so as to better understand why the identity that has been described in the discussion is always pinned to immigrants. This study explores the idea of how different rhetorical practices during election campaigns gave birth to different popular identities that could have different political consequences. Based on theoretical
discussions and empirical observations, this study is an interesting case for researchers to understand how political discourse is born in different locations and contexts. In addition, the 2017 French presidential election shows just how precarious the situation is for immigrants in France. The fact that they are a political commodity for all five candidates also indicates that their position is weak and in the hands of the ruler or the people in power in France, whoever is elected.
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