THESIS


"FRANCE DESERVES TO BE FREE": CONSTITUTING FRENCHNESS IN MARINE LE

PEN'S NATIONAL FRONT/NATIONAL RALLY



Submitted by

Lauren Seitz

Department of Communication Studies



In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2020


Master's Committee:

    Advisor: Karrin Anderson

    Julia Khrebtan-Hörhager
    Courtenay Daum

ABSTRACT

"FRANCE DESERVES TO BE FREE": CONSTITUTING FRENCHNESS IN MARINE LE PEN'S NATIONAL FRONT/NATIONAL RALLY

This thesis employs constitutive rhetoric to analyze French far-right politician Marine Le Pen's discourse. Focusing on ten of Le Pen's speeches given between 2015 and 2019, I argue that Le Pen made use of Kenneth Burke's steps of scapegoating and purification as a way to rewrite French national identity and constitute herself as a revolutionary political leader. Le Pen first identified with the subjects and system that she scapegoats. Next, she cast out elites, globalists, and immigrants, identifying them as scapegoats of France's contemporary identity split. Finally, by disidentifying with the scapegoats, Le Pen constituted her followers as always already French patriots and herself as her leader. This allowed her to propose a new form of French national identity that was undergirded by far-right ideals and discourse of revolution. This thesis presents several implications for understanding contemporary French national identity, the far right, and women politicians. It also contributes to the project of internationalizing public address research in Communication Studies.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, thank you to my advisor, Kari Anderson. I truly could not have completed this thesis without your guidance, encouragement, and advice. I also want to thank you for helping me with PhD applications and decision-making. Second, thank you to my committee members, Dr. Khrebtan-Hörhager and Dr. Daum. Dr. Khrebtan-Hörhager, I've loved having someone who I can speak French with and who can understand the cultural context of my research. Dr. Daum, your knowledge and understanding of women in politics is unparalleled; I want to thank you for contributing your valuable insights on my research from a different academic perspective. Thank you to my wonderful Communication Studies colleagues at Colorado State, especially Michelle Matter, Katie Patterson, Ben Pettis, and Taylor Weigel, for providing encouragement and advice, even as we all completed our theses from afar.

Thank you to my fiancé Andrew Campbell for all the support you've given me over the past two years of my Master's program—and for the next five years as I complete my PhD! Thank you for dealing with my stacks of library books in our office, for letting me talk your ear off about my research, and for helping me when technology and Microsoft Word formatting were not working properly. Thank you to all members of my family. Thank you to my parents for pushing me to continue my education in graduate school and for always wanting to hear about my work. I also want to thank my brother and grandparents for their encouragement and support. And, of course, thank you to my high school French teacher Elaine Jensen. You are responsible for cultivating my love of learning languages and traveling to different cultures. Without your passion for teaching, I never would have had the experiences that led me to graduate school and to a future career utilizing French language skills in my research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Chapter 1: Introduction

In May 2017, the world held its breath as the results of the French presidential election were announced. The two candidates could not be more different: Emmanuel Macron, a young centrist and former banker representing the new *En Marche!* (On the Move!) party versus Marine Le Pen, a far-right populist representing the *Front National* (National Front) party. At 8pm news sources announced an overwhelming victory for Macron, who won 66.1% of the vote compared to Le Pen's 33.9%.[1] Although this was Le Pen's second failed bid for president, the party did not lose momentum. Two years later, in May 2019, Le Pen's party, the newly-renamed *Rassemblement National* (National Rally) won more seats in the European Parliamentary election than any other French party, including that of President Macron, with 5.2 million votes. This massive electoral difference in only two years is the result of a split in France, "between Mr. Macron's France 'and peripheral France, which considers itself a victim of globalization,'" according to political historian Jean Garrigues.[2]

The latter view is that of the National Rally. A far-right party that was first founded in 1972 by Marine Le Pen's father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, the group has been known for its extreme anti-Semitic, Islamophobic, anti-European, and populist views. After Jean-Marie stepped down from party leadership in 2011, Marine Le Pen took over, winning a large percentage of the vote for party president. Although Marine's goal was to "de-demonize" the National Front, "the party remains faithful to the values of the National Front of Jean-Marie Le Pen."[3] As the rift within France continues to grow, the National Rally seems poised to take over political leadership and Marine Le Pen has the potential to take on another presidential run in 2022.

As the National Rally gains more power in France and abroad, it is becoming imperative to study the rhetoric of this group and, more specifically, of its leader. Marine Le Pen remains an understudied politician in the field of communication, and her ability to lead a growing political party warrants further scrutiny. Her ascent to power and the rhetoric she used to get there mirrors that of many other far-right movements around the world, as she appeals to rural voters who see themselves of victims of globalization.[4] She has also routinely called for a U.K.-style "Frexit" from the European Union and fights against the so-called "*Islamisation* [Islamitization] of France."[5] This reliance on fear-mongering and xenophobia has led to electoral success, especially as President Macron's approval levels dips at 32%.[6] By positioning herself as the opposition to the elite and current governmental policies, Le Pen has been able to place herself at the center of the crusade against Macron and acts as the savior of the everyday French person and traditional French identity that is being destroyed at the hands of liberal economic and cultural policies.

Given the power that Le Pen wields in the growing struggle for state control and voter support, along with the potential consequences of xenophobia and violence at her behest, she and her movement warrant more scholarly attention. Thus, for this thesis, I conducted a rhetorical analysis of ten speeches delivered by Marine Le Pen from 2015 to 2019. My guiding research questions were twofold: 1) In an era of competing discourse about nationalism and globalization, how does the French far-right conceptualize what it means to "be French"? and 2) How does Marine Le Pen constitute French identity through her discourse? Through my analysis, I argue that that Le Pen uses tactics of victimage and scapegoating to reconceptualize what it means to be French and constitute her followers as always already French patriots and herself as their

leader. As Le Pen scapegoats internal and external threats to the nation, she also engages in a revolutionary rhetoric that legitimizes and normalizes a far-right version of Frenchness.

Through my analysis, I found that Le Pen targeted three concrete enemies—elites, globalists, and immigrants—as scapegoats for France's identity problems. Relying on Kenneth Burke's tactics of scapegoating and victimage, Le Pen's discourse scapegoated these groups and portrayed the French people as victims. By demonizing these groups as national threats, Le Pen separated herself from these groups and instead aligned herself with the interests of the people, who she constituted as always already French patriots. This reconstitution of the people also allowed for a reconstitution of French national identity as undergirded by far-right beliefs and as contingent upon electing Le Pen and her followers to political leadership in an act of revolution.

This study not only increases scholarly understanding of the discourse of contemporary reactionary nationalism, but it also greatly contributes to current gaps in communication literature. This project helps to internationalize public address, as the majority of public address studies concentrate on English-speaking cultural contexts.[7] Moreover, this research contributes to the small body of literature about Marine Le Pen, the National Front/National Rally, and the French far right. In this introductory chapter, I present a literature review of relevant research on globalization, nationalism, national identity, and women's political leadership. Next, I detail my texts and the critical methodology that I utilized to analyze these texts. Finally, I present an outline of my thesis chapters.

Literature Review

*Globalization*

Since the 1970s, the term globalization has been used by academics and in popular press to explain the rapidly expanding and increasingly important ties between countries around the world. With the advent of new technologies and the Internet, governments and citizens from all over the world have been able to access more cultures and communicate more often and more effectively, thereby increasing global relationships with a variety of regions throughout the world. Scholars generally split theories of globalization into two different camps: globalists and skeptics. Globalists embrace the project of globalization as positive structural changes in how the world conceptualizes business, the economy, and governments. [8] Because this view of globalization champions an open and expanding marketplace and an increase of both "people and goods crossing borders," it is generally viewed as neoliberal in nature, one that "'hide[s] the effects of power.'"[9]

Skeptics, on the other hand, view globalization as a rhetoric that justifies a Western neoliberal takeover of global leadership and economy. In fact, Molefi Kete Asante characterizes the rhetoric of globalization as another form of colonialization because it often requires the adoption of Western ways of life and is encouraged by Western elites. Asante goes on to urge readers to "challenge this construction of reality to reveal its dirty underside as a hierarchical calculation of white supremacy."[10]

Regardless of the camp in which scholars find themselves concerning globalization, it is important to note that our understanding of globalization is discursively constructed via the language through which it is described. Thus, as Nilanjana Bardhan posits, the existence of the many points of view on globalization (such as globalists and skeptics) is solely the result of the variety of discourses on globalization: "they play a significant role in suggesting how human agents should make sense of, *and perform*, globalization."[11] In academia, however, this

discursive view of globalization has been largely ignored in favor of interpretation of its economic effects instead.[12]

Although it has been under-researched, the discursive construction of globalization has made it difficult for scholars and for popular press to agree on what globalization actually entails; in fact, many scholars recognize the concept of globalization as vague, to be understood in many different ways.[13] From the inception of the concept, it has largely been understood from an economic perspective, as countries united in trade and expanded their markets abroad, thus leading to trade wars and pressures to stay competitive.[14] Although economics undoubtedly plays a role in our understanding of globalization, it does not account for other factors that may impact globalization. For example, Marcos Ancelovici's study on anti-globalization protests in France found that, although France would (and currently does) benefit economically from growing globalization, inhabitants' protests were "the result of a political and cultural process conditioned by" previous social conflicts that took place in the 1990s.[15] Thus, in addition to economics, political and cultural aspects play large roles in how we may view globalization and its world impact.[16]

As such, the growth of globalization has a host of impacts in various cultures and countries around the world. At a global level, our understanding of globalization as primarily economic and political excludes women. Although often touted as a neoliberal opportunity for more freedom for women, discourse surrounding globalization often relegates women to the private sphere of child rearing and homemaking, leaving them unable to take part in the new potential political and economic roles that globalization would afford them.[17] Furthermore, globalization has large effects on singular nations in changing the culture, policy positions, media, and even language.[18] In a study on the New Zealand government's discourse on

globalization and the nation, Peter Skilling found that governmental rhetoric framed global competition as a catalyst to create a more concrete national identity for its inhabitants, as well as a shared vision for the future.[19]

As more nations embrace the calls of globalization, they welcome the advent of Western hegemony, especially in the form of the adoption of English. In Christof Demont-Heinrich's study of global English in U.S. American-owned newspapers, he explains hegemony of English and its detrimental effects:

> The hegemony of English refers to the hegemony of specific English language speakers and writers, meaning actually existing human social actors working toward the (re)production of a particular (global) linguistic order. The discourse of universal progress…frequently casts the global rise of English as an overwhelmingly progressive and positive development for the whole of humanity while glossing over the darker dimensions of this intensifying global social phenomenon—for example, the ways in which it discourages mother-tongue English speakers from acquiring fluency in other languages.[20]

The global takeover of English manifests itself in both native and non-native English speaking countries.[21] A set of interviews with elderly women conducted in South Korea, for example, found participants frustrated with their lacks of English-speaking abilities and the necessity to rely on their children or grandchildren to participate in consumer culture.[22] In addition to the global domination of English, it is important to remember in the context of this study that French is also considered an imperial language. As Stewart McCain explains, during Napoleon's reign over the French empire, the spread of the French language became crucial for both governmental and administrative purposes as well as for "the Napoleonic improvement of society." As such, the ability to speak and understand French became crucial for the leaders of groups that had been colonized by Napoleon as they acted as "cultural intermediaries," and the ability to speak French became connected to powerful leadership positions.[23]

The growing influence of the West as globalization expands not only detrimentally impacts cultures in the realm of language, but it can also be extremely harmful to the construction of nation and national identity. In fact, as Ulrich Beck points out, globalization actually "*weakens* the nation-state." This, in turn, allows for the return of the ethnic state in which state policies strengthen ethnic or neo-nationalism and promote xenophobic practices.[24] The rise of this type of nationalism, spurred on by globalization, is growing today around the world, especially in the United States and Europe. France in particular has seen an increase in reactionary nationalism led by the National Rally and Marine Le Pen as they fight against what they view as the growing economic, social, and cultural threat of globalization.

*Nationalism*

Though it may be tempting to separate the global from the local or national, scholars are quick to point out the necessary interconnectedness of the two concepts; however, they may not agree on the specifics of this relationship. For example, governments may respond to growing globalization by increasing their national identity discourse in an attempt to heighten national pride in its citizens.[25] For other scholars, the opposite occurs. Alev Çinar argues that globalization is actually a product of nationalism, writing "nationalist discourse itself produces, defines, and projects images of the 'global' as the backdrop against which the 'national' can be located and localized."[26] Yet another author pairs neoliberalism and nationalism as complementary, arguing that leaders have used neoliberal economic messages to communicate a nationalist message.[27] As such, globalization and nationalism can be seen as two processes that work in tandem and impact each other in distinct ways.

In order for either globalization or nationalism to exist, nations first must be conceptualized. Benedict Anderson writes that the nation is "an imagined political community"

which has three main characteristics: it is limited, sovereign, and a community.[28] Of these

characteristics, community is the most important because it explains why members can turn a

blind eye to societal inequality as well as why they may be willing to kill and die for their

nation.[29] Thus, according to Anderson, once a nation is imagined, nationalism follows

unwittingly, due to "the explosive interaction between capitalism, technology, and human

linguistic diversity."[30] The growth of nation-building and nationalism, Arjun Appadurai posits,

could stem from the fact that imagination has grown from only being used in myth and art to the

everyday, allowing ordinary people to participate in the imaginary creation of what their nation

and nationalism means.[31]

      Today, nationalism carries the connotation of an ideology carried by separatists or the far

right. However, it is important to remember that nationalism merely means a sense of national

pride that can be held by anyone, whether they are a part of the country or not. This type of

nationalism is typically not advanced in very overt ways. Rather, nationalism is reinforced in

everyday places and methods, a type of nationalism that Michael Billig terms "banal

nationalism."[32] Giving the example of the U.S. American flag hanging unassumingly outside a

U.S. post office, Billig notes that this type of nationalism is often mundane, but it is also a

constant reminder of the nation.[33] This type of nationalism is not merely visual; scholars also

posit that it can be inferred through linguistic choices, such as the use of pronouns ("we, us,

them") in public address and national news media.[34] Since the introduction of the concept of

banal nationalism in 1995, scholars have expanded this concept to study how banal nationalism

manifests itself online as the result of growing technology and globalization.[35] Moreover,

theories of banal Americanism and banal Europeanism have been proposed as scholars attempt

to understand American national identity and how European inhabitants view their identity in relation to both nation and Europe.[36]

Because nationalism is intertwined with government, politics, culture, societal norms, and the like, scholars have studied nationalism in a host different cultural contexts, including the United States, New Zealand, Iraq, Liberia, Turkey and France.[37] These nationalisms manifest in different ways and have different effects on those who may identify with a certain country. The power of nationalism to both empower citizens and contain them by restricting cultural norms should not be understated. In one experiment in the United States, researchers found that when Americans were shown advertisements with a strong patriotic message, they viewed the advertisement more positively. Moreover, the theme of U.S. American national identity was so strong that Asian Americans in the study reported shifting from their ethnic identity to reflect their American national identity instead.[38]

Studies on nationalism have yielded a host of different offshoots of nationalism identified by scholars. The concept of nation branding—or, image management of a country by a government to compete for foreign investment, tourism, and other financial advantages—has created what scholars call commercial nationalism.[39] This type of nationalism uses national identity as a marketing tactic to create "a recognizable and marketable version" of a particular nationality, which is aimed both internally to the nation's inhabitants and externally at the international market.[40] Scholars have also proposed the existence of virtual nationalism that is curated online; selfie nationalism perpetrated at the hands of Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi; and traumatic nationalism and a discourse of resilience that arises when a nation experiences tragedy and must recreate national identity to boost national pride and morale.[41]

Along with these growing trends in types of nationalism, contemporary far-right politics have introduced a far more extreme brand of reactionary nationalism. In this thesis, I conceptualize reactionary nationalism as a type of far-right extremism that is a response to contemporary social and economic change, such as increasing immigration and globalization. The rhetoric of reactionary nationalism, therefore, often relies on traditional family values, anti-immigrant sentiments, Islamophobia, Euroscepticism, anti-globalization, and an increased focus on national security and law and order. Reactionary nationalism is also frequently employed by populists.[42] As Manuela Caini and Patricia Kröll explain, far-right parties often rely on the combination of populist and nationalist framing to pit the everyday people against elites and the ethnic other.[43] Reactionary nationalism exists, according to Giorgos Katsambekis and Yannis Stavrakakis, to "construct the 'nation,'" which is accomplished by the party or politician making "claims to defend its territory, sovereignty, interests, history, and heritage, against anyone who threatens it."[44] As the nation finds itself in danger, these communities often turn to a form of fascism for help, as the nation is considered to be the natural order of how things should be.[45]

In the United States, this has resulted in the growth of white nationalism or the so-called "alt-right," which seeks to restore the status of white men as the dominant group in the United States.[46] Although the U.S.'s brand of far-right nationalism is based heavily on uplifting the white race, reactionary nationalism in Europe is largely the result of neoliberal globalization "which produces and reproduces…the identity panics, the obsessive search for sources and roots."[47] As a result, this reactionary nationalism employed by the European far right often relies on cultural racism, or what G. M. Tamás calls "ethnicisim," rather than the biological racism seen in the United States.[48] This type of cultural racism constructs a strong in-group identity which consequently designates outsiders as a "physical…cultural…and a socio-spatial threat."[49]

10

Although this type of extreme nationalism is powerful on its own, it is able to exist because of the successful creation of a national identity.

*National Identity*

The concept of national identity can be grounded in Henri Tajfel and John Turner's Social Identity Theory, which explains positive social belonging in groups as necessary to an individual's positive self-esteem. Consequently, groups try to differentiate themselves from others in an attempt to be seen positively when compared through in-groups and out-groups.[50] Taken from a nationalistic perspective, this desire to belong to a group or community can account for the emergence of the nation and, by extension, of national identity with that nation.[51] In the case of the development of French national identity, French philosopher Alfred Jules Émile Fouillée conceptualized national identity as "'national character.'"[52] In this way, Edmond Marc Lipiansky explains that "national character is not the simple sum of individual characters," but rather a "general way of feeling, of thinking, and of wanting." Each citizen, however, still maintains a distinct personal character that is informed by the country's national character.[53]

Although there are many different conceptualizations of what national identity means, I use the definition of Ruth Wodak and Salomi Boukala, which is twofold. First, national identity connotes a sameness, or an identification with those who also identify in the same group. The second meaning of identity connotes "distinctiveness," where members of the group are different than the "other" who is not a group member.[54] This distinctiveness is usually accomplished in the form of what Niebuhr calls a nation's "social myth," which helps to "distinguish it [a nation] from other nations, justify its existence, and defend its interests." These myths may be a certain telling of history, framing of a famous person, or the like, and it functions to make the nation appear superior to others.[55]

Unsurprisingly, construction of U.S. American national identity has received arguably the most attention in academia. Much of this research focuses on the role of American exceptionalism discourse in the constitution of what it means to be a U.S. American. This discourse is strengthened when it is echoed in political and governmental discourse. For example, George W. Bush reinforced a sense of American exceptionalism in his post-9/11 speeches which helped to restore Americans' self confidence in their group membership and national identity. As a result, the rhetoric of American exceptionalism "restore[d] national confidence" and "solidified public support for the U.S.-led 'war on terror.'"[56] More research conducted outside the United States has replicated this finding, demonstrating that social group bonds can actually become stronger in times of crisis, leading to a heightened sense of national solidarity.[57]

In other cultural contexts, scholars have highlighted the different ways in which governments go about creating, reframing, or strengthening national identity. This is often accomplished through hosting sporting events, such as the Olympics, where countries can show their sporting prowess and abilities to host a large global event.[58] Meanwhile, in Croatia and Russia, governments rely on the use of memory and nostalgia—including reframing past events in a more positive light—to unite its inhabitants.[59] The Singaporean Prime Minister is much more direct and paints a picture of the ideal Singaporean, rallying citizens to live up to the description that he has given.[60] Despite these efforts, national identity does not remain stagnant, as it is socially and culturally constructed.[61] Jenni Riihimäki, for example, proposes that the reason the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union in 2016 was because their national identity changed from identifying with both British and European identity to viewing

the European Union as working against their best interest; consequently, many inhabitants shunned their former identification with European identity and interests.[62]

Although governments play a large role in cultivating national identity, the media are also important in helping everyday people understand national identity of their country. In the past, a government could rely on state television to promote its agenda, boost national pride, and promote civic engagement. Now, however, broadcasters seem to be more focused on commercial interests, and discussion of national identity has moved online.[63] Studies of online communities have found that social media and other online media are powerful in constructing and reconstructing individual, national, and global identities because ordinary people are given the power and platform to discuss issues that were normally reserved for governments.[64] Although online media give people opportunities to contest government versions of history, this is more difficult to accomplish in the mainstream news. A study of U.S. news framing found that many frames that are used by politicians serve to protect American national identity and are embraced by many inhabitants of the country. Moreover, the study found that dissenters generally do not contest those frames for fear of being labeled unpatriotic. As such, the traditional media still hold much power when communicating about national identity.[65]

Although national identity has the power to encompass many different people in a community, Snobra Rizwan reminds us that "the construction of nationalists' identity remains incomplete unless it is contrasted with the traitors' identity."[66] In other words, there is no patriot without a traitor. As such, efforts to promote national identity create an other or an outsider. In countries like the United States, the outsider is often the immigrant who comes to the U.S. from a Latin or South American country.[67] In European countries, a study of newspaper coverage about the so-called "death of multiculturalism" revealed the construction of the Muslim as the

culturally inferior other—the conception of which has now spread throughout Europe and to North America.[68]

Despite the impressive number of cultural arenas in which research about nationalism and national identity has been conducted, there still remains much to be studied about French identity. Sabina Mihelj points out that the majority of communication research conducted about Europeanization has focused on the collective inter-national, rather than the *intra*-national where specific national identities are formed. Of that research about individual European nations, the United Kingdom is often the main focus.[69] Worldwide, scholars tend to focus on English-speaking countries and cultures, which allows the examination of non-English cultures to go by the wayside. Even fewer studies examining the constitution of identity in non-English nations have been conducted; in their study of the construction of the Turkish people, Aysel Morin and Ronald Lee draw attention to "the small number of studies examining constitutive discourses in non-English cultures."[70] This thesis works to frame that gap by using constitutive rhetoric to understand how Marine Le Pen constitutes French national identity.

Moreover, the way that many of these studies frame national identity makes it appear as though there can only be one national identity per nation. Of course, there may be an "official" national identity promoted by a national government but, as Mary Stuckey reminds us in her analysis of the 2004 American Republican and Democratic conventions, there are often multiple versions of national identity in a singular nation.[71] This project examines a conception of French national identity that is not promoted by the official government leaders; in fact, the National Rally's extreme beliefs position their view of national identity to be one on the fringes and one with which most of the French public would not agree. This does not mean it is any less important and should not be studied. Rather, I argue that it is *more* important to understand what

14

it means to "be French" to those who find themselves outside of the dominant political sphere. This also helps us to understand how Marine Le Pen attempted to constitute this version of national identity as necessary to save the nation and what types of discourse she used to present this view.

*Women's Political Leadership*

Women politicians have been studied extensively in academia. When women first began holding more public positions in politics and in social movements, scholars began to study communication that was specific to women. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell's work on the so-called "feminine style" has been instrumental to this understanding of feminist rhetorical criticism. Campbell began by examining feminist social movements, which, she argued, were fundamentally distinct from other studies on social movements because of the marginalized place that women occupy in society.[72] Later, Campbell coined the phrase "feminine style" in her study of women speakers and their speeches calling for women's suffrage. According to Campbell, the feminine style emphasizes the use of anecdotes and examples, uses a personal tone, and encourages audience participation.[73] Other scholars have extended Campbell's research past social movements to electoral politics. Bonnie J. Dow and Mari Boor Tonn note:

> female politicians must operate in the ultimate public deliberative context, where feminine communicative strategies would seem the least valued and adaptation to typically male communicative patterns would seem most useful.[74]

Although more recent studies have found that women in politics continue to use the feminine style, Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Trevor Parry-Giles caution the celebration of this style that was common of early feminist scholars, contending that "such a style potentially masks the reliance of political image construction on a hegemonic masculinity that serves to preserve politics as a patriarchal system."[75]

Indeed, the American presidency has been identified as extremely masculine, which may account for the lack of women who have ascended to this role.[76] As Kristina Horn Sheeler and Karrin Vasby Anderson point out, the United States president "both establishes and reflects political and cultural norms."[77] Campbell further notes that the office of the presidency functions as both a head of state and executive leader in a monarchial fashion. As such, he and his family should represent the ideal (and heterosexual) American family. Consequently, the role of the first lady is especially important in not only communicating familial norms, but gender and cultural norms as well.[78]

First ladies often walk the line between the public and private sphere, acting as caretaker of the White House and doting wife (and often mother), while also being expected to take up a cause and be conversant in her husband's policy proposals and decisions.[79] When one of these lines is crossed, political spouses are often victims of serious media and public scrutiny. For example, Hillary Clinton's famous "I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas" comment prompted outrage from homemakers and conservatives and was covered heavily by news sources.[80] The media have long played a role in dictating both the role of the first lady as well as the image of each individual woman herself. In fact, Teri Finneman and Ryan J. Thomas argue that the role and status of the first lady is stuck in a specific double bind between modernity and tradition as they struggle to balance the two.[81] As they struggle "to represent what we pretend is a single, universally accepted ideal for U.S. womanhood," Karrin Vasby Anderson asserts that first ladies are able to "achieve legitimate political agency through private influence," "'behind the scenes'" work only.[82] Hillary Rodham Clinton received some of the most scrutiny in her roles first as first lady of Arkansas, then of the United States, especially as she continued her career as a lawyer and took an active role in her husband's politics.[83] More recently, scholars

have begun producing scholarship on former first lady Michelle Obama—who is also considered very politically active—as well as expanding research to the media construction of first ladies outside the United States, such as those in the United Kingdom, China, and different countries of the Middle East. Even though these subjects are not all Western, scholars still tend to examine Western media and how it others or eroticizes non-Western women of influence.[84]

Until recently, there were very few women that political scholars were able to study because politics had been dominated by men. However, as women advance in legislative and executive elections around the world, they still continue to encounter obstacles related to gender when running for political office. Kathleen Hall Jamieson terms a "double bind" as "a rhetorical construct that posits two and only two alternatives, one or both penalizing the person being offered them."[85] In her book, she offers five double binds that are commonly experienced by women in leadership positions: womb/brain, silence/shame, sameness/difference, femininity/competence, and aging/invisibility.[86] Although women in politics may experience any of these double binds, one of the most common that scholarship points to is the femininity/competence bind, which implies that a woman cannot both be feminine and a competent leader. If she is a good leader, she is masculine and thus off-putting because she breaks social and gender norms. If she fits firmly within culturally defined femininity, she cannot possibly be a good leader.

While it is certainly possible for women to transcend these double binds, these binds undoubtedly make it more difficult for women to see electoral success, especially under media scrutiny.[87] Many studies that focus on news framing have found that women politicians do not receive equal airtime to men politicians and that they are portrayed through sexist frames that are detrimental to the representation of women politicians. These findings have been replicated in

studies of many different countries' news media, such as the United States, Germany, Bulgaria, Belgium, Australia, Tunisia, and more.[88] More recently, this study has expanded to online media portrayals of women, with very similar findings.[89] This trend is extremely detrimental to attempts at gender equality, as the frames upon which media rely not only reinforce sexist hegemony in society and culture, but they also may discourage women from running for office, thereby increasing the disparity between the population of women and their representation in government.[90] For women who do end up running for office, they often become victims of news frames that, in recent years, have been preoccupied with political authenticity. According to Shawn J. Parry-Giles, "political authenticity derives from character concerns as candidates…attempt to authenticate a candidate's image as their political opponents, in turn, attempt to inauthenticate it."[91] As Parry-Giles goes on to note, these attempts at authentication and inauthentication "take place within the history of gendered expectations and norms," and it is the media that perpetuate these norms as well as frames of political (in)authenticity.[92]

Despite these trends in news framing, women have been able to find electoral success in both legislative and executive leadership positions. Wilma Rule has noted the differences that arise in representation depending on the electoral system in which research takes place, writing that "electoral systems explain almost 30 percent of the varying proportions of women in democracies' national legislatures."[93] For example, most parliamentary systems are known as party-list/proportional representation systems (PL/PR). Here, parties choose who will represent them in electoral contests, meaning that women must win the support of both the party *and* the electorate to be elected to serve.[94] Because parties are more likely to choose women candidates to run in each district, it is easier for women to win votes from the electorate because they are more likely to run in the first place.[95] Moreover, because party membership chooses prime

ministers (rather than election by the people), "party members and long-term colleagues likely have less traditional bias against women as political leaders than does the general electorate."[96] Meanwhile, in a winner-take-all system like the United States and Canada, it is much easier for women to be elected to legislative positions than to executive positions, such as governor. As such, it becomes even more difficult for a women to advance to the top executive position as president.[97]

In their research on gubernatorial races, Lindsay Meeks and David Domke found that embracing femininity helped women candidates receive more support.[98] This is most evident in the media's embrace of Sarah Palin during her run for governor; because she fell squarely within hegemonic roles of femininity, and especially motherhood, she was praised. Governor Jane Smith, on the other hand, had a husband who filled the role of the stay-at-home dad, thereby threatening traditional family roles, and she was subsequently vilified in the press.[99] In New Zealand, an examination of two MPs' Twitter accounts revealed a dominant likeability frame, leading to the dilemma that voters enjoy "likeable" candidates, but that likeability does not necessarily translate into more votes.[100] Perhaps one of the most disheartening studies conducted on British parliament found that despite the growing number of women MPs, the type of aggressive debate expected on the parliament floor opens the door for harassment towards women. Specifically, the study found that women MPs are routinely objectified, patronized, and stigmatized in British parliament.[101] This is not exactly shocking, given Ignacio Moreno Segarra and Karrin Vasby Anderson's assertion that "[g]lobal political culture…has become a sexually charged environment."[102]

Although some studies have found that certain women politicians capitalize on this sexualization, operating within misogynistic tropes and continuing to employ the feminine style,

others have found that some women politicians use a more masculine style of communication, thus forcing audiences to view them as a politician first, rather than a woman first.[103] Given Hillary Clinton's two high-profile runs for president, much research has been conducted about her campaigns and tenure as Secretary of State. Although she continued to function within double binds and often negative news framing, Clinton's almost-presidency has received the spotlight in academic research, despite the fact that she never actually ascended to the role of U.S. president.[104] Many other nations have had women heads of state; however, there is little Communication Studies research that has been conducted in these (often non-English speaking) cultural and electoral contexts.[105]

Following this trend, there is little communication research about Marine Le Pen and her rhetorical and leadership style.[106] Le Pen is currently a member in France's parliament, the *Assemblée Nationale*, a seat she won in June 2017, less than two months after losing the 2017 presidential election. Although she holds political office, the National Rally only holds eight seats out of a possible 577, which left the party "unable to form a parliamentary group which would have given it a role in setting the parliamentary agenda as well as influence committee positions."[107] Consequently, after two unsuccessful bids for president of France in 2012 and 2017 and a lackluster showing for the French parliamentary elections, examining Le Pen's rhetoric allows for a unique opportunity to study a woman politician who has seen little electoral success, yet continues to hold a great amount of power in her country's political sphere. Moreover, Le Pen's attempts to soften—and, some would argue, feminize—the image of her party since 2012 are at odds with the rhetoric employed in the speeches I analyzed. In fact, Le Pen breaks with many norms of traditional feminine communication, thus expanding our knowledge of women rhetors who run for political office.

Critical Methodology

My texts for this project consist of ten speeches given by Marine Le Pen between 2015 and 2019, all of which have a major theme of globalization. As mentioned above, as globalization grows, there has also been a renewal in reactionary nationalism which is often accompanied by xenophobia and sometimes even violence. France offers an interesting case study of the relationship between globalization and reactionary nationalism especially as French identity continues to splinter and populism continues to grow in the wake of the ongoing *Gilets Jaunes* (yellow vests) protests, a violent, anti-government manifestation of this identity split that has been ongoing since November 2018.[108]

To better understand far-right identity in the context of globalization and reactionary nationalism, I rhetorically analyzed the following ten speeches:

- "Marine Le Pen's Gathering in Corsica," November 28, 2015

- "Presidential Conference in Lyon: Marine Le Pen," February 5, 2017

- "Marine Le Pen in Châteauroux," March 11, 2017

- "Grand Marine Le Pen Gathering at Zénith Paris," April 17, 2017

- "Marine Le Pen in Marseilles," April 19, 2017

- "Marine Le Pen on the Night of the First Round of the Presidential Election," April 23, 2017

- "Marine Le Pen in Laon," February 18, 2018

- "Public Gathering in Thor," January 22, 2019

- "Public Gathering in Bessières," March 3, 2019

- "Marine Le Pen in Metz," May 1, 2019

I chose to examine texts over a period of several years in order to get a better, holistic picture of what far right French identity consists of and how Le Pen goes about constructing it in her speeches. It may be difficult to fully understand a concept such as national identity if the texts I examine were confined to only a short window of time. Furthermore, I chose speeches that were given in a variety of contexts. The 2017 speeches were delivered during Le Pen's run for president, while the 2019 speeches were given to rally party supporters for the European Parliamentary elections. The 2018 speech was given in a small city before a local election, and the 2015 speech was given to inhabitants on the island of Corsica as they prepared for their elections.

Each of these speeches was delivered in French, and as a proficient French speaker, I conducted the analysis of these speeches in their original language, rather than from an English translation. All direct quotes from the speeches are my own translation. I also relied on a mix of English and French-language popular press sources as a means to access a more complete picture of French news and identity. Although I am a U.S. American, I have spent considerable time overseas, and most recently, I lived and worked in France for two years, during which the 2017 presidential elections were held. As such, I feel that I understand French culture and French identity despite my U.S. American nationality, and I feel comfortable representing this culture and identity in my research and writing.

In order to best understand how Le Pen creates French national identity and what it means to "be French" to the far right, I employed a methodology of constitutive rhetoric to analyze these speeches. To make a case for constitutive rhetoric, Maurice Charland conducted an analysis of French-speaking Canadians in Quebec and how they became a *peuple québécois*. Rather than focusing on the connection between rhetoric and persuasion, constitutive rhetoric

instead examines how an identity is constituted ideologically. Combining McGee's notion of "the people," Burke's identification, and Althusser's concept of interpellation and political subjectivity, Charland argues that the creation of the "people" is only possible "through an ideological discourse that constitutes them." This, Charland writes, is often accomplished through narrative with underlying ideology that creates a shared identity and is delivered by a leader who invites members to become a part of this identity.[109] In order for constitutive rhetoric to be successful—that is, in order for the created identity to continue to hold power—it "must require that its embodied subjects act freely in the social world *to affirm their subject position*."[110]

Following Charland's proposal of the practice of constitutive rhetoric, this methodology has been expanded to contexts other than that of politics, such as advertising, written discourse and audience design, and works of fiction.[111] Moreover, scholars are becoming increasingly interested in what happens when attempts at constitutive rhetoric fail. Helen Tate, for example, examined the rhetoric used by white lesbian feminists of the second wave as they attempted to constitute a feminist identity. This identity focused almost exclusively on the release from homosexual oppression, even though the movement sought support from heterosexual women as well. As a result, the attempt at creating this feminist identity was unsuccessful and instead created space for antifeminist criticism, thereby undermining the entire feminist movement as a whole.[112]

As constitutive rhetoric has already been used to analyze the creation of American conservative identity in the 1960s, this methodology can greatly aid in understanding how an identity is constituted in the case of Marine Le Pen and the French far right.[113] As Robert Elliot Mills points out, the negative identity of constitutive rhetoric is just as important as the identity

23

that is constituted. In other words, the identity of a people heavily rests on both what the people

are, as well as what they are *not*.[114] This may explain why Le Pen relies so heavily on

scapegoating elites, globalists, and immigrants in order to constitute a new version of French

national identity. Moreover, the splintering conception of French identity has created a nation

that has left many people on the fringes, which makes them specifically susceptible to a

reconstitution of national identity. Le Pen's rhetoric not only validates how these outsiders may

feel, but it creates an ideological narrative to bring them together as political subjects and,

consequently as "the people" of the French far right.

Furthermore, in order to maintain this French identity and political subjectivity, members

must undertake political action—such as attending protests and voting—to protect this version of

French identity which has become a necessary part of their essence. Thus, the actions that they

are called to take are performed as a way to protect their identity and their subject position. In a

nod to Stuart Hall, Charland writes

> Various contradictory subject positions can simultaneously exist within a culture…These
> contradictions place a strain upon identification with a given subject position and render
> possible a subject's rearticulation. Successful new constitutive rhetorics offer new subject
> positions that resolve, or at least contain, experienced contradictions.[115]

In the case of the National Rally, Le Pen's construction of "the people" served to create a new

identity that counters dominant Western ideals of diversity and neoliberalism, thus containing the

contradictions between far-right beliefs and dominant French identity. Specifically, in her

discourse, Le Pen constituted a new way to perform patriotic citizenship, part of which was

contingent upon continuing to support her movement and vote her into power. By breaking with

conceptions of identity through specific electoral action, Le Pen is an ideal subject for which to

use constitutive rhetoric. This, along with the reminder of Morin and Lee's call to address "the

small number of studies examining constitutive discourses in non-English cultures," indicates

24

that constitutive rhetoric is a methodology that is be incredibly useful in not only addressing gaps in communication literature, but also in helping understand the French far right and the rhetorical and leadership style of Marine Le Pen.[116]

## Chapter Outline

In order to support this argument, the outline of my thesis is as follows. Chapter two focuses on context, which provides background and pertinent information about French history, national identity, culture, and the electoral system; gender and sexism in France; and the history of Marine Le Pen and the National Front/National Rally. Chapter three comprises my analysis of Le Pen's ten speeches. In the chapter, I outline how Le Pen follows the three steps of Kenneth Burke's cycle of scapegoating and victimage: initial identification, casting out, and purification/alleviation of guilt. Finally, my fourth chapter serves as a conclusion and outlines the implications my analysis represents for French identity, reactionary nationalism, women political leaders, constitutive rhetoric, and internationalizing public address.

**Chapter 2: Context**

In order to better understand Marine Le Pen's constitution of French far-right identity, it is imperative to situate her discourse in past and contemporary French history, identity, culture, and politics. In this chapter, I contextualize this research project in three main ways. First, I give a historical overview of the founding of France, French national and political identity, French government and electoral process, and a brief explanation of contemporary French political and social issues. Second, I review relevant information about the role that gender and feminism plays in French politics and contemporary identity issues. Finally, I provide a brief history of the National Front/National Rally, from its inception to today, focusing on the change in party leadership from Jean-Marie Le Pen to Marine Le Pen and how this change in power has impacted French identity with regards to the far right.

French Foundations

Although the land that is now recognized as the country of France has a long history spanning thousands of years, I am interested in it from its inception as a nation in the late fifteenth century. Referred to by Cecil Jenkins as "A Nation Born in Blood," after an invasion by England, French King Charles VII organized the collection of taxes to fund an army.[117] It was this war and bloodshed on which the nation of France was founded as the army also acted to quash internal threats of nobility uprisings. Consequently, the feudal system was dead and a monarchy arose to form the nation of France by the end of the 1400s. According to Jenkins, patriotism and nationalism followed this creation of the state.[118]

David A. Bell details the events that led to the creation of French nationalism specifically via the "general religious and cultural transformation" occurring in Europe.[119] Although France did not invent the concept of nationalism, Bell points out its "unusually strong emphasis on political will as the foundation stone of the nation (as opposed to language or blood or history)."[120] In France, the formation of the nation was grounded in the notion of *patrie*, or fatherland, as a unifying concept for the variety of people who found themselves spread out geographically and linguistically. Moreover, the shifting role of Christianity in areas of what would become France played a significant role in understanding both the values of the nation and the public/private divide.

Eventually, rather than be divided by the multitude of different regional languages, or *patois,* revolutionaries decided to create a singular national language, which not only unified the country, but was also used as a mechanism of power during the era of French colonialism.[121] The French language has historically constituted a major part of French national identity. As Dominique Estival and Alastair Pennycook point out "the notion of the mother tongue, equated with nation in what has always been a diverse and multilingual society, was crucial to the formation of the French state, resulting in a set of ideologies about French, what it is and what it is not."[122] In other words, the formation of the unified country of France led to both a standardized form of French and to the notion that those who could not speak French correctly were viewed as unable to sufficiently embody proper French identity. Unlike English speakers, Estival and Pennycook continue, the French do not view their language as a malleable instrument for self-expression, but rather as a symbol of French identity.[123]

Revolutionaries changed more than just language in the late eighteenth century. After decades of mass poverty, food riots, a cruel justice system, and a monarchy that cared more

about the elites than solving these problems, demonstrators took over the Bastille fortress in Paris on July 14, 1789 in a symbolic victory for the revolutionaries.[124] In August of that year, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen was adopted by France's National Assembly and outlined all men's rights to freedom, liberty, equality under the law, and obedience to the law, not a monarch. As Georges Lefebvre writes, this Declaration was "the death certificate of the Old Regime" of the French monarchy.[125] After the Revolution ended in 1792, the French government abolished the monarchy without a true direction for future French government, leading to a host of short-lived constitutions, parliamentary rule, and Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte. Finally, in 1848, France established the first of the four main republics that comprise French political history, where political and national identity began to flourish.[126]

In addition to these specific facets that played a role in the formation of France and French nationality, Bell asserts that the difference between French nationhood and that of other European countries is that French nationalism can be viewed as "an unparalleled success story," with very little that has disturbed French national identity over the last 200 years. Writings and speeches in the eighteenth century that encouraged a love of national *patrie* were widespread, contributing to the unique connection the French have to their national identity for several centuries.[127]

*French National Identity*

As the country of France continued to develop, national identity was formed through founding myths and histories that bound the nation and its people together. Alain Finkielkraut writes that national identity came about as the "daughter of equality," following the creation of a nation with a people who had equal, constitutional rights under the Declaration of the Rights of

Man and the Citizen.[128] This identity was further cultivated by Enlightenment thinkers who viewed the path to individual liberty through reason, rather through God and religion.[129]

Since France's founding as a nation, French national identity has been personified, conceived of as a person, with a national soul and national character. While individuality is celebrated, a piece of national character and the national soul can be found in all French people. As Edmond Marc Lipiansky writes, "in each individual mind exists a system of ideas reflecting the social and physical environment and embodying the ideal community of the nation."[130] The way that the French make sense of their national identity is through comparison of themselves to neighboring nations. They are able to differentiate themselves from others and valorize their own traits that they perceive as being unique to French identity, such as good taste, eloquence, spirit of justice and liberty, and tolerance, among others.[131] In 2010, Minister of Immigration Éric Besson proclaimed: "France is neither a people, nor a language, or a territory, nor a religion, it's a conglomeration of people who want to live together. There is no strained French, there is just mixed French."[132] The creation of this singularity—of a soul, national character, and common traits—therefore encourages homogeneity of the population, free of internal threat or problems, which is able to more easily join together in creation of a national identity.

With this view of togetherness, French identity has also historically entailed a sense of superiority known as the French exception. In other words, France has always seen itself as being held to the highest of standards, as an exception, an example for other countries. "At the heart of this notion," Jenkins writes, "is the ambition, accepted as national destiny, to be the highest expression of civilization."[133] This notion of exceptionalism was enacted by the foundation of the prestigious *Académie Française* in 1635, which worked to prescribe rules of the French language to all French speakers, with the goal of creating a "pure" version of French.

King Louis XIV, who helped found the *Académie,* worked to systematize the language to make it so perfect that this system would be emulated by others.[134]

The notion of French exceptionalism has also been reflected historically in France's constitution of *La Grande Nation* (The Great Nation) as a descriptor of France's military expansion during its revolution in the late eighteenth century. *La Grande Nation* emphasizes France's military victories, again personifying the nation, and showing that "the state is seen not as an intruder but as a fair arbiter."[135] Even today, the French fondly remember their glories of the past and often carry an air of smugness as a result. On the other side, *La Grande Nation* also connotes France as the underdog, as France is better known for its defeats than for its victories. France has constantly portrayed itself as struggling against the dominant European power at different times in history, embodying a "'culture of opposition to the dominant norms.'"[136] In other words, the state's ambition of reaching its national destiny has not yet been able to be realized, often leaving them frustrated with their inability to achieve their great and lofty goals dictated by the French national identity of exceptionalism. Despite the mismatch of ambitions and actual power, *La Grande Nation* has often been equated with true patriotism no matter the outcome, especially during the Revolution.[137] The rule of Napoleon is sometimes even referred to *Le Grand Empire* (The Great Empire) that was led by *La Grande Armée* (The Great Army).[138] This French exception and conception of a great destiny for a great nation is also reflected in how the French view themselves politically.

*French Political Identity*

The French exception is clearly communicated in the so-called "social model" of the French exception, which prioritizes "the social and moral vision…and the republic context in which it operates."[139] This social model, however, is quite vague and not specific. The clearest

way to conceptualize the ways in which the French view themselves politically is by examining the wording the constitution of the Fifth Republic. Cecil Jenkins breaks down the four main ideas that guide the French constitution. First, the emphasis on France as a republic highlights the rejection of hereditary privilege of aristocratic and monarchical systems, privileging the rights of the individual citizen. Second, the Constitution's use of the term "indivisible" clearly "implies a centralist, non-federal state in which an individual is not defined by region or by adherence to any minority cultural or ethnic group, but purely as a citizen of the Republic."[140] Third, a focus on secularity treats religion as a private matter, not to be sanctioned or regulated by the state and undergirds France's notion of *laïcité. Laïcité,* or the strict separation of church and state in France, was initially instituted to limit the power of the Catholic church in France and "center[ed] on issues such as the removal of crucifixes from school or the elimination of prayers from public events."[141] This principle not only governs many aspects of religion in everyday life—for example, no visible signs of religion, such as a Muslim hijab or Christian cross are permitted in public schools or to be worn by students—but is also integral to the majority of French people as an "essential republican principle," according to a 2019 poll.[142] Finally, the term "social" is invoked in the preamble of the Constitution to encompass France's unifying principles of *liberté, égalité,* and *fraternité* (liberty, equality, and brotherhood).[143] These major ideas all come together to form a clear picture of what French political identity looks like.

Despite the idealized notions of equality and togetherness of the republic, scholars have pointed out that French society is very hierarchical, relying on the social pyramid of class as a defining organizing feature of society. Although one can theoretically transcend to a higher social class, this is extremely difficult to accomplish, and it is often the bourgeois elite who hold the social and political power. As such, dominant French political identity has historically upheld

middle class ideals and values.[144] This is especially reflected in the French concept of *l'honnête homme* (honest man), which came about in the seventeenth century. For a person to embody *l'honnête homme,* one must speak with clarity and be "respectable and courteous, in addition to being cultivated" (this holds a different connotation than contemporary conceptions of honesty).[145]

The electorate of the French far right perceives itself as a victim of these bourgeois attitudes, frustrated that their points of view are being ignored by politicians and lawmakers. The National Front and National Rally often capitalize on these tensions, presenting themselves as representatives of the common people and what they truly value. This includes keeping national identity as homogenous as possible and protecting it against potentially damaging forces in order to "ensure a harmonious relationship between people and environment."[146] These messages have resonated with working class voters who are disillusioned with governmental policies, allowing the far right to capture a portion of the electorate that is typically a stronghold of the left. However, neither of the Le Pen leaders has been able to capture middle or upper class votes, likely because their voices and desires are already being represented by the elitism of elected officials.[147]

*French Politics and Governance in the Fifth Republic*

The current system of governance that privileges these elite interests was established in in December 1958 when a French national referendum ratified a new constitution and created the Fifth Republic, which continues to today. Four years after the ratification, French president Charles de Gaulle advocated for a constitutional amendment that would elect the president by popular vote of the people, rather than the legislative body of the National Assembly.[148] According to Catherine Fieschi, this upheaval of the electoral system threw French political

parties into disarray as they scrambled to re-organize the roles of political parties that were

needed by this new system.[149]

Today, there are many active political parties in France, the most popular among them the

left-wing *Partie Socialiste* (Socialist Party), centrist *La République En Marche!* (The Republic

on the Move!), and right-wing parties *Les Républicains* (The Republicans) and *Rassemblement*

*National* (National Rally). Although there are two major right-wing parties in France, the

National Rally relies on a much more extremist form of nationalism and populism, while The

Republicans can be characterized as center right.[150] Because of the large number of political

parties, the political system often relies on coalition building to achieve a majority in the

governing body of the National Assembly—the house of parliament that is elected by the

people.[151] Voters cast their ballots for the presidency and National Assembly in a two round

system every five years. The presidential elections occur first, and campaigning lasts for one

month. After presidential candidates achieve the support of at least 500 elected French officials,

they can officially run in the first round of voting. French citizens cast their vote for any of the

candidates. If a candidate wins at least 50% of the votes, they are automatically declared the

winner, although this has never happened. Instead, the top two candidates who receive the most

votes advance to a runoff election that is held two weeks later. Whoever receives the most

overall votes wins.[152]

*Contemporary French Issues*

The 2017 presidential election saw candidates determined to solve problems that plague

contemporary French society, including the issue of security and terrorism, which remains a

main concern throughout the country. In 2015, a terrorist attack in Paris, purportedly carried out

by the Islamic State, killed 130 people and wounded 350 more.[153] This caused the entire country

to remain in a state of emergency for nearly two years, giving heightened power to law enforcement. The fear of another terrorist attack has caused growth in Islamophobia and anti-immigration sentiments, as migrants—especially Muslims migrants—are viewed as both a security threat and a threat to French *laïcité,* or secularism, that guides much of what is acceptable in French society. In fact, a poll conducted in December 2018 by the French Institute of Public Opinion found that 64% of respondents believe that the current impact of immigrants in France is a negative one, and 60% said that France should no longer welcome immigrants because of large differences in personal and political values.[154]

In France, the visibility of the Muslim hijab as a sign of religion has caused tension as many inhabitants view Muslims as unable or unwilling to assimilate into French society by complying with the rules of *laïcité*. Consequently, Islamophobic acts have been on the rise.[155] The state of emergency only ended in 2017 with the passage of a new anti-terrorism law that, among other provisions, sets aside significant financial aid to suburbs of France's large cities, where much radicalization has taken place. In an interview with NPR, Yasser Louati, the head of the Justice and Liberties for All Committee, says that those who turned to radicalization were often ostracized in French society. He continues, "Those kids are French. And as long as France's elite fail to accept it and understand it and listen to their grievances, we will continue in this cycle of action and reaction."[156]

Louati's anti-elite sentiment is another contemporary problem in France. President Emmanuel Macron's approval rating in November 2019 was only 32%, with his disapproval rating at nearly 65%. Much of the public views Macron as an elitist who does not understand everyday people's problems and priorities.[157] These frustrations took activists to the street during the Gilets Jaunes protests, violent manifestations that have been occurring for over a year, since

mid-November 2018, and are still ongoing. The protests began after Macron announced a new tax on carbon emissions. This especially impacted working class adults who drive to work and was the flashpoint for the protests. A year later, however, other demographics, such as young people and activists, have joined. Although Macron dropped the proposed tax, the protests have evolved into "a much more ambiguous expression of anger against what they [protestors] think President Macron and his government represent: namely elitism, big banks, and centralized government in Paris."[158] The protestors represent a physical manifestation of the identity crisis in France that is the result of increased globalization and the power of the city-dwelling French elite. The issues of security, terrorism, *laïcité,* anti-elitism, and objection to globalization reflects the largest problems that are driving the (re)constitution of what French national identity looks like in an increasingly fractured world.

*Fracturing French Identity*

Despite claims of the strength of French national identity, these contemporary issues indicate an increasingly fractured French national identity, drawing boundaries between the working class and the elites. Specifically, the fear of globalization has produced so-called "identity panics" and "the obsessive search for sources and roots" as inhabitants attempt to establish cultural homogeneity.[159] The increasingly globalized world is often seen as a threat to the health of traditional French national identity as a cohesive group with certain country-specific traits and an overarching national character and national soul.

Moreover, for many in French society, the elites in office do not understand these issues and instead continue to push policies that encourage globalization and immigration. In this sense, those who find themselves on the margins have begun to see themselves as directly in conflict with President Macron and his interests. This has led to the massive protests like that of the

Gilets Jaunes, whose message has continued to morph based on perceived injustices. As such, today in France, there are two main sides to national identity: that of the elite globalizing bourgeois, represented by Macron, and that of the rural-dwelling, working class who feel left behind by Macron's policies. It is this latter group who has turned to Marine Le Pen and the National Rally for hope and support.

Contemporary identity panics in France are stoked by the far right and allow political parties like the National Front to attract more voters. Since its creation, the National Front has always cautioned against the problems associated with globalization and transnationalism, focusing their energy and policies on Euroscepticism and anti-immigration policies. In other words, they argue that the changing world will cause irreparable damage to the French people and French identity. Jean-Marie Le Pen capitalized on these messages in the wake of the economic downturn in the mid-2000s with messages such as "'for France to remain France, the French people must remain masters of their own home,'" linking anti-immigrant sentiment (often discussed in terms of "strangers" versus "true Frenchman") to concerns about economic and cultural homogeneity.[160]

Not only are globalization and increased mobility of people moving in and out of countries seen as a threat, but the Le Pens situate themselves as the only ones who understand the view of the everyday people who experience these threats. Positioning themselves as opposition to the elite politicians who hold office, Jean-Marie and Marine Le Pen have consistently invoked the notion of "the people" to show how connected they are to everyday concerns. The head of the party *is* the people. According to Alduy and Wahnich, all political Le Pen speeches follow the same formula: they open with a vivid picture of France on the brink of disaster, followed by an appeal to "memory of the 'real' France, glorious and resilient," and finally the positioning of the

speaker as "mirror of the People and incarnation of the values of combat, sacrifice, and rights that allowed an eternal France to escape annihilation over the course of centuries."[161] As representatives of concerns of the people and embodiment of eternal French values, the National Front/National Rally therefore becomes the savior of traditional French national identity for whom the anti-elitists have been searching.

This section has shown how the concept of French national and political identity has evolved over time from France's inception as a country until today. French national identity is conceptualized as a singular character and soul, with specific characteristics. Moreover, the French exception and *La Grande Nation* has led to the goal of the French as an exceptional society and an example for other nations to imitate. Despite the strength of this brand of national identity for centuries, contemporary issues, such as security, immigration, and globalization has led to a splitting of French national identity, which has radically altered the French political sphere. As conceptions of Frenchness change, it is important to understand what "being French" means to the group that feels it is left out of current policy as well as the rhetorical strategies that are being used to constitute this new identity. As Marine Le Pen continues to capitalize on the splintering of identity as one of the most powerful women in French politics, scholars must also understand the current status of women in France, along with current feminist and policy issues regarding gender.

Gender and French Politics

Despite Marine Le Pen's advancement to the final round of voting in the 2017 presidential election, French politics and France in general remain hostile places for women. French women did not receive the right to vote until 1944, and the country has only had one

woman Prime Minister, who was removed after less than one year in office because of "low approval ratings that some attribute to the misogynistic attitudes of…elites."[162] Historically, women in France have been the most underrepresented of any European country because there are very few successful women politicians.[163] This is partially due to, as Cécile Alduy and Stéphanie Wahnich note, the fact that sexism and misogyny are still alive and well in France and that, in some public places, banal misogyny is becoming more common.[164] This has led to an environment that is unfriendly to feminist causes and initiatives in governmental agendas. Although the French do not mind European feminist initiatives, it historically has "ha[d] nothing to show in this domain."[165]

Luckily, the French government has taken steps to address this problem, notably with the strengthening of their parity law in 2017. This law requires that "the ratio of men to women in public services must be no more than 60/40."[166] For legislative elections, the law requires each party to have "a minimum of 48% candidates of either sex" run for seats.[167] Parties that fail to do so will lose a portion of funding they receive from the state. While the law may have been passed in good faith, it does not seem to be as effective as it was intended. As Rainbow Murray points out, women do not have to run for winnable seats and thus are often placed in races that the party never had a chance of winning in the first place. Moreover, smaller parties that rely more wholly on this funding have been forced to make more changes to comply with the parity laws while the larger parties can afford to lose some of their state funding. In fact, in the 2012 legislative election, only two parties achieved gender parity: the Green Party and the National Front.[168]

Despite the fact that the National Front achieved parity in 2012, this was markedly difficult for this particular party due to what Terri E. Givens calls the "radical right gender gap," or the fact that the far right receives significantly more support from men than from women.[169]

Several studies have worked to explain the factors that cause this gap. Men are more often the "'globalization losers,'" in terms of the economy and competition with immigrants for jobs.[170] Meanwhile, women are more likely to be religious or hold feminist beliefs, and far-right messages of hate and traditional family values are less likely to resonate with these religious or feminist values.[171] When Marine Le Pen took over party leadership in 2011, the National Front had traditionally earned twice the number of men's votes as women's votes. In her attempt to make the party message more palatable to voters, Le Pen shunned the overt racism, anti-Semitism, and homophobia of her father's leadership, which, coupled with the achievement of parity of women candidates, led to a near-equal amount of votes from men and women for the National Front in 2012.[172]

*Feminist Issues in French Identity*

Despite the parity law passed by elected officials, it is still difficult to be a woman in France. As mentioned above, sexism is still prevalent throughout France, based in part on a long history of social conservatism and Catholicism that limited roles and rights of women. As is made clear in previous sections, French identity is very much grounded in history and is not likely to change easily. While there have been attempts at more equality for women in recent years, many of these attempts have fallen short. For example, in 2012, former President François Hollande secured a symbolic victory by achieving gender parity in his Cabinet, appointing an equal number of men and women; however, upon closer examination, it was revealed that gender stereotyping caused men to hold the most powerful positions in the Cabinet.[173]

Although current President Macron declared the *grand cause* of his presidency to be gender equality, his Cabinet achieved the same gender parity with the same problem of only appointing men to the truly powerful positions of senior Cabinet members. Women felt

disappointed after Macron hinted at appointing a woman as his prime minister only for him to choose a man instead. Another member of Macron's Cabinet has been accused of rape and has said he will sue his accuser for defamation.[174] Thus, despite the increasing numbers of women in governmental positions, few priority issues for women are reflected in political agendas, making the country and French government an unwelcoming place for women, feminism, and women's political issues.[175]

Many French laws that are hostile to women specifically target Muslim women and the religious symbols that they may choose to wear. France's explicitly secular constitution has allowed the country to police religious symbols worn in public, such as hijabs, burqas, and niqabs more closely than others. For example, in 2011, France became the first European country to ban "any article of clothing intended to conceal the face."[176] While not explicitly a ban on religious head coverings, the French government argued that the law was passed both for security reasons and to "encourage people to 'live together,'" indicating that the intended target of this law was Muslim women.[177] Moreover, attempted bans on burkinis—a modest bathing suit, created specifically for Muslim women—at public beaches and pools were the object of intense debate in summer of 2016, despite a French court overturning the bans.[178] Through these laws, the French government has continued policing religious symbols in an attempt to homogenize French society, and these laws often disproportionately target Muslim women.[179]

In addition to these targeted laws, sexual harassment remains a problem for the majority of women living in France. While a new law that allows on-the-spot fines for sexual harassment was passed in August 2018 and has led to hundreds of fines, many women feel that "#MeToo has fallen short in France."[180] This comes in the wake of a letter penned by 100 French women including France's most famous actress, Catherine Deneuve, that denounced #MeToo and

defended men's "'freedom to pester'" [that is] "'indispensable to sexual freedom.'"[181] Some

women, however, are fighting back on this culture of sexism and fighting for mainstream

recognition of important issues. For example, in addition to embracing the #MeToo movement,

French feminist Sandra Muller also started the popular #BalanceTonPorc (Expose Your Pig)

movement, which takes a much more direct and active approach to the issue of calling out sexual

harassment.[182]

At the governmental level, President Macron's Minister for Gender Equality, Marlène

Schiappa, has become the most outspoken member of the Cabinet, prioritizing initiatives to

combat problems that impact women, such as sexual harassment and health risks and

complications associated with childbirth.[183] Schiappa has also been working for state and judicial

recognition of femicide, or gender-related killings, which has reached over one hundred killings

in 2019. Femicide is most often defined as women killed at the hands of their partners, a problem

marked with increasing urgency for French society and the French government as thousands

have taken to the streets to protest government inaction on this issue.[184] Schiappa attributes these

and other gender problems in the country to the "'deeply sexist'" nature of French society.[185]

This is only buttressed by the gender inequality latent in French language. Saskya Vandoorne

explains that:

> Language itself is also a tool of male domination, according to [feminist organizer
> Caroline] de Haas. French grammar rules give the masculine form of a noun precedence
> over the female. "If you have one hundred women (a feminine noun) and one cat (a
> masculine noun) you say the word ('they' as a pronoun) in masculine. One hundred
> women and one cat. And the masculine form is superior. It's crazy!"[186]

With the status of French as a colonialist language and Napoleon's assertion that women were

not equal to men, gender inequality is reflected in nearly all facets of French life and society.

The feminist reckoning in France comes at a time when national identity in the country is continuing to fracture, and women continue to find their voice to protest gender-based injustices. These injustices are steeped in a long history of sexism and misogyny in societal organization, government, legislation, and language. This sexism has therefore governed much of French political identity as being male-dominated and representative of the upper echelons of society. As the French government takes feminist issues more seriously and more activists take to the streets and social media, French political identity, which, as mentioned above, has theoretically rested on idealized notions of equality, must evolve to include women's voices rather than a perpetuation of misogyny. The increasing unrest over issues such as these has allowed more extreme leaders, such as Le Pen, to take center stage as a pseudo-feminist voice.

## Like Father, Like Daughter: Nearly Fifty Years of Le Pen Leadership

It took several decades after the National Front's founding in 1972 to achieve the popularity of the group today. The cultural and social upheaval of the 1960s in France had led to an erosion of the traditional right-wing parties and a fear that these new directions would threaten the traditional French way of life. Jean-Marie Le Pen was determined to revive it. Founded out of neofascist group *Ordre Nouveau* (New Order), the National Front was created as an extremist group with the guiding principle being the French political tradition of what Eric Roussel calls "'the belief of a natural order, the defense of certain traditional values, suspicion of democracy—at least in its parliamentary form, xenophobia, and even latent anti-Semitism.'"[187] Though the original other founders of the National Front wanted Jean-Marie to act as merely a front man for the party, he refused, taking an active stance in his role as party president and emphasizing the traditional values of the right.[188]

When the party was first founded, however, it had virtually no impact on French politics. Jean-Marie refers to 1972 to 1983 as the party's "'crossing of the desert,'" as the National Front received only 2.8% of the total vote across the four national elections in those eleven years. However, the 1984 European parliamentary elections—during which French voters choose their representatives in the European Union's governing body—saw a surge of support. In this election, the National Front earned 12.34% of the overall vote and 10 seats in the European Parliament.[189] Although scholars cannot be sure of the reason for this sudden popularity, many point to President François Mitterand who, during the 1980s, encouraged extensive media coverage of Le Pen and the National Front, despite their overall low polling numbers. Mitterand's strategy was meant to undermine center right parties to boost his own left-leaning party's chances at electoral success.[190]

After the National Front's increased press coverage and very public legislative victory, the Le Pen name and the National Front became more well-known throughout France and Europe in general as Le Pen's hard stances on issues such as immigration and nationalism created both immense support and immense uproar. In fact, Nona Mayer and Pascal Perrineau even coined the phrase *lepénisme* ("Le Pen-ism") to describe the ideas promoted by Le Pen. In the late 1990s, polls found that a majority of the French public supported at least *some* of the National Front's political agenda, such as confronting issues of unemployment and violence, lowering the number of foreign workers in the country, and focusing less on racist rhetoric.[191] According to Le Pen, the country had lost its way with the decline of religion (Catholicism, specifically) and the promotion of changing family structures (such as encouraging women to work outside the home and not have children).[192]

Since the party's victory in 1984, National Front membership has steadily increased, and the party now can count on the far north and far south of the country as important footholds for electoral victory.[193] According to Edward G. Declair, the party has withstood the test of time for two main reasons. First, historically, the French far-right has been plagued with a wide range of ideologies to which it subscribes; Le Pen was able to consolidate all of it into the one philosophy of *lepénisme*. This philosophy was one of the first times that a party was able to meld all the far-right views together into a strong and cohesive philosophy. Second, Le Pen's charismatic energy was able to bring together the many different political characters of the French far-right, from student militants to Catholic fundamentalists to disillusioned war veterans. The ability for Le Pen to combine the power of these many different leaders led to a voting base and party leadership that subscribed to the philosophy of *lepénisme*.[194] Moreover, as Cas Mudde points out, strong leaders such as Le Pen will generally profit from systems that choose political positions by popular vote, such as in France.[195]

Despite his popularity, Le Pen never had a very concrete base. In fact, in a study conducted after he ran in the 1988 presidential election, researchers found that those who voted for Le Pen did so as a protest vote and that the majority of Le Pen voters "come and go."[196] Before 2002, voters associated the National Front almost exclusively with Jean-Marie Le Pen. Essentially, any vote for the party was a vote for him, no matter the election.[197] In fact, during the 2002 presidential election, the National Front gained more name recognition, and Jean-Marie advanced to the second round of that year's election. Though he lost the election by a long shot, when the 2007 presidential elections rolled around, the French electorate promised to "never again" let such extremist views and an extremist candidate get so close to reaching the presidency. Due to the media-instilled fear of a Le Pen presidency, it was predicted that voters

would turn to the far-left Socialist candidate in 2007. However, as Aurelien Mondon points out, 2007 center-right candidate Nicolas Sarkozy "accepted the idea of appealing to Le Pen's electorate" and tried to garner support from voters from the center all the way to the extreme right.[198] This created a divide between "never again" voters on the left and right-wing voters that were drawn in by Sarkozy's messages and efforts to court Le Pen supporters. Although French politics became more firmly polarized between the left and right, the presidential election of 2007 marked a shift away from the extreme right as center-right Sarkozy won by a landslide.[199]

Jean-Marie Le Pen led the National Front to many electoral victories, but not without controversy.[200] After making public anti-Semitic comments and being convicted of contesting crimes against humanity, he stepped down from party leadership in 2011.[201] Because, as Daniel Stockemer points out, Jean-Marie Le Pen "designed the party on the model of a family business," his daughter Marine Le Pen was able to easily win the votes in 2011 to take over party leadership. [202] Capitalizing on the so-called "Le Pen brand," Marine has transformed the National Front from a small party to a new party that poses a real possibility to change the French political sphere.[203]

*Marine Le Pen Transforms the Party*

Although Marine Le Pen has only led the party for eight years, she has managed to grow the National Front's profile immensely. Le Pen herself has run for president twice—once in 2012 and once in 2017—losing both times.[204] She has not been afraid to directly confront fellow candidates; a 2012 study of Le Pen's online discourse during that year's presidential election found that she was extremely critical of all the candidates, but most notably of the center-left and center-right candidates, François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy, respectively.[205] Despite these losses, she won more votes than predicted in both elections, and, after rebranding the party to the

National Rally in 2018, the party won more votes in the 2019 European Parliamentary election than any other French party, including that of President Macron.[206]

Since 2011, Le Pen has vehemently denounced her father's casual anti-Semitism and has sought to shed the racist image attached to her party through a "de-demonization" of the party.[207] It seems to be working. Scholars agree that Marine has made the Le Pen name and the National Front party message more palatable for French voters since her father stepped down from power, despite the fact that she has changed very few party policies.[208] Michel Marian points out that because Marine was groomed to take over the party—he even calls her a "clone" of her father—she still felt loyal to Jean-Marie and his original goals.[209] The difference, however, is that Marine is not demonized in the same way that her father was. She is seen as more polished and more credible, and therefore is able to attract more voters than Jean-Marie, even though she continues to promote much of her father's original political strategy. For example, Marine has retained many of his core principles, such as "conspiracy theories…fear of mixing [between French citizens and foreigners, and] anti-Communism," but in a way that Marian calls "watered-down" or diminished in importance to the overall party message.[210] Michelle Hale Williams explains that Marine "represents a continuation of the style and strategy that brought her father's FN [*Front National*] to a culmination point in 2002." The only difference is that "she appears to be doing it all in a way that is both qualitatively and quantitatively better than he did."[211]

Though Le Pen retains some of her father's initial political views, she has also introduced new topics such as *laïcité* and the invocation of feminist ideas (in contrast to her father's frequent misogynistic remarks). She has also downplayed some of her father's important talking points, such as the importance of Christian values and rallying against marriage equality.[212] Rather, Williams notes, Marine has focused her main goals on economics and security, "portray[ing] an

apocalyptic scenario for criminality and violence in neighborhoods." Additionally, Le Pen has

increasingly become focused on an even broader law and order policy.[213] Michel Eltchaninoff

explains Le Pen's overall message about the increasing danger in French society:

> According to her [Marine Le Pen], we, in our developed and relatively prosperous countries, live under a hitherto unknown form of totalitarianism, in which a power invisible as it is absolute has been taking hold over several decades. Through a duplicitous media, the hegemony of advertising and marketing, the tyranny of consumption, Internet surveillance and a standardized political discourse, the French, she claims, have been transformed into brainless consumers.[214]

Through this message, Marine advocates for a reconstruction of the country and of the people,

urging citizens to take their country back from the hands of these corrupt forces.

Marine Le Pen has not only changed the priorities of the party, but she has also changed

the communication strategies through which these issues are presented as a campaign to attract

more votes. For example, although Le Pen focuses more on security and economics, Alduy and

Wahnich point out that she uses these themes to include thinly veiled racism as central to her

platform.[215] Though she rejects the overt biological racism of her father's party, she now

"transfer[s] the racial and the genetic into the cultural—and even ethical and political—

domain,"[216] which is especially notable in her condemnation of so-called "mass migration" to

France and her crusade against the "*Islamisation* of France," both of which she links to increased

security and economic risks.[217] She also connects anti-immigration sentiments to "main concerns

of large part [sic] of the French public, such as wages, purchasing power and social and public

security."[218] Thus, the anti-immigration policies are presented as solutions for a host of public

French problems. In general, rather than focusing explicitly on issues of identity, the new party

under Marine Le Pen leadership weaves these concerns throughout many other talking points,

which creates more palatable policy programs for French voters.

The other major change that Le Pen has made in her communicative style is her invocation of gender. Marine Le Pen is not a feminist by any means; in fact, Dorit Geva points out that populism and the far right rely on gendered hegemony and concretization of masculinity and femininity. However, Le Pen does often invoke gendered or feminist talking points to make herself and her party platform seem more progressive than they really are. For example, Le Pen genders the virtues that she embodies as feminine, such as "carrying the history of France…in her very being."[219] She also portrays herself as matriarchal, taking care of the future of France and of the party. In this case, she makes use of her identity as a woman to position herself as the ultimate leader and savior of the party and political cause. By portraying herself as a modern woman—"a woman, a mother, and a lawyer"—Le Pen has created a political persona that is anti-elitist and relies upon her femininity to gain support and make the party that she leads more appealing to women.[220] Although the invocation of femininity and motherhood could be read as a break with traditional tropes of masculine political personae, Katie L. Gibson and Amy L. Heyse point out that sometimes seemingly feminist candidates who rely on traditional feminine scripts such as motherhood can reinforce traditional gender roles. In their analysis of Sarah Palin's speech at the 2008 Republican National Convention, Gibson and Heyse found that, despite media hailing Palin as a feminist, her rhetoric actually undermined her own position as a mother and a woman through "degradation of the feminine," which led to "the devaluation of feminist values and the undermining of women's voices writ large."[221] The authors point out that this trend is more likely to occur in conservative party politics.[222] Thus, despite Le Pen's invocation of her womanhood and motherhood as an asset to the party, she may use these scripts to instead reinforce the hegemonic masculinity that is comfortable at the heart of the conservative politics of the National Rally.

While Le Pen does craft a persona that emphasizes her status as a woman, she also takes on several other roles, many of which are not linked to her womanhood. Dorit Geva's interviews with National Front leaders and activists found that Le Pen is viewed in many different ways by supporters: "as daughter, mother, warrior, maiden, seductress, captain, and commander."[223] As such, while Le Pen emphasizes her role as a woman and mother, to supporters, she embodies a more androgynous position, able to take up traditionally masculine roles, such as captain or commander, as well as traditionally feminine roles such as mother or daughter. This ability to oscillate between many roles allowed Le Pen to effectively close the "radical right gender gap" of voters in both 2012 and 2017. Many voters cite her ability to soften the image of the party, as well as Le Pen herself as a relatable woman and mother as reasons for voting for her.[224] This message reframing has led to a growth in the voter base, notably in young people and women, both of which were underrepresented groups in Jean-Marie's National Front.[225]

In general, Marine's messages are arguably more populist than those of Jean-Marie, but they are also more respectable because of the change in rhetoric she uses to deliver those messages. Although she has introduced new topics and put others on hold, the real difference propelling electoral success has been the new way of presenting the same issues that were a part of Jean-Marie's foundational program for the National Front in 1972.[226]

*The Far-Right's National Identity*

In order to appeal to the national identity of supporters, Marine and Jean-Marie Le Pen have regularly invoked the idea of "the people" and fighting against the elite.[227] In fact, in the Jean-Marie-led National Front believed that French national identity did not come from the political realm, such as the country's Constitution, but in the more abstract concept of a singular people. With this logic, any outsider was perceived as a threat to national identity, and

immigration was met with cries of "anti-French racism," in which the French are not allowed to preserve their specific distinctiveness due to increasing populations of diverse cultures, religions, and values.[228]

Marine Le Pen's National Front and National Rally does still rely on notions of the people, but not to the same extent as her father. She positions herself as a representative of all French citizens "who not only faced unfair foreign competition but are also governed by corrupt political and social elites."[229] Moreover, by claiming to transcend the left/right political power dynamic, Le Pen situates her party as the only one that can take on the totalitarianism and elitism of which she speaks.[230] During her most recent presidential campaign in 2017, her campaign slogan *Au nom du people* (In the name of the people), reflected this move towards populist messages. Despite the populist invocation of the people, Le Pen uses notions such as *patrie* and patriot or patriotism rather than "nation" to undergird her message of representation.[231] As such, she connects her messages of national identity less to the state and its discontents and more to a patriotic love of country in order to inspire her brand of reactionary nationalism in her followers.

Le Pen also is quick to dictate *who* is included in this notion of the people whom she represents. Especially in her economic arguments, she continuously emphasizes the need to "renew French generations born to French parents."[232] In her discourse on Frenchness, Le Pen routinely connects this identity to the biological components of pure French lineage. Using "us versus them" rhetoric, the ethnic others is framed as unwelcome by "nationals," "patriots," or "the genuine French" that the National Front claims to represent.[233] Not only does Le Pen only represent the "true" people of France, but Daniel Stockemer notes that "those who are ruining the economy and the social system—foreigners—are not included in the national community and the system of solidarity that she [Le Pen] aims to create."[234] In other words, national identity in Le

Pen's National Front/National Rally positions supporters as true patriots imbued with traditional past French values and identity to which the party would like to return. This can only be done by demonizing the other and by positioning Le Pen leadership and National Rally party members as "outsiders to the political system…[and] and alternative to mainstream politics."[235]

Research conducted on Marine's transformation and de-demonization of the National Front/National Rally clearly indicates a desire to return to the past and resurrect the French identity of the past as the contemporary electorate does not feel represented by current French governmental leadership. Thus, I ask: In an era of competing discourse about nationalism and globalization, how does the French far-right conceptualize what it means to "be French"? and How does Marine Le Pen constitute French identity through her discourse? With a general understanding of the context of France and French national identity, from its founding to today, I now turn to the analysis of ten speeches given by Marine Le Pen.

# Chapter 3: Analysis

The social and political upheaval in contemporary France has created conditions that amplify Marine Le Pen's voice and similar far-right sentiments. As she and her movement continue to gain political power and solidify public support throughout the country and abroad, it is imperative to closely examine her rhetoric as she influences French national identity. Through my rhetorical analysis of ten of Le Pen's speeches, I argue that Le Pen uses tactics of victimage and scapegoating to reconceptualize what it means to be French and constitute her followers as always already French patriots and herself as their leader. As Le Pen scapegoats internal and external threats to the nation, she also engages in a revolutionary rhetoric that legitimizes and normalizes a far-right version of Frenchness.

In his 1969 book, *A Grammar of Motives,* Kenneth Burke explains why tactics of scapegoating may be invoked:

> All scapegoats are purposive, in aiming at self-purification by the unburdening of one's sins ritualistically, with the goat as…the chosen vessel of iniquity, whereby one can have the experience of punishing in an alienated form the evil which one would otherwise be forced to recognize within.[236]

In other words, scapegoating allows for the creation of villains (real or imagined) as a sign of societal sin. In order for society to absolve themselves of guilt related to that sin, the scapegoats must be cast out rather than society recognizing their own problems.

In the case of the far right in France, Le Pen identified internal and external threats to the nation and national identity as her scapegoats. Blaming cultural, societal, and economic problems on these scapegoats and framing the people as helpless victims, Le Pen absolved the people of any guilt over those current problems; instead, she constituted her followers as always

already French patriots and herself as the revolutionary leader of patriots. This analysis is divided into three parts that reflect the three steps of scapegoating, according to Burke.

First, there must be initial identification of the scapegoater with the scapegoat. Though Le Pen branded herself as a revolutionary, she sought to work *within* the systems that she demonized, including the French government and the European Union. Although she made it clear that she disapproved of current governing bodies, her speeches emphasized her desire to take over governance of France through the presidency and, in 2019, for her party to wield significant power in the European Union parliament. The second step of scapegoating is for the scapegoats to be cast out and divided from the rest of society. This is where Le Pen vilified those who she deemed elites and globalists, both internally and externally. Specifically, she targeted leaders like German chancellor Angela Merkel (who she often casts as a globalist), Emmanuel Macron, and other French political adversaries, as well as institutions such as the European Union itself. In this step, Le Pen also targeted immigrants, positioning them as clandestine terrorists who seek to destroy France from the inside. The third step of scapegoating, according to Burke, involves purification. In France, Le Pen sought to bring the newly purified people together, which would be accomplished through Le Pen's revolutionary rhetoric. As she constituted her followers as always already French patriots, she absolved the people of their guilt, as long as they continued to play their constituted role of loyal National Front/National Rally voters.

## Initial Identification

In order for the scapegoating system to unfold as Burke explains it, there must be initial identification with the scapegoats themselves. As Burke puts it, "both the attacker and victim are

parts of the same system."[237] Le Pen herself is a politician and sought to take over leadership

from the system that she criticizes. Moreover, in 2019, her goal was for her party to have

significant representation in the European Union Parliament. This is especially significant

because Le Pen had been a vocal proponent for France's exit from the European Union, or

"Frexit," and subsequently backed away from supporting that policy.[238] Thus, although Le Pen

and her party sought to enact major change, their political and societal goals worked within the

system that they condemned.

For example, Le Pen considered French culture to be sacred. Rather than let this culture

disappear, Le Pen called for the preservation of national culture as a right, saying that "France

deserves to be free. It is here, it has a culture, it has a language, it has a history to pursue."[239]

This would likely be done through cultural institutions that already existed in France, such as the

*Académie Française* or through governmental creation of new institutions or foundations. In

other words, if Le Pen wanted French culture to be protected, that had to be accomplished

through the system that Le Pen criticized. Culture was especially important to Le Pen during the

2017 election because if "the French people, modeled by their history, their art, their culture"

work to protect this culture, they would then be able to protect the history that comprises and

inspires much of French national identity.[240] This would not be an easy task, she said, as the

French people have been repeatedly challenged to legitimize their fundamental values when

confronted with the possibility of forced uniformity.[241]

For Le Pen, the European Union was one such institution that sought to force uniformity

on the diverse nations and cultures that comprised Europe. When discussing Europe, Le Pen

often argued that the E.U. would like to see a uniform society and submission of Europeans to a

singular institution. During the 2017 presidential election, she explained that the globalist elites

wanted to "make the diversity of world cultures old-fashioned."[242] In 2019, she intensified this

discourse, saying that the E.U. "only has a goal of 'normalization'" in which the E.U. advanced

"'uniformity'…and the submission of people," under the guise of what the European Union

referred to as "'harmonization.'"[243] In this case, *all* European cultures were under attack because

of these attempts at forced uniformity by the E.U. and its efforts to wipe all countries from the

map, creating a form of totalitarianism ruled by the globalizing, post-national, European

Union.[244] Rather than completely rejecting the European Union in her speeches, however,  Le

Pen called on the E.U. to adopt her plans on multiculturalism throughout the continent, calling

for the institution's "cardinal value" to be "freedom," first and foremost, including cultural

freedom.[245] Thus, although Le Pen did not want to see a European Union with unchecked power,

she posited that working *with* the E.U. could help to preserve the European multiculturalism that

she viewed as so important to national identity.

Another way that Le Pen indicated that she could work within the system she critiqued

was her description of the role of the French presidency in 2017. Rather than attempting to

completely change the duties of the president, she offered a fairly traditionalist description of the

role. For example, Le Pen told audiences that it is the role of the president to protect the country,

not act as "an administrator of untamed globalization…[or] a lobbyist of a large bank," a direct

jab at her opponents in the presidential election.[246] Following this trend, Le Pen's view of the

presidency was one of an empathetic protector: she said that she "hurts every time a French

person hurts," but refused to see "my people massacred."[247] Le Pen also referred to France as

"my country," situating herself as the lead caretaker of a country in which she had a real stake

and vowing to end the people's suffering.[248] Promising not to abandon the people, Le Pen

pledged to be "the president that protects you, the president of the French republic, a truly French

republic…do not be afraid to be French."[249] Most importantly Le Pen saw the job as president to protect France, the French people, and to put France first. This was especially notable in her preoccupation with what she perceived to be disappearing French sovereignty—and, by extension, French freedom—which she vowed to bring back and fiercely protect.[250] Although Le Pen aimed to alter the role of the president by adopting an overtly caregiving function, her goals for the presidency still fit squarely within what would traditionally be expected of the French president.

In addition to Le Pen's goal of attaining the presidency, she also explained that the National Front/National Rally should take on countrywide leadership. This message was particularly apparent during her campaign in 2019. For example, Le Pen said it was the party's job to steer the country towards good decisions.[251] More specifically, she said the party must continue to warn the French people about the dangers posed by a government that either did not share her opinion or just ignored the warning signs.[252] To Le Pen, "the truth is not objective and freedom of expression is justly done to permit and protect ideas that could bother [the system]."[253] In other words, the party pledged to protect the right to speak out against a government that was viewed as corrupt and working against the interests of the French people. In this way, even if Le Pen did not win the presidency, she and her movement promised to hold the system accountable, working to call out dishonesty, in hopes of leading the country back to national prosperity.

For Le Pen, accountability this would be achieved by giving power back to the people, which, as she reminded listeners, is the goal of a democracy in the first place. In a 2017 campaign speech, she pointed out that the people *are* the State, "the instrument" through which the people can enact what they want because "the State is in service to the nation."[254] Le Pen

promised the "reaffirmation of public authority" and pledged to "give back what belongs to you."[255] As she told her supporters in 2017, the presidential election would be one of the only things that gave the French people "control. And control cannot be exercised if you are without a voice."[256] Thus, despite Le Pen's authoritarian policy proposals, her message praised democracy and promised to give all French people a voice. Once power returned to the people, Le Pen asserted, France would regain the magnificence that Le Pen said it has lost. Pledging to defend "freedom, equality, brotherhood," and all other traditional French values, Le Pen set out a vision for the future of the country as "strategic," "modern," and "respected in its decisions" during her run for president in 2017.[257] By using discourse that praised democracy and promised to give power back to the people, Le Pen asserted her intention to work within contemporary conceptions of the state and democracy, rather than to introduce a complete overhaul of the contemporary French system.

One of the main ways that Le Pen worked within the system concerned her legislative proposals. During her 2017 campaign, she said "there is not and there will never be other laws and values in France other than French ones."[258] Le Pen thus made it clear that she foresaw a very specific code of law in a France over which she wanted to preside. One example of French laws in Le Pen's France was her proposal to pass laws that would enshrine a love of France in national legislation. In the speech that launched her 2017 presidential campaign, Le Pen said "We will inscribe in the Constitution, the defense and the promotion of our historical and cultural patrimony."[259] She even continued "to reinforce the feeling of belonging and solidarity, we will institute a national service, civil or military."[260] Rather than passing overtly authoritarian laws, Le Pen indicated that she intended to work within the system of parliament to pass laws about the love of France.

In addition to working within the legislative system, Le Pen also focused on bringing a love of country to the people in other ways. As she set out her presidential platform in 2017, she often focused on education, encouraging her audiences to be proud of their culture, and teach children about it, in order to preserve culture and identity.[261] One of her favorite talking points throughout 2017 and beyond included a call to return more power to teachers to teach their students "to read, write, count, the knowledge about the history of our country, its values, its flag, its national anthem."[262] By equating cultural knowledge of France with the ability to read, write, and count, Le Pen made it clear that an education in French culture is an imperative for every French child and way to fight against malicious forces that would prefer French culture be forgotten.

While Le Pen was working to change the status quo, her discourse suggested that she was still working within the current system. Although she criticized it, Le Pen needed the help of the European Union to preserve the French culture she holds so dear. Thus, rather than burning bridges with international leaders, Le Pen called on the E.U. to put more regulatory protections in place to encourage European multiculturalism. At a national level, Le Pen sought to hold the title of president of France, which would be accomplished through traditional means of electoral victory and democracy. Her rhetoric about giving the country back to the people and passing culturally-specific legislation also indicated that she wanted to continue democratic practices upon which France's Constitution was founded. Le Pen's dependence upon and functioning within the system thus fulfilled the first criterion of Burke's scapegoating, as she initially identified with the system and leaders who she hoped to unseat.

Division and Casting Out

Although there is initial identification with the scapegoat, the second step of the scapegoating process involves distancing from the scapegoat as a way to break with that identification. Burke calls this "a principle of division" and it is accomplished, according to Brian Ott and Eric Aoki, "through vilification and through a redrawing of boundaries that excludes the scapegoat."[263] To distance herself from the system, Le Pen focused her efforts on scapegoating elites, globalists, and immigrants. First, she viewed those in the French government—especially Emmanuel Macron—and the European Union as elites who have abandoned the people. Second, she also cast them as globalists, as she rallied against the perceived negative impacts of globalization on France. Finally, Le Pen used her platform to demonize immigrants who, according to Le Pen, seek to invade France and hurt the people, physically, culturally, and socially. Through the vilification of these groups, Le Pen further separated herself and the people from their perceived evils, painting the people and the nation as helpless victims of these scapegoats.

*Elites*

Although Le Pen may be part of the same system as her political opponents, her main critique was that the system was dominated by elites; that group became her scapegoats. She advanced this characterization by framing the French government and European Union as callous and uncaring toward the people. As she pointed to examples of how the elites do not have France's best interests at heart, she created a pronounced division between the elites and the everyday people. This division allowed Le Pen to more easily separate herself from the elites by billing herself as a representative who understands and cares about the people.

Le Pen framed French politicians and the government as those who no longer believed in France. Le Pen often talked about them and other elites as intentionally working against French

interests and wanting the people to suffer, putting the blame for many for French problems on an uninspired government. In many speeches, Le Pen told her followers that politicians have betrayed the people and emphasized how they work against the people.[264] During the 2017 presidential election, she said that if the government had it their way, French culture would not exist and that politicians gladly "accept the shameful mission of saying no to France. They do not acknowledge you [the French people]."[265] Specifically, Le Pen charged that Macron's goal was to "end 1500 years of French history" and act as if French culture did not exist.[266]

In her 2017 Paris speech, Le Pen attacked each of her political opponents as elites, saying that center-right candidate François Fillon wanted "dry bread and water for the poorest and opulence for the most powerful."[267] She continued on to Emmanuel Macron, characterizing him as a candidate who only cared about implementing globalist policies and allowing "uncontrolled immigration" in France.[268] Finally, according to Le Pen, left wing Jean-Luc Mélénchon, in addition to favoring the country being taken over by immigrants, wanted to hand over the reins of control to extremists.[269] More generally, Le Pen said that all politicians—left or right—did not believe in France: "they are opportunists who consider the word 'identity' in the class of swear words (mostly when it is applied to the French people), that the word 'people' would be unseemly, or that the expression 'values of civilization' would be unpronounceable."[270] This allowed Le Pen to present her political opponents as callous concerning French wellbeing, an issue that was a cornerstone of Le Pen's campaign and helped her differentiate herself from her competition.

Le Pen also characterized politicians as liars, saying in 2019 that "we are used to living with these small arrangements with the truth" especially with regards to Macron's presidency.[271] Moreover, Macron was described as belonging to "a very selective caste" with "few places" for

others to join.[272] By drawing attention to Macron's perceived elitism, Le Pen further separated

him and his government from everyday people and their needs. She demonstrated this through

her invocation of the Gilets Jaunes protestors, who, as noted in the preceding chapter, took to the

streets in massive protests against Macron's government. During the 2019 European Union

election, Le Pen said that the left hired "professional rioters" to join the movement as a way for

the government to more easily discredit the protests.[273] Through both general and specific

descriptions of elitist French politicians, Le Pen attempted to show that elites do not care about

the people and would rather look out for their own self-interests than those of the people.

Not only did Le Pen point to how French politicians betrayed the people, but she also

explained the negative impacts that this betrayal and elitism had on the nation. This was most

notable in what Le Pen characterized as a lack of French patriotism and solidarity. Because of

the so-called "Franco-skepticism" of the elites, French patriotism was "thrown to the dungeons"

and the elites left France with "the absence of national ambition."[274] According to Le Pen, chaos

followed, as politicians worked to undermine national solidarity, and Macron wanted to "make

the French people disappear…a project that confirms the exit of France from history."[275] The

government's passivity toward French national identity and its active efforts against the people

had, "under the guise of progress and prosperity, expanded misery and despair everywhere

and…never defended our national identity and our country."[276] Because elected leaders were the

perceived cause of France's current lack of national solidarity, it became easier for Le Pen to

further distance herself from the government despite her attempts to take it over through electoral

success.

While Le Pen focused much of her discourse on demonizing the elitism of the French

political system specifically, she also gave some attention to the elites of the European Union. In

contrast to how she talked about the French government, Le Pen painted the European Union as a controlling "monster" that had stolen France's power and sovereignty.[277] For example, Le Pen reminded audiences that "The collapse of our values of civilization…the end of indivisibility, of sovereignty, and equality in the French nation" was an inevitability with the European Union's power over the country.[278] In her speech announcing her candidacy for president, Le Pen said that the E.U. was "disconnected from the aspirations of the people" and, two years later, that the power of the European Union represented "a danger for [citizens'] freedoms."[279] Moreover, because of this external force, "we are living in an inversion of values," an inversion that "wants to replace freedom of expression with censure."[280]

While Le Pen showed how the European Union seemed to have a negative impact on French values and culture, the biggest concern about the E.U., according to Le Pen, was that the institution's control negatively impacted France's fundamental freedoms. Because France must report to the E.U. and follow many of its laws, the far right saw this as an assault on French sovereignty. In her 2017 speech in Paris, Le Pen said that the French people had been "unjustly deprived, deprived of our choices, our sovereignty having been transferred to others."[281] In this case, she blamed the European Union in Brussels, Belgium and the European Bank in Frankfurt, Germany for stealing their sovereignty. Moreover, Le Pen pointed out that the French are ruled by a European Constitution that they did not even approve.[282] Later in the speech, she specifically said that France is no longer sovereign because the country must obey the E.U.[283] This was not just a theme during the 2017 presidential elections; in 2019 when promoting the National Rally for the European elections, Le Pen again painted the European Union as stealing sovereignty and other parts of French identity.[284]

With remarks like this, Le Pen effectively depicted the French people as helpless victims of an evil European Union that was guided by its own interests rather than what is best for each individual country over which it rules. This was further solidified as Le Pen used metaphors of monstrosity to describe the European Union. In her 2017 speech in Paris, Le Pen described the institution as a "bureaucratic and ultraliberal monster."[285] Two years later during the campaign for the European elections, Le Pen reminded the audience of the tale that European leaders told when the E.U. was first forming: "The European Union was first built as a nicely orchestrated tale…"[286] This then took a morbid turn for Le Pen: "Stop! The Europeanist tale is played out. We are at the end of the story and we are discovering that under the cape of the kind knight hides, in reality, an ogre who aches to devour the sleeping princess."[287]

This discourse surrounding the European Union framed the French people as innocent victims of this institution's power and susceptible to its powerful rhetoric. This trickery allowed the E.U. to swoop in and steal the last remaining bits of sovereignty that France had, which led to a decrease in freedom for the French people. By literally describing the E.U. as a monster and an ogre, Le Pen effectively showed how the European Union does not serve French patriotic interests, but rather, that it actively attempted to take away French national identity afforded through state sovereignty. In this way, she scapegoated the European Union as an institution that worked against the best interests of the people.

Although Le Pen used different tactics to scapegoat the French government and the European Union, the overarching message is the same: these groups are comprised of elites who do not care about the needs or problems of the people. By demonizing these groups as unsympathetic to the plight of the people or the necessities to the health of the nation, Le Pen

successfully created a larger division between leadership (the guilty) and the people (the victims). This is especially reflected in her characterization of elites as globalists.

*Globalists*

Marine Le Pen has consistently viewed globalization in a negative light, and it was a popular topic in her discourse. Globalization was described in terms of how it negatively impacted countries and populations. Similar to Le Pen's critiques of elites, she argued that globalization did not take the interests of the French people into account, and the increasing characterization of nations as markets and people as either producers or consumers can only hurt the French people and French national identity. Globalization and globalists, such as Emmanuel Macron, therefore, seek to erase French identity in favor of the economic.[288] In this sense, globalists work to homogenize the European population, expecting France to assimilate to a globalist vision of values and identity.

While Le Pen does differentiate between the impacts of economic and cultural globalization, she brings them both together under the umbrella term "untamed globalization." In her discourse, Le Pen demonstrated how both iterations of untamed globalization caused problems for France and how those problems were perpetrated by the system. First, for Le Pen, economic globalization is connected to the increasing privatization of the economic sphere. She described how this type of globalization "organize[d] the world like a large worldwide supermarket" with the people "destined to be only consumers or producers."[289] In other words, Le Pen said, untamed globalization represented the "commodification of the world" and "ultra-capitalism without borders."[290] This characterization allowed her to link economic woes to a greedy government that cares more about ties to private, globalized companies than serving the interests of its people.

To Le Pen, the elites have created a France that must "submit to market logics" of globalization.[291] These leaders have chosen deregulated, untamed globalization against the will of the people, encouraged by the European Union's view of Europe as a market.[292] Casting this system as "an experiment" in *"sans frontièrisme"* (without border-ism), Le Pen pointed out that countries that have fully embraced globalization are suffering as a result.[293] She called Switzerland "a country totally inserted in global exchanges" and argued that its economic problems have arisen because of the difficulty in protecting its agriculture from globalizing policies.[294] Through her discourse on the economic aspect of untamed globalization, Le Pen emphasized specific policies that she believed to be a demonstration of elites' apathy toward the good of the people.

Because the system is more concerned with money and markets than the country, the people and culture have been negatively affected, according to Le Pen's discourse. Le Pen pointed to the relocations of workers and how this shows no concern or care for workers in a globalized system.[295] According to Le Pen untamed globalization created a "worldwide Monopoly" with the people as pawns and led to a dehumanized society, which began to work against national solidarity.[296] As globalization continues to wage war on France, Le Pen told her audiences that the social system and the French people's way of life will collapse under the system.[297] Ravaging from the interior—especially as it caused French villages and cities to lose local jobs—economic globalization caused France and Europe to see more external effects.[298] Le Pen painted a picture of France as weak, unable to keep pace in the global economic competition and surpassed by globalizing China and the United States.[299] Even worse than the economic issues was the effect globalization has on the nation: "Countries are no longer nations, united by

momentum of the heart, but are markets, places where commodification of everything…is feasible, possible, administrated, and even organized."[300]

In this case, Le Pen distinguished herself and her party from the scapegoats by explaining that nationalism should outweigh the capitalism of current leaders. This proposal would radically change the way France operates. Consequently, it pits Le Pen against leaders in French government and the European Union. In fact, throughout both the 2017 and 2019 elections, Le Pen repeatedly framed the fight as globalists versus nationalists.[301] The National Front/National Rally represented the nationalists, acting only in the best interest of the country, while Macron and his government represented the globalists, beholden to globalization interests and only interested in turning France into a giant market.[302]

Le Pen often connected the economic and cultural effects of untamed globalization by explaining how financial problems would negatively impact the nation and the people. For Le Pen, this type of globalization is connected to issues of security and culture and its deregulation can be blamed on many different policies and institutions. According to Le Pen, the system "enslaves" people to "the law of the jungle, to the dictatorship of financial markets, to the reign of money."[303] This "industrial carnage" leaves France and the French people "bereft of our laws…bereft of our territory…bereft of our rights…bereft of our memory, and finally bereft of our hope."[304] These problems were often also blamed on what she viewed as lax immigration policies. As she explained it, "immigration is intimately bound to untamed globalization."[305] Characterizing globalization as deregulated and with no constraints allowed Le Pen to present apocalyptic scenarios that may occur should globalization continue to take over France.[306] As such, the cultural side of untamed globalization not only literally targets borders, but it also seeks to split the French people, which undergirds the entirety of French national identity, according to

Le Pen.[307] This is partially because this type of globalization relies on "a subjugation [of the people], first of all mental, that operates through disaffiliation, by isolation, by the dissolution of traditional ties."[308]

In addition to showing how the elites of the French government and European Union seek to turn the people into slaves of capitalism, Le Pen also made a powerful argument about cultural globalization's effect on the notion of the nation itself. Le Pen targeted Macron and other leftists, saying that they believe "the nation is an outdated concept," and that they defend a "post-national" vision in which France's flag, culture, and history are no longer important.[309] As such, the so-called "globalizers" seek to advance "a miserable and sad post-national vision" as they continue to be on the side of globalization, rather than on the side of the French people who aim to preserve their country. She argued that globalists view the nation as a barrier to enacting a globalist worldview, seen by elites as merely a place for people to "'live together,'" giving little importance to the role and importance a nation plays in creating a cohesive people and national solidarity and identity.[310] Exasperated by globalization in 2017, Le Pen exclaimed: "everything scrapped, melt[ed] in the grand magma of untamed globalization," essentially arguing that globalization swallowed everything up, including French identity.[311] Globalization also relies on "the negation of values on which France is constructed," leading to a weakening of the nation's morale.[312] As globalization "erase[s] nations" it also therefore "puts our civilization in danger."[313] In addition to targeting the nation, Le Pen argues that untamed globalization "also attacks our Republic by questioning its indivisibility."[314]

Through this characterization of globalists and the nation, Le Pen continued to cast out the scapegoats while simultaneously justifying her divisive rhetoric as in the best interest of the nation's future. As such, Le Pen and her followers viewed untamed globalization as a force that

sought to force France to submit and give up, to make the people feel lost and like outcasts in their own country.[315] In short, globalization sought to break down a nation's national solidarity and way of life as a way for elite systems and institutions, such as the European Union, to gain power. Le Pen explained that some of the traditional French values were being altered, as "globalists have enshrined greed as a virtue" in France, and Germany had taken over France's power as a global leader.[316]

In order to take back power from globalists—and, by extension, reclaim power for France— it was necessary to cast them out from society through a divisive and scapegoating rhetoric upon which Le Pen relied. Although she employed divisive discourse, she framed it as acting in the best interests of the people while also depicting herself on the side of the people rather than the elites and globalists. Thus, by portraying the French government and European Union as made up of elites who are apathetic to France's history and culture, it became easier for them to be scapegoated as the cause of France's economic, social, and cultural woes. Moreover, by linking these elites to what Le Pen sees as the great un-equalizer of globalization, she showed that these groups deserve to be demonized as they seek to erase the nation as a barrier to their true interests. In addition to her intense focus on globalization, Le Pen also targeted immigrants and what she views as lax immigration policy as scapegoats for France's problems.

*Immigrants and Immigration*

Before delving into Le Pen's views on the negatives of immigration, I want to note that Le Pen does not view globalization and immigration as separate phenomena. Though distinct topics, Le Pen's discourse consistently links globalization and immigration, as she argues that increasing globalization has also led to an increase in state-sanctioned migration to France. In her 2017 speech announcing her candidacy for president, Le Pen divided globalization into two

68

categories: low and high. Low globalization results in mass immigration, which negatively impacts the social aspects of France, while high globalization concerns the economy, reducing France to a market.[317] These notions do not exist independent of one another—Le Pen explicitly linked increased economic globalization to increasing immigration.[318] For example, Le Pen said that this "dogma" of globalization and its deregulation meant that France no longer has borders or protection, leading to "unfair international competition, mass immigration, and the circulation of terrorists."[319]

Although she typically did not use this typology to describe globalization in other speeches, Le Pen did still link globalization and immigration. In her discourse, globalization is often framed in terms of economics, as Le Pen argued that it puts the people at a disadvantage and hurts them economically. The neoliberalism of globalization allowed immigration en masse to follow, according to Le Pen. An influx of migrants not only poses a serious risk to the culture and identity and French people, as she continued to demonize other cultures and ways of life, but also a physical security threat, as Le Pen consistently linked immigration to heightened threats of terrorism within France.[320]

Le Pen's connection between immigration and globalization allowed her to blame what she viewed as problems caused by increased immigration on the elites of the French government and European Union. Essentially, because elites were also viewed as globalists, they tacitly endorsed "untamed" immigration that Le Pen saw as going hand-in-hand with globalization. For example, the European Schengen agreement, which allows for free movement within Europe, "erases our physical borders," and political parties have caused those borders that do still exist to become even weaker.[321] Le Pen also put the blame on the European Union, saying that it "has destroyed our interior borders, all while leaving the large exterior ones open."[322] In other words,

for Le Pen, the elites were responsible not only for the economic hardships caused by globalization, but also for the cultural and social harms that arise from what Le Pen viewed as unfettered immigration.

One of the main threats of immigration, according to Le Pen was that potential for increased multiculturalism that is brought to France by migrants. One of her favorite lines, both before and during the 2017 presidential election, was "A multicultural society is a multi-conflictual society."[323] As immigrants continued to pour into France, Le Pen viewed the multitude of cultures they brought with them as a danger to traditional French culture.[324] In her 2015 speech in Corsica, Le Pen explained that multiculturalism would "ruin our identity," by trying to "replace our customs, our way of life, our traditions, our local identities."[325] In fact, Le Pen continued, the only diversity in France should be small differences between the various regions throughout the country.[326] Because strangers were entering the country with no regard or respect for the French way of life, Le Pen rallied against this "otherworldliness."[327] As a solution, Le Pen proposed assimilation, which she said "is not the rejection of the other, the stranger…Assimilation reinforces and welds the national community by being firm on the reception conditions for those who want to live on our land."[328] Moreover, she reminded the audience that assimilation is not "a rejection of the other," but something that "reinforces…the national community."[329]

In her discourse on immigration, Le Pen never explicitly said that she is against all immigration or even all Muslims, but she did make it clear that she and her supporters only welcome people to the country who want to live in France and abide by the cultural customs that have already been established. In other words, she would welcome outsiders only if they were willing to accept conditions of French national identity. She reminded her audience that not all

immigrants are bad people and that those who "live in France, with dignity, who work here…have nothing to fear from my presidency."[330]

Le Pen reinforced French culture as something very specific: something to be protected from any other cultures that threaten to dilute it. Le Pen thus simultaneously advocated multiculturalism throughout Europe and a homogenous culture throughout France, creating a "right" and "wrong" type of multiculturalism. European multiculturalism, which allowed for the flourishing of diverse national cultures, was seen as a positive for the continent. Meanwhile, multiculturalism within France—specifically, the multiculturalism brought from to the country by immigrants, many of whom are not European—threatened the French way of life and constituted an existential threat to French values, identity, and solidarity.[331] As such, Le Pen believed that the population of a country with a strong national identity should be culturally homogenous, with outsiders willing to assimilate into the dominant culture.

In early theories of nation-building, theorists viewed the strongest nations as socially, culturally, and politically homogenous, arguing that greater homogeneity produced increased national solidarity and fostered a uniform identity for a nation's people. Benedict Anderson's notion of "deep horizontal comradeship" as integral to nation-building reflects this view.[332] In this case, the nation's homogenous population is linked by shared historical and cultural myths, as they are invited to imagine a singular community to which they belong.[333] While Homi Bhahba has pointed out that this is an idealistic and unrealistic conceptualization of the nation, this has not stopped nationalistic discourse from promoting the ideal of a homogenous nation.[334] As M. Mosheer Amer explains, "there is often a nationalist tendency to assert, or over-emphasize, national sameness and homogeneity while largely ignoring or downplaying intra-national economic, social, and ideological differences among the members of the ingroup."[335] Le

Pen's fearmongering about disappearing culture reflected these trends in nationalistic discourse. Because she posited that French culture and identity are disappearing in large part because of increasing immigration, immigrants directly threatened France as a homogenous nation. For Le Pen and other nationalists, not only does homogeneity preserve the traditional culture and history of the people—by preserving the culture's social, historical, and cultural myths, for example— but it also ensures that the other does not take over the people. Homogeneity of culture, customs, and language is thus seen as a safeguard for the people, while rejection of the other and culture of migrants is viewed as a protective act.

Le Pen's discourse, while demonizing the European Union and globalists, also demonized the non-European immigrants who come to France and refuse to assimilate, criticizing a group of people for preserving their own culture. As such, Le Pen valorized the differences that exist between European cultures only while promoting xenophobic sentiments and internal cultural homogenization. Through this rhetoric on the so-called evils of multiculturalism, Le Pen made an argument against mass immigration and asserted that the French people are victims of globalizing elites who would like to see France's culture diluted by allowing many immigrants to come into the country.

Not only are migrants existential threats to the country's culture as migrants bring their own customs to France, but they are also considered physical threats as Le Pen focused extensively on the figure of the Muslim terrorist who seeks to destroy France from the inside. This is only augmented by the weakening of borders, which leads to "cultural dilution" of France, according to Le Pen.[336]

In this section, I focus primarily on Le Pen's invocation of the figure of the Muslim terrorist as a threat to the nation. Although Le Pen made general comments about migrants and

immigration, she focused much of her time on the threatening link between immigration and

terrorism specifically. Moreover, her Islamophobic discourse not only created a fear of Muslims,

but also of *all* immigrants. Le Pen instilled this fear by framing terrorists as sneaking

clandestinely into the country in order to attack the French people, culture, and identity. As such,

in order to understand how Le Pen scapegoats all immigrants as threats to the people, it is

important to closely examine how Le Pen framed the biggest threat to the nation, in the form of

the Muslim terrorist. To do this, Le Pen portrayed the Muslim terrorist in two ways. First, she

argued that the Muslim terrorist does not belong to any nation and therefore specifically targets

France to implement a terrorist government. Second, she framed Islam as a poison for French

national identity and society. The increase of this migration, through which anyone could be

terrorist, threatened the national solidarity, national identity, and patriotism that Le Pen and her

movement worked so hard to cultivate.

First, Marine Le Pen consistently and explicitly connected immigration to a heightened

risk of terrorism, especially during her 2017 presidential campaign.[337] She often drew

connections between France's so-called "weak" borders and terrorism. These open borders act as

a "lure" as "the doors of our home" remain open to undesirable immigrants.[338] Throughout her

speeches, Le Pen used the metaphor of a house to explain how perceived open borders hurt the

people. During her 2017 presidential campaign, she told attendees that other candidates wanted

to "open the door of the French house to mafias, terrorists" who seek to do harm to France.[339] In

a later speech on the campaign trail, she extended this metaphor concerning national borders:

> It's probably the same as those who invest in three-point locks. Our detractors tell us that,
> in wanting to recover our borders, we are going to…close the country in on itself, but
> what poppycock! That's nothing, like for your house, a door does not lock you inside, it
> opens if you want to enter or leave. It opens if you want to let your guests enter or permit
> them to leave…You always have the possibility to close it and even to lock it if it is about
> protecting you from thieves or squatters.[340]

In the same way that the people expect protection in their own homes, Le Pen expected the same protection for the country's borders, giving the power to inhabitants to decide who can enter and leave their country. The immigration policy that Le Pen was so strictly against was consistently framed as a complete opening of borders with immigrants flooding into the house of France. With Le Pen in power, she promised to no longer let this continue, and to "put the doors and windows back on the house of France," while also giving the people "the keys of your country to you, the French people."[341]

As globalizing policies unlocked the doors of France, Le Pen explained how this perceived lack of security led to many safety problems. Overall, for Le Pen, this type of globalization resulted in "uncontrolled immigration," which directly connected to "the establishment of fundamental Islam" in the country.[342] In fact, Le Pen occasionally preferred the term "Jihadist" globalization to "untamed" globalization.[343] As these lax rules became the norm, she charged, "dangerous or malicious individuals" were permitted to enter the country freely.[344]

As she pointed to globalization as a major way that Islamic terrorists "infiltrated" the country, in 2015 she also explained why France was the target for terrorism in the first place: "these barbarians are not soldiers of a hostile nation or an enemy people. These combatants do not exhibit a national flag."[345] Rather, she continued, "they come to destroy and annihilate everything that we are and everything that they hate: our freedom, our way of life, our culture, our secularism."[346] In a later speech in 2017, Le Pen described terrorists as "soldiers of hate," rather than soldiers that represent a country, sent to "strike the heart of our country."[347] In this sense, Le Pen quickly pointed out that extremist terrorists do not fight for a country, marking them as a group without a national identity and saying "terror is their doctrine, Sharia law is their constitution."[348] By portraying Muslim terrorists as lacking allegiance to a country, Le Pen cast

them in direct opposition to French society and national identity for whom national belonging is a cornerstone.

In her speeches, Le Pen told her supporters that Muslim terrorists not only attack France because they are opposed to everything the country stands for, but also because they want to implement a new way of life. They see France as the perfect place to establish rule because they do not have their own country in which to do so. These terrorists want to erase what France is and represents now. Le Pen said that the goal is to "dissolve France from the interior," and ruin the freedom that France has, along with French national identity.[349] In this way, Islamic terrorists want to manipulate France and take over power from them.[350] As she pointed out in 2017, "Each day there are hundreds of additional strangers that enter [France]…to live in our country with the intention to live as in their own country."[351] With no regard for French culture and no intention to learn, these immigrants want to keep their own way of life and take over cultural control of France, according to Le Pen. Because the Muslim terrorist seeks to transform French identity into their own view of what a country should be, it was easy for Le Pen to dismiss these non-nationals as "barbarians" and "monsters" who want to take over a country simply because of hate and jealousy of France's values and national solidarity.[352] Framing them in this way created conditions for easy scapegoating of all immigrants, by extension.

To further the fear of immigrants, Le Pen often talked about what a terrorist takeover vision of France looks like. The major component of this new France under terrorism that Le Pen invoked the most often in 2017 and 2018 was the fact that Sharia law would be implemented.[353] Not only would this new form of governance threaten the leadership and authority that constitutes much of French identity, but it would also threaten the French people physically and psychologically. Le Pen painted a picture of a "shadow army who would like to teach us to live

in fear," and to "replace our democratic order with their totalitarian order."[354] This new order

would "condemn all the pleasures of life" and replace French equality between men and women

with the practice of women as subservient to her father or husband.[355] In other words,

immigration represented "oppression" of the French people and French way of life to Le Pen.[356]

      In order to achieve this vision of France controlled by Islamic terrorists, Le Pen explained

how the takeover would enact this vision in her first campaign speech of 2017. She made it clear

that the fight against terrorists is an "ideological combat," of which terrorism is a tool.[357] This

ideology would be imposed through killings, massacres, and barbarianism, according to Le Pen,

supporting her argument that immigrants are both ideological and physical threats. She went on

to explain that, because terrorism is the result of globalization, Muslim terrorists are able to

infiltrate the country through a false invocation of the freedom "to set up their totalitarianism.

It's the freedom of a fox in the henhouse."[358] In other words, Le Pen argued, immigration policy

allowed terrorists the freedom to easily enter the country and set up systems to support their

beliefs. Another way that these Muslims are able to infiltrate the country is by crying

Islamophobia. Le Pen pointed out that these groups often invoke Islamophobia in order to obtain

sympathy from groups that will then unwittingly help them put their plans in place to take over

France.[359] Through these steps, Le Pen argues, Muslim terrorists can clandestinely arrive in

France in order to put their vision of the country in place because they do not have their own

country in which they can implement it. Through her distrust of immigrants Le Pen explained

how migrants should be considered especially suspect because they lack allegiance to a nation

and work towards an aggressive takeover of France, physically, and culturally. By constructing

immigrants as other, Le Pen was able to effectively scapegoat a group that she viewed as a threat

to the nation.

Second, Le Pen urged that as terrorism becomes more common throughout France, it will begin to slowly poison French society. "This terrible poison of Islamic terrorism," she said during her presidential campaign, "ruins our capacity to look at the future with hope."[360] Because of France's conception of its national identity as one of a national soul and character, the metaphor of poison is especially moving for supporters. If France is conceptualized to be a singular soul, a piece of which is found in each French person, then a poison that is unwittingly fed to that soul will quickly destroy it internally. These were the threats against which Le Pen spoke when talking about the dangers of globalization and open borders, as she believed that more Muslim terrorists will unwittingly sneak into the country and will be able to overpower France from the inside. Le Pen also told supporters about the different ways that this poison will negatively impact French values and what the real-world consequences of this poison will be on French society.

First, she spoke at length about French values and how Islamic terrorism actively works to deconstruct them. This attack would not only be waged on the nation, but also on the republic and what it stands for.[361] Inspired by the French flag and guiding values of *liberté, egalité* and *fraternité* (freedom, equality, and brotherhood), Le Pen argued that Muslim terrorists aim to undermine these building blocks of French identity. In addition these basics, Le Pen also listed the "thirst for liberty," "ingenuity," "inventiveness," and "creativity" as other French values that the terrorists seek to attack.[362] According to Le Pen, Muslim terrorists seek to destroy these values, which are "what makes France France."[363] This destruction of values would then force the French to live in a state of an "inversion of values," in which every new custom and law implemented by Islamic terrorists fundamentally opposes French values and society.[364] As terrorist ideology slowly takes over, Le Pen told listeners that the French people will feel like

foreigners or strangers in their own country, repeating this point in both 2017 and 2019.[365] Overall, this feeling will lead to "the questioning of our identity as a people."[366] These changes are then reflected in a host of actions. In Le Pen's speech launching her 2017 presidential bid, she explained that once the rule of Islamic terrorists is established in France, they will make many changes, including not allowing "social mixing [mixing between men and women] in public places," permitting "the full veil" in public, creating "prayer rooms in business, prayers in the streets, cathedral mosques," and "the submission of women, forbidden from wearing skirts, working, or [going to] the bistro."[367]

After Le Pen laid out what the poisoning of France seeks to undo in terms of national values, she then painted a horrific picture of the future once this destruction and reversal of values has taken place. Although Le Pen focused extensively on the threat of terrorism as a result of increasing immigration, she also believed that lax border policies can lead to other problems, such as gun and drug trafficking. She pointed to so-called "chronic insecurity" as the future daily reality for everyone in France.[368] According to Le Pen, this insecurity was the cause of heightened violence in the "hell of the *banlieues,*" suburbs of large cities that are often comprised of low-income housing projects and occupied by immigrants.[369] A *banlieue* is also often viewed as extremely dangerous and filled with violence. Through her discourse, Le Pen implied that all of France would experience the terror of living in the *banlieue,* a lifestyle formerly relegated to immigrants and the poor. However, under the terror of drug and gun traffickers, as well as Muslim terrorists, these the country will become a shell of what it once was, causing danger for all the inhabitants.[370] In a 2017 speech, she even said that terrorists "dream about how to teach [children] how to" blow people up with bombs.[371] As the danger and crime in France will continue to get worse, unable to be fixed because of the lack of national

solidarity and the undermining of French national values, Le Pen told her audience that this will

be become the norm. In fact, the government and society will ask the French people to "get used

to living with this horror."[372] In other words, Le Pen said, France will transform to a land

governed by criminals, rather than one governed by the law of the French republic.[373]

While Le Pen did not seek to blame all security problems on potential terrorists, she did

characterize an unsafe future as the result of lax immigration policies. This allowed her to link

potential security concerns back to those in power who created those policies in the first place.

Consequently, Le Pen made it much easier to blame many safety problems on elites and

globalists, further distancing them from the interests of the people.

Le Pen was also able to link mass immigration to larger economic problems. Cities and

villages are described as "submerge[ed] by planetary immigration," especially as Le Pen relied

on the classic argument that the country should not support migrants when unable to support the

country's own people, such as farmers and the homeless.[374] In 2019, during the European

elections, Le Pen explained how mass immigration led to "a collapsed economy…mass

unemployment…social insecurity or uncertainty for the future."[375] Thus, in addition to the

security issues and attempts to change or undermine French culture, immigrants have also

brought economic woes, which hurt the French people and continue to weaken and destabilize

French national identity.

In Le Pen's view, Islamic terrorists who are pouring into France across open borders will

infect and kill France like a poison, which will cause catastrophe for the country, its values, and

its status in the world. Not only does terrorism "attack" France with "calculated harassment," but

it also requests excessive and unreasonable requirements and accommodations from the French

government, who do not attempt to fix this problem to save the future.[376] Le Pen's fear tactics

were especially powerful for her followers who already felt unease about globalization and the Muslim faith in general. By stoking this fear and creating a doomsday picture of a calculated infiltration and poisoning of the country—destroying everything that France stands for—Le Pen demonized the Muslim terrorist and, by extension, the Muslim other. By linking terrorism exclusively to Muslims and arguing that terrorists were slipping into the country through more and more open borders, any Muslim becomes a potential hidden terrorist in the eyes of Le Pen and the followers of the French far right.

Overall, Le Pen's discourse about the threat of terrorism in France presents thinly veiled Islamophobia in the form of attempts to protect the French people and culture. The figure of the Muslim terrorist threatens the nation in two ways: physically, and socially. The most obvious threat of terrorism is its ability to physically hurt the French people through violence. Less obvious, however, is the Muslim terrorist's desire to kill the French way of life and replace French culture and identity with one that terrorism wishes to cultivate instead. Not belonging to a nation, terrorists then seek to undo French culture as a way to establish a nation for themselves because they hate everything that France stands for. This rhetoric demonizes all Muslims as a potential security threat to the nation. By extension, Le Pen urged stricter security measures for *all* immigrants so that security forces can more easily protect the country, the people, and its identity. This then demonized all immigrants as forces that work against the good of France and the French people and allows for the promotion of more xenophobic rhetoric and desires for immigrants to assimilate so that their threat to the nation is neutralized.

Through her description of Muslim fundamentalists as wanderers with no national identity, Le Pen drew a distinct line between self and other along the lines of national belonging. This not only scapegoated immigrants as the cause of French problems, but it also linked issues

of immigration back to globalists and elites for whom the nation is outdated and a barrier to their goals. By connecting elites, globalists (and globalization policies), and immigrants through their lack of national allegiance, Le Pen easily blamed them for what she viewed as physical, social, and cultural problems caused by these entities. Consequently, the people—including Le Pen and her followers—were divided further from elites and their seemingly harmful policies of globalization and immigration.

Through this tactic of explicitly naming the enemies of Frenchness, Le Pen successfully completed the second step of scapegoating by drawing attention to perceived wrongs committed by elites, globalists, and immigrants. By consistently blaming internal French problems on other forces, Le Pen clearly framed these outside powers as the enemy of Frenchness. Opposing France is what made them the enemy, and their refusal to view France and French culture as important helped Le Pen continue to demonize them. Her ability to portray them as out of touch with how the people would prefer the country to be regarded and run also allowed Le Pen to characterize them as outsiders with whom the people do not agree, further separating elites, globalists, and immigrants from the vision of France that the people truly want. This allowed Le Pen to easily begin the third step of scapegoating: purification of the people.


Purification

The third and final step of scapegoating involves purifying the victims, in part by bringing the scapegoats to justice. According to Burke, this consists of a "a new principle of merger, this time in the unification of those whose purified identity is defined in dialectical opposition" to the scapegoat.[377] In France, as the people are purified as simply victims of Le Pen's scapegoats, they redefined their identity in terms of opposition to elites, globalists, and

immigrants. In other words, this third step allowed Le Pen to present an alternative, far-right version of French national identity with which the people must identify to absolve themselves of any guilt associated with the scapegoats. To accomplish this purification, Le Pen first unified the purified people around a new version of national identity that was focused extensively on far-right performances of patriotism, constituting Le Pen followers as always already true French patriots and Le Pen as their leader. This rewriting of what constitutes French national identity thus absolved the people of any guilt due to association with the scapegoats, but only as long as they continued to play their role of patriotic voter and Le Pen supporter. In this way, the alleviation of guilt became conditional upon the people's ability to keep Le Pen in power. In order to entice even more voters to her side, Le Pen engaged in a rhetoric of revolution, labeling followers as revolutionaries and further separating herself from the status quo that the scapegoats created.

*Unifying and Redefining the Purified French People*

One of the clearest ways that Le Pen unified her audience was in her framing of the election. Rather than speaking about candidates in terms of the left versus the right, she often cast the fight as patriotic nationalists versus unpatriotic globalists.[378] In fact, according to Le Pen, the division between the political left and right obscured an even larger problem and was in itself "only an illusion."[379] Rather, this division "hides the fundamental divide between the proponents of the system, exclusively oriented toward themselves, on one side, and the proponents of France and of the people, on the other."[380] Le Pen clearly put herself in the latter camp, while asserting that all the other candidates' loyalties lay with the European Union, especially because they do nothing to fight against the E.U.'s attempts to get France to submit to its power. In fact, Le Pen said, "they lack the courage of patriots."[381] Through this framing of the election, the people were

permitted to purify themselves by disidentifying with these leaders, allowing Le Pen to redefine a new version of Frenchness for the purified population. For example, Le Pen used her platform to set up outrage against the increasingly globalized sphere. She mentioned several times that the people are opposed to the system and all the problems that it causes, saying in 2017 that "no reasonable person" favors untamed globalization.[382] Acting as the representative of the people, Le Pen called for France to "rearm [itself] against untamed globalization."[383] This rearmament would place France on an even playing field with other world players, such as the United States, as opposed to France being indebted to or beneath other nations.[384] This argument allowed Le Pen to frame Frenchness as "France first," putting French interests ahead of all others, shunning concepts like globalization in favor of localism.

Moreover, inherent in Le Pen's requirements of Frenchness was a type of inheritance, which she mentioned in several of her speeches. She often reminded her audiences that they should preserve France in part so that they can give or transmit the country to their children and other future generations.[385] In this sense, Le Pen linked the defense of French culture and way of life directly to the future wellbeing of families and children, making the issue far more concrete and personal for her followers. By reminding party members that "the best guardians of nature are those who have received their land from generations before them, and who want to pass it on to the generations that follow, after having enriched it," Le Pen firmly engrained Frenchness in the practice of traditional generational practices that seek to keep Frenchness in France, protected against immigrants or other practices that seek to undo centuries of hard work.[386] In fact, Le Pen explained that generations "have worked and suffered and sometimes died" to leave their children "a free country that is *ours*."[387] This emphasis on heritage precluded true Frenchness

from being embodied by first or even second generation inhabitants of France and supported Le Pen's advancement of xenophobia upon which she often relied in her discourse.

While the practice of inheriting Frenchness had been occurring for generations, Le Pen explained to her audiences that the practice was disappearing, and the people were losing their innate ability to pass on their country to heirs. This change in principles was blamed on an E.U. directive from 2015 that updated successor rights to be based on place of residence rather than heritage.[388] According to Le Pen, these rights should be open to the French people and the French people only.[389] The ability for any person living in France to potentially inherit France and therefore leave their mark on Frenchness directly contradicted one of Le Pen's favorite quips: "*Être Français s'hérite, ou se mérite!*" ("To be French is inherited or earned!").[390] While this does not preclude those who were not born in France from being considered French, it does narrow *who* is allowed to embody Frenchness in the eyes of Le Pen. With Le Pen's discourse, she thus set up true French identity as nearly impossible to achieve for immigrants. By linking hereditary practices to Frenchness, national identity was thus redefined in terms of generational longevity and was defined against immigrants who came to France and attempted to adopt French identity. This set up boundaries between who could be considered purified—and therefore, French—and who could not.

As the scapegoats were cast out, Le Pen also constituted her leadership as a grand unifier of the people and the country. In her speeches, especially when campaigning for president, Le Pen framed herself as a patriotic protector of France who would forge into the future with France's best interests in mind, unlike the elites. She continuously worked to set herself apart from her political opponents as well as any other person or institution that may be considered part of "the system," such as the European Union. Not only did this strategy set her up as the

other side of the scapegoats, but she also firmly aligned herself with purified French patriots and a new patriotic understanding of national identity. As an embodiment of patriotism and French national identity, Le Pen was able to mobilize supporters who desperately wanted to perform the patriotic citizenship that she promoted.

One of the most common moves that Le Pen made was to explicitly link her campaign and candidacy to patriotism. Even before the presidential election, in 2015, Le Pen asserted "I am a French citizen, a patriot in love with her country, who suffers every time a French person is hurt."[391] In 2017, she referred to herself as "deeply French, deeply patriotic" and "the candidate of the people."[392] As she put it, "what drives us is not the love of money or special interests, but the worry about *patrie*."[393] Representing patriotism was one of the ways Le Pen intended to reach out to all French people, as she presented herself as not only a patriot, but also as fierce defender of patriotism for the good of the country. Because Le Pen is of the opinion that patriotism "does not grow naturally, it builds," she worked to build it herself in conjunction with her ideas.[394] Through this discourse, Le Pen's invocation of patriotism supported the people rather than the elites, which linked purification from those elites with specific patriotic actions. This created the "new principle of merger" about which Burke writes, with the people merging with far-right sentiments and pushing against the system that had previously held much of the power in defining identity.[395]

By encouraging her audiences to disidentify with elites, globalists, and immigrants and to identify with Le Pen and far-right notions of patriotism, Le Pen constituted her own followers as an uprising against the unjust treatment by these groups. In doing so, she explained that the followers of the far right were the only true patriots and therefore, the purified, guilt-free people. By showing how her movement was the perfect embodiment of French loyalty and patriotism,

85

Le Pen provided a blueprint for what national identity and solidarity entailed post-purification and how they could be enacted by the newly purified and unified people.

The separation from scapegoats and subsequent purification of the French people necessitated a new brand of Frenchness, a picture of which Le Pen offered in her speeches. Focusing extensively on the roles of patriotism and national solidarity, Le Pen argued that purified patriots, who act in the best interest of the country, would create the best future for France. By emphasizing this, Le Pen thus constituted her listeners as always already patriotic National Front/National Rally voters who served the country's national interests unlike elites, globalists, and immigrants. In fact, she said, France itself is a protector of the people: "France is great, it is just,…it defends its children, it does not forget anyone."[396] By personifying the values Le Pen viewed as inherent in France, she framed the country as a protector that, with its regained power, could return to its original glory, acting as a guide for all French patriots. As she told her supporters in 2017, France has "gotten up," has "reconstructed itself, free, for its children."[397] As the people continue to free France from the chains of Le Pen's enemies, this can only lead to a reinvigorated and purified population that puts France first. For example, in 2017, Le Pen said that there was nothing more important than "the interest of the French people"; in 2019, she asserted that the National Rally's only guide was "national interest because what we bring is the love of France and the French people."[398] As such, Le Pen's movement functioned as the model for the purified people and how they should embody the new far-right notion of Frenchness.

When Le Pen kicked off her presidential campaign with a speech in Lyon, she welcomed all patriots to her movement, saying "you have a place on our side."[399] In another 2017 speech, Le Pen told her supporters "a vote for your ideas is a vote of the patriot, it is a vote for France."[400] Described as true patriots, party members and supporters were told that they were

supporting the most important political movement in France because it was the only one that truly cared about the French people and actually included patriotic politicians.[401] By equating all of Le Pen's voters with patriots and telling them that "we will write a new glorious page in the history of our beautiful country of France," Le Pen presented herself as the candidate that could unite a seemingly divided country as she aligned herself with the purified people and subsequent patriotic movement she sought to create.[402] In fact, according to Le Pen, any victory that the party accomplished also belonged to the people, as she called the growing support for the party "ideological victory."[403] Included in this ideology was a fierce love of country and *patrie* which, Le Pen reminded supporters, was of paramount importance to her and her movement. In a 2019 speech, Le Pen pointed out that "we are the union of French people," implying that they were the only good representatives of the people in politics.[404] Even when running for president, Le Pen explained that her party was for everyone who wanted to see a better and safer France.[405] Because the scapegoats had been cast out because of their apathy towards France's future, this allowed Le Pen to more firmly anchor her movement as the leaders of those who had been purified.

As she reminded her audience in Marseille a few days before the presidential vote, patriotism is an act of love and the best way to put the interests of the country first.[406] Four days later, in another speech, she pointed out that the unity of the people "can only happen around the love of France."[407] This love of France, or "brotherhood of the heart" could then help the people "face the future together" and affirm the values, grandeur, and destiny of the people.[408] This message of discovering national solidarity often resonated with the audiences at Le Pen speeches. During two of her 2017 presidential campaign speeches, the public burst out into song in the middle of Le Pen's speech, singing the *Marseillaise,* France's national anthem in a loud

87

and public act of national solidarity.[409] According to Le Pen, this increased solidarity would help inspire the French people to fulfill their destiny of lifting French voices for the world to hear, a goal that is embedded in national consciousness.[410] No longer stifled by the scapegoats, these descriptions necessitated patriotism as the solution to current woes, with National Front/National Rally voters leading the charge.

By positioning French solidarity and patriotism as the only way to achieve France's national destiny and act as a purified and unified people, Le Pen attempted to right the wrongs that she perceived the elites to have committed against France. To empower the French people to ostensibly take their country back, she reminded them that they had always had control over what happens in their own country; they just needed to exercise it. In a 2017 speech in Paris, she told the audience that "France is ours and we are all responsible for our home."[411] This is because the people know what is best for them and for their country, guided by national solidarity and their national interest.[412] Specifically, Le Pen said that the French people should be able to make decisions about who should be allowed to enter the country as well as who can become French and who is not worthy of the honor.[413] According to the ideologies of the far right, defending this French way of life would empower the French people to take their country back from those who hope to see France's demise. As Le Pen put it in 2017, "We deserve our freedom. We deserve security. We deserve our prosperity. We deserve to enjoy our immense culture, to be able to defend our identity, and to offer a legacy to our children. We deserve to again guide our destiny."[414] Le Pen's positioning of destiny, prosperity, and national identity as an entitlement afforded to all French patriots allowed her followers more agency over the future of the country and who runs it, directly confronting the scapegoats who attempted to wrest control of France from the people. As such, Le Pen used the desire for one cohesive national

identity and solidarity to her advantage, encouraging her audiences to rise up against the status quo and especially against the E.U. and French elites. Because Le Pen's new form of nationalistic Frenchness was focused on setting the people apart from the scapegoats, it became imperative for the people to shift their understandings of national identity if they were to remain purified and the scapegoats were to remain cast out.

To effectively fight these forces, Le Pen called for "a moral rearming of the country" to reinvigorate a national French movement.[415] This was especially grounded in the love of *patrie,* or homeland, which she mentions in six out of the ten speeches in this analysis.[416] In fact, Le Pen began her 2019 speech in Metz by quoting French poet Paul Verlaine, saying "'the love of *patrie* is the first love.'"[417] This loyalty to the homeland is so powerful that "prevails over doubt, over hesitations."[418] As such, the French patriot is one that loves *patrie*, and national solidarity naturally follows.[419] Le Pen also often invoked France's national motto *liberté, égalité, fraternité* (freedom, equality, brotherhood), saying that solidarity, and thus national identity, are not possible without these extremely important French values.[420] France's grandeur and destiny, which include love of *patrie,* the values of France's motto, and its other universal values must be cherished by the French people if the country is to regain its formerly grand status, Le Pen said.[421] Le Pen's focus on patriotism and love of *patrie* as necessary to stand up to the system and advance new forms of French national identity was paramount in her constitution of followers as patriots. As she encouraged them to reconstruct their identity as in conjunction with her movement and in hopes of staying purified, Le Pen was afforded the opportunity to lay out a plan for what a performance of proper patriotic citizenship entailed.

*Performance of Patriotic Citizenship*

Le Pen's discourse made it clear that one of the best ways to become purified was to join the community of Le Pen's supporters as she constituted the purified people as always already National Front/National Rally patriots. This purification, however, was contingent upon performing the patriotic citizenship Le Pen laid out in her speeches.  Communication Studies has altered how citizenship is conceptualized over the years. Rather than viewing citizenship through acts of national belonging, such as voting or serving on a jury, citizenship has been reconceptualized as a practice or performance.[422] This version of citizenship is constituted through "supportive and relatively enduring practices and institutions" at the hands of the state.[423] In other words, "citizenship is not inherited, but learned."[424] As globalization creates more state-like institutions, the nation must fight to retain its inhabitants' allegiance to the state by promoting the performance of "good" citizenship.[425] Attempts to encourage this type of perfected citizenship leads to exclusionary practices with the state rewarding an in-group and demonizing an out-group, often framing out-group members as unable or not allowed to join the nation.[426] Although Le Pen was not an official mouthpiece of the state, she sought to create a new form of citizenship performance that undergirded her political beliefs. As a political leader who was able to divorce French national identity from so-called elites, globalists, and immigrants, she worked to solidify practices of Frenchness with values of the far right.

In her 2015 speech in Corsica, Le Pen laid out a clear blueprint for the Frenchness of the National Front: "To deserve French nationality, you must speak French, eat French, live French, you must respect [French] laws, write your own story, integrate [France's] values."[427] This definition of the ideal French citizen required assimilation and left little wiggle room for anyone who may be different than Le Pen's version of Frenchness. Although she did not elaborate on what it may mean to "live French," it is clear through other parts of her discourse that Frenchness

involved living by a very specific set of values and being proud of the country in which an immigrant may be a stranger and treated as such. For Le Pen, these qualities were absolutely necessary to the protection of the country's national identity and the continuation of purification of the people. In fact, Le Pen believed that all societies have the right to "historical continuity" for their people and values.[428]

In Le Pen's narrative, those who think that everything is going fine are probably being deceived by the left. Le Pen talked about the "legitimate anguish" of the "inconsolable patriots see[ing] their country adrift" and also legitimized their concerns about French national identity disappearing.[429] Le Pen also asked if "we are going to seriously accept seeing our national identity blow up with the emergence of a fragmented society."[430] A good patriot, according to Le Pen, should have been upset about the state of the country, but will not let fellow French people suffer in silence. Banding together under national solidarity, they must work together to help the other French people who were hurting at the hands of the scapegoats.[431] Some of the clearest examples of patriots fighting for the rights of all French people are the Gilets Jaunes, to whom she offered support in both 2019 speeches analyzed here.[432] Le Pen made it clear that she supported people who were taking an active stance against perceived injustices and unhappiness with the current state of the country. Rather than allowing citizens to live with what Le Pen called "chronic insecurity," patriots were those who feel anguish about the state of national identity and rise up to fight back.[433]

In this case, Le Pen advocated for a performance of patriotic citizenship that prioritized generations of Frenchness that have cultivated a love of country and developed an affinity and deep understanding of guiding French values. This can only be achieved through direct action. Le Pen urged her followers to actively promote and defend the country by showing that the

country belongs to the French people, rather than to institutions, governmental elites, or immigrants.

In Le Pen's version of patriotic citizenship performance, true French patriots must show that the country belongs to them and that they want to defend this power that has been given to the people. Without the aid of French patriots who perform proper citizenship, France will continue to suffer under those who question the traditional French way of life. The current post-national vision, Le Pen argued, had diluted French power, as she called for "the return to French power" and for France to "recover its unique place: number one."[434] After being tricked and having their power taken away by the European Union and the globalist elites, the people no longer had any choices or sovereignty, and the "survival of France" was at risk.[435] In addition to these external pressures, Le Pen was also worried about the internal hit to national solidarity, saying in 2015 that "by forgetting patriotism…the French people forgot who they were."[436] In 2018, Le Pen worried about the increasing individualism that had been "dissolving national spirit."[437] These potential problems that threatened the whole of the country and its national identity therefore prompted Le Pen to take an active stance to combat them..

Le Pen also proposed the notion of what she calls "economic patriotism" as a way for the people to continually support their country.[438] Mentioned several times throughout four of the ten speeches in this analysis, Le Pen saw the economy as fundamentally tied to social and national responsibilities.[439] Economic patriotism, specifically, included frequenting local shops, buying French products, and supporting other French businesses as a way to fight against the evils of globalization that were trying to replace French goods with those of other countries, thus ruining the French economy. Prioritizing the local over the global thus showed strong patriotic ties to

France while also supporting the livelihoods of the fellow patriots, and Le Pen even asserted that economic patriotism would lead to more freedom throughout France.[440]

One specific type of economic patriotism upon which Le Pen focused is what she called "localism." This is a newer concept that she introduced after the 2017 presidential election, so it is only mentioned in the two 2019 speeches in this analysis.[441] Le Pen and her party represent localists and propose "a revolution of proximity."[442] By prioritizing local issues and local economic choices (such as buying local goods and eating at local restaurants), there exists a closer proximity between producers and consumers.[443] By extension, then, localism brings the inhabitants of France together, strengthening national solidarity and togetherness, while also fighting the economic forces of globalization that seek to put local producers and business owners out of business. This is a form of the "economic patriotism" that Le Pen championed as it seeks to transform and improve French industry.[444] Through her advocacy of localism, Le Pen argued that this new system is also a way for the people to be ecologically conscious, as locally sourced and produced products are undoubtedly better for the people, the country, and the economy.[445]

By setting out guidelines for an enactment of patriotic citizenship, Le Pen showed how the people would be expected to act in order to achieve purification. Because Le Pen's explanation of how patriots should act seemed to counter the actions of the scapegoats, those who lived as a patriot, prioritizing nationalistic interests, would be purified as the scapegoated forces were cast out. Contingent upon remaining purified, however, was the necessity for the people to remain Le Pen and National Front/National Rally supporters.

*Living by Le Pen's Rules*

By distancing themselves from perceived evils of the country and performing Le Pen's version of patriotism citizenship, Le Pen's patriots were absolved of any guilt that could occur from being associated with the scapegoats. However, this absolution of guilt only remains if followers continue to play by Le Pen's rules. Essentially, by continuing to live by Le Pen's version of patriotism, the people continue to distance themselves and bring the evil of the scapegoats to justice, thus remaining purified. Should Le Pen lose power or support by her followers, however, disaster can only follow.

First, Le Pen argued that only she, rather than the elites, was able to give the people back much of their agency. She viewed this power to be given back primarily through unification of the country and the re-establishment of national solidarity, which was something that *only* Le Pen and her movement would be able to accomplish.[446] In fact, she even said that she wanted to enshrine a love of French patrimony in the Constitution of France.[447] Going into the second round of voting for the presidential election, Le Pen reminded the public that it was national unity that was "behind our project of [the country's] recovery."[448] Le Pen reminded her audience that "the happiness of French people is the only goal that matters."[449] Moreover, she pointed out that her movement welcomed everyone and that she had been tasked with "the immense responsibility of the defense of the French nation, its unity, its security, its culture, its prosperity, and its independence."[450] As such, "rallied around our immortal three colors [of the French flag] and our universal values, the French people can conquer the world" with a focus on the value of freedom and an economy "in the service of the [people] and of the well-being of the people."[451] In this way, she disguises her authoritarian leanings as the only person who can keep the people purified, instead framing her leadership as one that would afford agency to the people.

As the people line up behind Le Pen while she stands up to powerful entities, she painted a picture of power returning to the people for whom the government should seek to please and fairly represent. This return of power would allow the people to "take over the helm of our destiny" and "re-establish the people as the political subject," rather than pleasing financial and global institutions.[452] Putting French destiny back into the hands of the French people would help protect the people and the country in the long run because, as Le Pen argued, "the strongest nations are those that know how to protect a powerful national bond."[453] With Le Pen at the helm, she argued, France could achieve the grandeur that it should have never lost to begin with.[454] In this case, the people could only become and remain empowered with Le Pen in leadership.

However, this vision of the country's reunification with the people being put first can only be accomplished by Le Pen's movement. She always explained that she represents the French people and their interests *only*.[455] In other words, the newly purified people could be provided new types of agency—but only with Le Pen and her movement in leadership positions. Because she claimed to represent the people, she fully opposed the elites who do not care about the people.[456] In addition, she also paid special attention to some of the people who were left behind by the system, namely the weakest groups that were being attacked by the system, as well as the "the France of villages and small cities" that have been forgotten by governmental elites.[457] By advocating for those who were often cast aside by the government, Le Pen worked even harder to bring together disparate groups under the double label of French patriot and Le Pen supporter. She even said "If you vote for me I will consider you only French…totally French. We do not see your origins, nor your skin color, nor your religion, you will be French citizens with the same rights and the same duties as any other French citizen."[458] In other words,

Le Pen seemingly opened up her candidacy to all people living in France who consider themselves to be French. Promising equality throughout the country if they support her, Le Pen linked innate Frenchness and patriotism with her campaign, candidacy, and victory. Even the slogan for her presidential campaign, "In the name of the people!" reflected this view. Through this argument, Le Pen framed support for her candidacy as a way for individuals to be purified, even if they did not fit the typical criteria of Frenchness that Le Pen presented. Consequently, Le Pen invited *all* types of people to be purified, opening the opportunity to anyone in France, as long as they supported her movement.

Throughout her speeches, Le Pen often described love of country as internal and naturally occurring in each individual. This positioned her movement—billed as true French patriots—to be the movement that could continue to nourish and support these natural inclinations. In 2017, Le Pen promised to "nourish this immense ambition for France."[459] In her 2015 speech in Corsica, she called the French "warriors of the soul," explaining that "each French person feels French and intends to defend this" feeling.[460] Later in the same speech, she said that the national community was "the only possible community, the only existing community. The only [community] because [it was] deeply inscribed in each person's spirit. A natural reflex of a united people."[461] By framing national solidarity as natural, engrained in each true French patriot, the desire to protect it was also understood to be innate. This argument was especially powerful when one is reminded that French national identity is often conceived of as a singular national soul, a part of which can be found in each French patriot.

Using the national soul as a catalyst for national defense was especially powerful and mobilizing for the far right. In 2017, Le Pen told supporters that the elites do not like when "you proclaim your love of France," setting patriotism squarely against the system that she

demonized.[462] Throughout both the presidential and European elections, Le Pen and the National Front/National Rally positioned themselves as the protectors of France and patriotic French values.[463] Defending "the right to be French in France" opened a space for far right members to be unashamedly prideful in their beliefs.[464] Moreover, for those who wanted to continue to protect patriotic views in France, Le Pen and the National Front/National Rally seemed to be the only party to prioritize these values. While Le Pen's vision of the future allowed the people to be purified, she presented herself as the only way they could remain absolved of their guilt. Consequently, keeping Le Pen in power would be paramount to achieving and sustaining the future that Le Pen set out in her discourse.

With these values at the forefront of the Le Pen's leadership, the far right represented a prosperous future, at least for supporters of the party. Le Pen envisioned a return to France's grandeur, back on track to achieve the country's "worldwide mission" to be the "beacon" for the world.[465] She also wanted to work towards further security for France and "responsibilities for the security of the world."[466] In 2017, she framed presidential election as a chance for the people to "raise their heads…a people sure of their values and confident in the future."[467] Because "France is not for sale and the French people are not for sale," they refused to be tricked into standing by as passive observers while their country is destroyed by the scapegoats. Instead, Le Pen promoted love of country as a powerful unifier, able to bring people together across the political aisle, from the left and the right.[468] Le Pen's characterization of her ability to reach across the political aisle has been intrinsic to the National Front/National Rally's decades-long contention that they represent "neither right nor left, but French."[469] As proponents of all the people, Le Pen explained that they were driven to represent the strength of the people. In her 2017 Châteauroux speech, Le Pen explained that "there is no irrepressible force that could drive

the French to renounce [their country]."[470] Rather, the French people should be energized by their pride in their country and through the recognition that "we…[are] members of the same people."[471]

This grand vision of a free and prosperous France, united through love of *patrie* and national solidarity would not be possible without Le Pen's loyal followers to whom she delivered instructions on how to enact a patriotic version of citizenship. This responsibility was presented as life or death, with the practice of citizenship as necessary for every single French person in order to restore France's status in the world. As Le Pen reminded her audience, "our country needs you, it needs your energy, it needs your commitment."[472] This is not a role to be taken lightly, but it is one to be taken as a lifelong commitment, not only for Le Pen and her movement but for all French patriots as a way to sincerely protect France. Reminding followers that this vision of a prosperous future would only be possible through giving Le Pen and her party power and support, Le Pen anchored the future success of France and continued purification of the people as contingent upon her political success. Should Le Pen and her movement lose momentum, the people would be left with governance at the hands of the elites and a loss of national identity and solidarity at the hands of globalists and immigrants, according to Le Pen. Thus, in order for the people to remain pure as a result of casting out scapegoats, they must continue to support Le Pen and her movement, as they were constituted as the only true representatives of the people.

*Right-Wing Revolution*

As Le Pen worked to ally herself with the people and against the system, she frequently referred to her movement as a revolution, with herself and her followers as revolutionaries. Discourse about revolution therefore allowed Le Pen to unabashedly explain how she and her

movement would work to completely upend the system, projecting an image of strength and resilience in the face of adversity caused by elites, globalists, and immigrants. The theme of revolution was a common thread throughout half of the speeches analyzed, with mentions of it in 2015, 2017, and 2019. [473] With the growth of this "revolution," Le Pen proclaimed that "we will turn our backs on these tacky ineptitudes" of the system that these scapegoats represent. [474] Moreover, positioning her movement as a revolution allowed right-wing ideas to be viewed as ways to save the country from the scapegoats, with Le Pen and her party as the heroes.

As the leader of a revolution, Le Pen took the time to explain how the victory of her movement would completely upend how the system functioned. Even before her presidential campaign in 2017, Le Pen gave supporters some statistics on terrorism following the massive terrorist attack on Paris in 2015. These numbers seemingly contradicted the official messages from the French government and showed that terrorism at the hands of radical Muslims was in fact must more of a danger that it seemed. Le Pen ended this section of her speech by asking "Who's lying?" essentially arguing that the government should be forced to admit that it is wrong about this issue. [475] Although questioning the elites may have seemed revolutionary in the eyes of Le Pen's followers, disputing official government facts more likely reflects the contemporary far-right move toward post-truth. [476] Instead of legitimately questioning official statements from the government, Le Pen uses her platform to advance an alternative version of the truth. Moreover, as revolutionary, Le Pen talked about how politicians should be afraid of her.  On the campaign trail, she said that people wanted her to lose because they were afraid, especially of the radical changes that she would bring. [477] Le Pen agreed, saying that those who profit from the system, not the French people, should be scared of her candidacy because she stood against everything they worked for. [478]

Le Pen presented herself as the only real hope for the future of France and the preservation of its national and cultural identity. Because she represented French patriots and France's best interests, she was easily able to juxtapose herself against her political opponents who she cast as apathetic to France's struggles for identity and national solidarity. In fact, Le Pen explained that "I no longer have confidence in this political class" because their interests are "against ours."[479] She pointed out that she had tried to function within the system, attempting to alert leaders to various problems concerning immigration and terrorism, with no success.[480] As such, Le Pen sought to overtake the system and change political leadership with her revolution. Intrinsic in her advocacy for her candidature was the notion that national identity is implicitly found in her supporters and Le Pen herself because they represent true patriots. Consequently, Le Pen's leadership would be imperative to the good of the country and the revival of the form of nationalistic identity that she promoted. Moreover, purporting to upend the system with a revolution would more easily allow a far-right candidate to take over leadership as one of the furthest things from the contemporary French system.

Often presenting herself as the most courageous candidate, daring to oppose the system and tell it like it is, Le Pen explained that she only had this courage because of her desire to nourish French patriotism.[481] Because she was very outspoken about her distrust of the current system, freedom of expression (especially expression that runs counter to governmental discourse) would become a primary value in Le Pen's France, as it was seen as one of the only ways to gain back power as French values "are contested in our own country."[482]

Importantly, while Le Pen positioned herself as leading the revolution, she also acknowledged the role of her followers as French patriots and revolutionaries. Referring to the overall movement as a revolution, Le Pen represented the National Front/National Rally message

as "a message from the heart, the call that comes out of your chests," imbuing the messages and goals of the movement as intrinsic in the hearts of each French person.[483] This implied that *every* French person should want to follow the National Front's movement because it would be what is best for national identity and solidarity. Le Pen ended a 2019 speech by saying "In the name of this freedom that we cherish, we invite the people to make themselves heard, we invite citizens to rise up, we invite French people who share our ideals to join us."[484] In another speech before the European elections, Le Pen described the project of the party as "deeply national and in that...deeply human."[485] Through this discourse, Le Pen focused on the openness of the movement, framing it as empowering and one that was engrained in national interest. During elections, the revolution was open to anyone and everyone.

As the revolution would purportedly lead to a better quality of life, Le Pen also painted a disheartening picture of what may occur if the party could not achieve the political power it needed to challenge the system:

> If we do not win, the country will be flooded and our people will disappear via dilution in the grand globalist maelstrom. Our country will be ruined and each generation will live less free and less prosperous than those that preceded it.[486]

As such, the party presented itself as the only option for French patriots because "we are the only ones to have never succumbed to the new post-national order."[487] Because they were not under the influence of these forces, the party consistently is presented as "the true opposition force" and the alternative "to Macron's government."[488] This opposition was characterized as therefore the only choice for France and Europe with the potential for a prosperous decent future.

With the National Front/National Rally at the helm of the country, Le Pen proposed a revolutionary vision of the future. Not only would France return to its position as a leader in the world and the people would rejoice in their unification, but this would all be accomplished

radically. Throughout both her presidential campaign and the campaign for the European elections, she proposed a great change "that will put another politics in place, other faces in power, and the renewal that you aspire to."[489] This renewal consisted of what Le Pen called a "republican conquest" as a way to take over the French political sphere. Although Le Pen made mention of these ideas in 2017 during the presidential race, the notions are carried through in 2018 and 2019. In 2019, she reminded her supporters that the movement still supported Le Pen's goals from that election that had not been put into action.[490] In fact, they were now even more determined to enact their version of France through a "national renaissance" that would purportedly bring freedom back to the French people. This "refoundation is a necessity because without this cultural evolution, we will not take the [path] of the political reformation that the presidential election opened up."[491] It is through this foundation that the party could become the majority throughout Europe.[492] As Le Pen engaged in a rhetoric of revolution, she further set her movement apart from scapegoat status quo representatives while simultaneously enticing more individuals to join her party.

Through her revolutionary discourse, Le Pen invigorated her voting base with visions of a grand and prosperous future of France, back in the hands of the people. With Le Pen and her party in power, she explained how the national interest and national identity would be reborn, as they had previously not been priorities in Macron's government. With these populist and nationalistic undertones, Le Pen framed her revolution as centered around the people and the country's best interests, despite her authoritarian policy proposals. As such, her rhetoric indicates how revolution may be invoked to provide audiences with feelings of agency and patriotism while leaders work behind the scenes to implement far-right agendas. In this case, appealing to the people's desire to remain purified—and thus to distance themselves as far as possible from

the scapegoats—allowed Le Pen to use revolutionary rhetoric to clandestinely propose more far-right, authoritarian proposals as a radical alternative to Macron's center-left, neoliberal policymaking. In other words, for many followers, it did not matter what the difference was between Le Pen and the scapegoats—just that there was a difference.

In this chapter, I have shown how Le Pen carried out the three steps of scapegoating as defined by Kenneth Burke. First, she began by identifying with her adversaries as members of the same system. Second, she created distance between herself and her political opponents by scapegoating elites, globalists, and immigrants. Third, she constituted a constituency separate from those she scapegoated and purified them as true French patriots through membership in her party and acknowledgement of her leadership. This constitution allowed Le Pen to create a new vision for what French national identity entails, with a specific focus on an isolationist, far-right version of patriotism and citizenship performance. This was accomplished primarily through Le Pen's rhetoric of revolution in which she characterized her leadership as a complete upending of the system, thus bringing the scapegoats to justice and absolving the people of any guilt they had because of association with the scapegoats.

**Chapter 4: Conclusion**

This thesis has sought to answer the following research questions: 1) In an era of competing discourse about nationalism and globalization, how does the French far-right conceptualize what it means to "be French"? and 2) How does Marine Le Pen constitute French identity through her discourse? First, my analysis showed that nationalism is a main factor in far-right conceptualizations of French national identity. In fact, this identity was defined in direct opposition to forces of globalization and the so-called elites who promote globalist policies, including a perceived relaxation of immigration policies. Moreover, Le Pen's version of far-right Frenchness necessitated a deep love of country and a desire to protect it, which can only be done through a performance of nationalistic citizenship.

Second, this analysis suggests that Le Pen used tactics of victimage and scapegoating to constitute her far-right version of French identity. Following Kenneth Burke's steps of scapegoating, Le Pen first identified with the system that she criticized. Next, she scapegoated elites, globalists, and immigrants as a way to separate herself and her movement from these forces. Finally, she absolved the people of their guilt by constituting her followers as always already French patriots and herself as their leader. This allowed her to advance a new, nationalistic version of national identity that relied heavily on patriotism and *patrie* and put herself and her movement at the center of a revolution. This research presents several implications for contemporary understandings of French identity, the growth of reactionary nationalism, and women politicians. Moreover, my research contributes to the project of internationalizing public address scholarship in Communication Studies.

First, as contemporary French identity continues to splinter, it is important to understand its impacts on France and how inhabitants are confronting this issue. As I wrote about in chapter two, increasing frustration with President Macron's neoliberal policies has led to unrest in France, such as the Gilets Jaunes protest.[493] This analysis has worked to uncover the far right's response to this increase in conflict, especially as reactionary nationalistic movements such as those led by Marine Le Pen have been growing in popularity around Europe.[494] Because France has often viewed itself as a worldwide leader and an example for other countries to follow, Le Pen's promise to restore France's grandeur through a return to traditional patriotic citizenship was especially persuasive to audiences who felt as though their identity was changing or disappearing altogether.

I also used this analysis to better understand how Le Pen advanced her authoritarianism through a discourse of national identity. This research has revealed that French far-right conceptions of national identity are at odds with the perceived values of Macron's government, which led to Le Pen's attempts to rewrite the meaning of French national identity. Le Pen's version of national identity included nationalistic and populist undertones. However, rather than proposing overtly authoritarian policies, Le Pen framed a new performance of citizenship— undergirded by a new understanding of national identity—through a rhetoric of populism. By promoting a very specific kind of citizen and type of citizenship, Le Pen, while promising to give power back to the power, actually advanced policies that only benefitted a small number of people. As such, Le Pen's rhetoric reveals how leaders may appeal to the people with populism and purported agency while actually concealing authoritarian sentiments as care and concern for the people.

This research has also shown how Le Pen has been able to remain a significant force in French politics despite losing two presidential elections. By promising to hold the political system accountable as the main voice of opposition, Le Pen was able retain her influence over followers even without an electoral victory. Even in her 2019 speeches, Le Pen reminded her audience that her movement still sought to achieve the goals set forth by Le Pen's 2017 presidential campaign and that they would continue to confront Macron and other scapegoated forces. Thus, rather than losing support after a bad electoral showing, the people became reinvigorated, more determined than ever to vote the National Rally into power as representatives of the opposition and of a revolution. This discourse demonstrates the strategies that may be used by politicians operating in parliamentary systems who know they have a slim chance of electoral victory but still strive to remain relevant in the political sphere. For Le Pen, this strategy proved useful as her party won the most votes in the 2019 European Union parliamentary election, two years after losing the 2017 presidential election to Emmanuel Macron. Continuing her crusade against Macron for several years allowed Le Pen to bolster support as the main adversary of both Macron and the larger elite system that he represented. As such, Le Pen and her movement became the only option for voters who wanted to oust Macron's government, as she was the major mouthpiece of opposition for several years between elections. In this case, continued scapegoating after electoral loss may prove useful for far-right or other opposition movements to remain relevant to voters, without losing any momentum that they may have gained during a previous election.

Second, this analysis has shown the rhetorical strategies that may be employed by reactionary nationalists as they attempt to wrest power from governments around the world. Specifically, Le Pen's use of scapegoating and victimage was especially powerful for her voters.

By constantly and explicitly scapegoating large swaths of people—elites, globalists, and immigrants—she was able to target the blame for perceived injustices on a concrete enemy. In doing so, she harnessed the unorganized anger and frustration of French inhabitants into one cohesive movement and directed those negative feelings at very specific enemies—who also just happened to be Le Pen's political enemies. By constantly demonizing these forces, Le Pen created a new space for her platform to achieve relevance for voters.

Moreover, Le Pen's emphasis on the return to patriotism as an idealized version of citizenship and national identity suggests that invocation of past attitudes and ways of living—real or imagined—can be an especially powerful rhetorical strategy for the far right and conservative followers. President Donald Trump's slogan "Make American Great Again," for example, shows how this yearning for "the good old days" can connect with voters who are disenchanted with contemporary politics. Casey Ryan Kelly explains this yearning through a conceptualization of "*ressentiment*," or "'revenge, hatred, malice, envy, the impulse to detract, and spite'" that links "emotions, ideology, and collective identity."[495] Trump's slogan, therefore, embodies the melancholy of *ressentiment,* "in that it continually revisits past injuries without adequately mourning them."[496] In the case of Le Pen, a call to return to traditional values of French patriotism and love of country works similarly in that Le Pen's scapegoating accused certain groups of leading the French people astray. Arguing that the people had been subjugated by these forces, Le Pen consistently reminded people what they had lost at the hands of the scapegoats.

Unlike Trump's rhetoric of *ressentiment,* however, Le Pen did not invite followers to "idealize an indeterminate time when they were un-fragmented subjects."[497] Rather, she pointed towards the future as a beacon of hope to change the status quo, with herself and her party in

power. While Le Pen lamented a loss of traditional values such as patriotism and *patrie,* she did not hearken back to the past as much as she encouraged her followers to look toward a future with the National Front/National Rally in power. Moreover, Le Pen's rhetoric suggested that her party would be the only ones able to harness the feelings of *ressentiment* and lead the charge to achieve that shared vision of the future. For a country like France that is experiencing major, explicit identity divides, this strategy may prove useful as a way to intensify the emotions of the masses and gain political support for a revolution in the political system, like the one that Le Pen sought to lead.

Third, Le Pen's rhetoric as a woman politician contradicts much of the other research conducted about women politicians. I do want to note that much of this previous research has examined women in United States politics, which may account in part for some of the differences. The most notable difference between Le Pen and other women politicians is that, in the speeches analyzed here, Le Pen did not make mention of her gender, nor did she invoke feminine tropes. In past discourse, Le Pen did occasionally used a feminized rhetoric. For example, in an analysis of Le Pen's discourse between 2013 and 2017, Dorit Geva found that Le Pen embodied an androgynous position, by "simultaneously symboliz[ing] feminized and masculinized virtues."[498] In more contemporary discourse, however, Le Pen did not turn to discourses of motherhood or femininity. While Le Pen has tried to soften the image of her party after taking over leadership from her father, gender seemed to not to play an explicit role in Le Pen's 2017 electoral loss. In fact, unlike in the United States, Agnes Poirier of *Al Jazeera* pointed out in 2017 that "hardly any political analysts in France have commented on the fact that Marine Le Pen's chances of becoming the first female French president may be enhanced or undermined by her very gender."[499]

In fact, as a mother who has been divorced twice and is pro-abortion and pro-birth control, at first glance, Le Pen may seem to use her gender to advance the status of women in a society plagued by sexual assault and harassment. However, her discourse employed gender as a way to advance xenophobic sentiments, notably in her scapegoating of Islamic fundamentalism and immigrants. In her predictions of the future of France under a reign of terrorists, Le Pen consistently argued that fundamentalists would work to dismantle the equality between men and women in France and would force French women to wear a hijab or burqa, in an act of subjugation of women. This discourse led to feminist groups like Femen to brand Le Pen a "fake feminist."[500] Despite this label, Le Pen's discourse shows how conservative women politicians may attract women voters through seemingly feminist rhetoric. As Geva reminds us, populism like Le Pen's, is "deeply structure[ed]" by "gender hegemony," so it is unlikely that a far-right candidate would ever embody true feminist values.[501] However, Le Pen's "fake feminism" does show how the far right may invoke seemingly feminist discourse to attract more women to their cause. This type of feminism that would be more palatable to National Front/National Rally voters may also explain how Le Pen closed the radical right gender gap in 2012 and 2017, receiving a nearly equal number of votes from men and women.

Le Pen's use of revolutionary rhetoric was also uncharacteristic in terms of scholarship on women politicians, many of whom have historically employed the feminine style in their rhetoric. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell identifies characteristics of what she terms the "feminine style" in her book *Man Cannot Speak for Her*. These characteristics include the use of personal anecdotes and examples, a personal tone, and audience participation. Campbell argues that the feminine style arose in response to societal expectations of women in the nineteenth century.[502] Undergirded by what Barbara Welter calls "the cult of True Womanhood" and the virtues of

"piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity," the adoption of the feminine style allowed women to advance their views while not overtly challenging hegemonic communication norms.[503]

One way in which women have traditionally made political appeals is through an invocation of motherhood. Sarah Hayden argues that the metaphor of the "nation-as-family" helps women use maternal appeals to "advance progressive gender politics" and create political change by showing maternal care and concern as the mothers of the nation.[504] For example, Valeria Fabj's analysis of the group Mothers of Plaza de Mayo shows how women may make political critiques through maternal rhetoric, demonstrating "the power of 'private' voices [that] transferred to the public realm of political action."[505] Jennifer A. Peeples and Kevin M. DeLuca note similar tactics employed by a group of women in pursuit of environmental justice:

> the rhetors attempt to create a collective understanding of what it means to be a mother in a contaminated community, using what they believe are the shared experiences, roles, and goals of motherhood to show that women have the capacity and power to challenge the entities that threaten their children. They reconceptualize the "good mother" to ennoble militant behavior that they establish as necessary to protect the community.[506]

Similarly, Mari Boor Tonn's study the use of "militant motherhood" by Mary Harris "Mother" Jones found that women may make use of a symbolic maternal persona. Jones referred to the oppressed groups for which she fought as her children, with her rhetoric oscillating between nurturing motherhood and protective militant mothering.[507] In the case of women in politics, controversies have arisen when women refuse to play the role of doting mother. Recall the backlash that Hillary Clinton received when her infamous quotation "I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas" was taken out of context by the media; or the criticism Governor Jane Smith's husband received for supposedly threatening traditional family values by being a stay-at-home dad.[508] Meanwhile, conservative women like Sarah Palin often embrace

rhetorics of motherhood in their political discourse and advance a maternal persona while also upholding patriarchal norms.[509]

Le Pen's case, however, was different. In the speeches I analyzed, she forewent any mentions of motherhood in her speeches, and she also rarely even referred to her status as a woman. As such, her discourse did not invoke the maternal rhetoric that seems to be the norm for many other women politicians. Instead, Le Pen favored a discourse of revolution, portraying an image of strength and characterizing herself as leading her followers into battle. The rhetoric of revolution may have been especially persuasive in France, a country whose history heavily favored revolution and whose founding myths valorize strong women leaders, such as Joan of Arc. Joan of Arc also embodied nationalistic sentiments by disguising herself as a man and fighting against the English. According to historian Stephen W. Richey, "she helped to create a French national consciousness that had never existed before. To her own discomfort, during her lifetime and at the same time as her military victories, she became the center of a personality cult that embraced all France."[510] For her bravery and sacrifice for *patrie,* Joan of Arc was canonized as a saint in 1920.[511] This particular cultural history may have made Le Pen's arguments for revolution—and potential cultural parallels between her and Joan of Arc—more salient for a French audience. Despite the cultural context, Le Pen's rhetoric of revolution does indicate that women politicians may be turning to different rhetorical tactics to garner support. Rather than embracing femininity and tropes of motherhood, Le Pen's discourse suggests that women no longer must rely on traditional femininity or the feminine style in order to achieve political success. Although Le Pen was unsuccessful in her quest for the French presidency, she was able to close the radical right gender gap in the 2017 presidential election, gaining almost equal support from men and women voters. By continuing to frame her movement as a revolution

throughout 2017 and into 2019, Le Pen worked to reach out to women who felt disillusioned by the status quo, and her scapegoating of those in power set up the necessity of a revolution led by the far right and Marine Le Pen.

Overall, Le Pen's discourse has shown new ways for far-right women politicians to change rhetorical strategies in order to garner more support from women while not alienating the base of men voters that has traditionally undergirded movements of the far right. Outwardly, Le Pen projected a type of feminism in which she advanced xenophobic sentiments by scapegoating Islam and, more generally, immigrants. By softening the traditional values upon which Jean-Marie Le Pen's party was founded and touting a fake feminism, Le Pen presented herself as a modern woman who did not take the same hardline stances as her father and sought to protect French women from enemies who would purportedly seek to force them into subjugation. At the same time, her authoritarian proposals and framing of her movement as revolutionary breaks with traditional understandings of how women candidates communicate. Rather than drawing on conventional tropes of motherhood and femininity, Le Pen leads the charge into battle. While Le Pen's second-place finish in 2017 does offer hope to the future of women politicians who would rather not heavily invoke gender, it is also troubling that Le Pen was so easily able to close the radical right gender gap. Thus, Le Pen's discourse not only breaks the mold of how women politicians may be expected to act, but it also serves as a warning to voters who may be duped by Le Pen and others' emerging brand of far-right feminism.

Fourth, in addition to revealing new knowledge about Le Pen and reactionary nationalism, this analysis also expands methodological understandings of constitutive rhetoric. This research has answered Aysel Morin and Ronald Lee's call for additional constitutive research to be conducted in non-English speaking contexts.[512] Additionally, the use of this

methodology also expands the use of constitutive rhetoric which, as Andrew Taylor points out, has been under-utilized to study political conservatism. In his analysis of Barry Goldwater's use of constitutive rhetoric to build a new conservative identity, Taylor argues that, because conservatives are often in favor of the status quo, they do not need to constitute new identities. However, Taylor identifies who he terms "insurgent conservatives" such as Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher, and Barry Goldwater who rely on constitutive rhetoric as an integral part of their agenda for "radical change" that is "both *polarizing*…and *synthesizing*."[513] In other words, an insurgent conservative both challenges the status quo and constitutes "a new electoral coalition."[514]

Under these criteria, Le Pen would also be considered an insurgent conservative, as she scapegoated the elites, globalists and immigrants—thus creating polarization between these forces and the followers of her revolution—and she brought together a new voting base by constituting her followers as always already French patriots who would support her movement under a new patriotic national identity. As a unique case of a conservative who employed constitutive rhetoric to constitute herself as a leader, her followers as patriots, and her movement as the necessary change to save French identity, the use of this methodology sheds light on how constitutive rhetoric can be fruitful in understanding the contemporary far right. Because contemporary reactionary nationalism necessitates a reaction to global changes, these types of politicians are also likely to embody the traits of insurgent conservatives in attempting to change the status quo; as such, future studies of contemporary reactionary nationalists may benefit from employing a methodology of constitutive rhetoric to understand the discourse of these figures as they gain more popularity.

Moreover, Le Pen's discourse has shown how constitutive rhetoric can be conditional. As Le Pen constitutes her audience as always already French patriots, her rhetoric also indicates that they can lose that title if they fail to support her and the National Front/National Rally. In other words, the constitution of this patriotic identity is conditional upon a single person who has the right to award or revoke membership to that identity. Unlike many other examples of constitutive rhetoric used to construct "the people" or national identity, Le Pen's rhetoric suggests that identity could also be *reconstituted* at the whims of one person. As belonging for Le Pen was contingent upon support for her and her movement, if her followers were to remain representatives of idealized French citizenship, they would be obliged to support Le Pen, no matter her policy proposals. Should they question their leaders or defect from movement membership, they would no longer be constituted as French patriots. Because Le Pen constituted French patriotism in tandem with National Front/National Rally support, she used constitutive rhetoric for authoritarian purposes. The potential threat of being ousted from the constituted identity and branded unpatriotic was veiled as revolutionary as Le Pen presented her version of "I alone can fix it."

Finally, this research has worked to expand the purview of public address scholarship beyond U.S. speakers and subjects. Barriers including language, cultural knowledge, travel, and funding have contributed to the dearth of international public address scholarship and, more specifically, to the lack of Communication Studies research about Marine Le Pen. By examining public address texts in other cultural, electoral, and linguistic contexts, we can more fully understand the differences and similarities between public address texts around the world. Moreover, of the public address research conducted in non-U.S. contexts, efforts have still been focused on the English-speaking world.[515] This analysis examined speeches and media accounts

in the original French. Public address scholars who are bilingual or multilingual or who have cultural understandings of other understudied areas of the world should focus on these different public address contexts as a way to expand the field.

This chapter has sought to put the findings of this thesis in a larger context by presenting implications and future directions for research on reactionary nationalism, women in politics, constitutive rhetoric, and international public address. Although Marine Le Pen is a single rhetor, her discourse presents a number of broader takeaways by providing a blueprint for how authoritarian leaders may invoke authoritarian sentiments under the guise of agency and through a rhetoric of *ressentiment*; by breaking with traditional norms utilized by women politicians; and by acting as an insurgent conservative who constitutes identity to mobilize a voting base to action and revolution. Moreover, this research contributes to attempts at internationalizing public address, diversifying the cultural, electoral, and linguistic contexts in which public address research is conducted.

By continuing to research Marine Le Pen and the many politicians who look to Le Pen as inspiration, scholars can not only contribute new knowledge about rhetorical strategy; they also can also help curb the rising tide of contemporary reactionary nationalism around the world. As Le Pen continues to hone her rhetorical strategies and work to soften the party's image—without actually changing any policies—it is imperative to further understand how she attracts supporters and what that support means for French national identity. In the first round of the French municipal elections, held in March 2020 to elect local councilors and mayors, the National Rally received the third-highest number of votes of large national parties, while Macron's party received the fifth-highest number of votes.[516] While these numbers are not yet conclusive because the second round of voting has been postponed, it indicates the likelihood of more

electoral success for Le Pen's movement.[517] As France prepares for another presidential election in 2022—for which Marine Le Pen has already declared her candidacy—it is crucial to continue expanding our rhetorical understandings of contemporary nationalism outside a U.S. American context.[518] By turning our focus outwards, we can better understand what the future may hold for the world's rising popularity of the far right and their followers.

**Endnotes**

[1] Gregor Aisch et al., "How France Voted," The New York Times, May 7, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/05/07/world/europe/france-election-results-maps.html.

[2] Adam Nossiter, "European Vote Reveals an Ever More Divided France," *The New York Times*, May 27, 2019, https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/27/world/europe/european-vote-france.html. para. 4. After her failed bid for president in 2017, Marine Le Pen proposed a vote to party members to change the party name to the National Rally in an act of rebranding. The vote passed and the party name was officially changed on June 1, 2018. I will refer to the party at the National Front or *Front National* when writing about the party before June 2018. Vivien Le Guen, "Le Front national change de nom et devient Rassemblement national," *France Bleu*, June 1, 2018, https://www.francebleu.fr/infos/politique/le-front-national-change-de-nom-et-devient-rassemblement-national-1527875341.

[3] Emma-Kate Symons, "The New National Front Is the Same as the Old National Front," *Foreign Policy*, April 11, 2017, https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/04/11/the-holocaust-denying-vichy-celebrating-heart-of-the-national-front/., paras. 4 and 16.

[4] Vivien Le Guay, "Européennes : Marine Le Pen enfile son gilet jaune," *Paris Match*, December 13, 2018, https://www.parismatch.com/Actu/Politique/Europeennes-Marine-Le-Pen-enfile-son-gilet-jaune-1594024; Pierre Avril, "Vladimir Poutine a reçu Marine Le Pen," *Le Figaro*, March 24, 2017, http://www.lefigaro.fr/international/2017/03/24/01003-20170324ARTFIG00178-vladimir-poutine-a-recu-marine-le-pen.php. Le Pen said that Donald Trump's 2016 electoral victory would make it easier for her to be elected in the 2017 French presidential election: "Le Pen Says Trump Win Boosts Her Chances," *BBC News*, November 13, 2016, sec. Europe, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-37964776.

[5] Le Pen has previously strongly advocated for "Frexit," but after seeing the many logistical problems that accompanied Brexit, she has since dropped this particular policy proposal. However, Le Pen still remains a strong Eurosceptic: Vivienne Walt, "How Nationalists Are Joining Together to Tear Europe Apart," *Time*, April 11, 2016, https://time.com/5568322/nationalism-in-europe/. In 2012, Le Pen made headlines after claiming that "The Islam of France doesn't exist": "Marine Le Pen : «l'islam de France n'existe pas»," *Le Parisien*, October 7, 2012, http://www.leparisien.fr/politique/marine-le-pen-l-islam-de-france-n-existe-pas-07-10-2012-2212217.php. In 2016, her party proposed the creation of a commission that would track mosques and other Muslim places of worship and close down any that seemed to be preaching extreme ideology: Marion Maréchal-Le Pen and Gilbert Collard, "Proposition de résolution de Marion Maréchal-Le Pen et Gilbert Collard, Députés à l'Assemblée Nationale," Rassemblement National, September 28, 2016, https://rassemblementnational.fr/interventions/proposition-de-resolution-de-marion-marechal-le-pen-et-gilbert-collard-deputes-a-lassemblee-nationale-2/. She also penned an op-ed for The New York Times in which she named fundamental Islamic terrorism as one of the main issues facing

French society, and she blames the French government's policies for allowing terrorist attacks in France to occur: Marine Le Pen, "Bien Nommer La Menace," *The New York Times*, January 18, 2015, sec. Opinion, https://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/19/opinion/marine-le-pen-la-france-a-ete-attaquee-par-le-fondamentalisme-islamiste.html.

[6] Gregory Viscusi, "Macron's Approval Rating Continues to Rise, French Poll Shows," *Bloomberg*, July 21, 2019, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-07-21/macron-s-approval-rating-continues-to-rise-french-poll-shows.

[7] Stephen E. Lucas points out that, traditionally, the study of rhetoric and public address went hand in hand, writing "to be a rhetorical critic…usually meant that one was also a student of British or American public address." Moreover, his 1988 essay calls for us to "assert the intrinsic value of scholarship in American public address." Since then, emphasis on the United States has dominated public address scholarship. Although rhetoric as a discipline has expanded slightly with journals such as the National Communication Association's *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* and SAGE's *European Journal of Communication,* other top journals in rhetoric and public address, such as *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* and *Quarterly Journal of Speech* publish little public address research outside of a United States context. Although *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* often publishes research with an international focus, this scholarship rarely comes from the public address tradition. As such, academic research in Communication Studies presents a large gap in published scholarship concerning non-U.S. American public address topics. Stephen E. Lucas, "The Renaissance of American Public Address: Text and Context in Rhetorical Criticism," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 74, no. 2 (1988): 241–60.

[8] David Held and Anthony McGrew, *Globalization/Anti-Globalization* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc., 2002).

[9] Giroux, 75, quoted in Yuko Kawai, "Neoliberalism, Nationalism, and Intercultural Communication: A Critical Analysis of a Japan's Neoliberal Nationalism Discourse under Globalization," *Journal of International & Intercultural Communication* 2, no. 1 (2009): 17, https://doi.org/10.1080/17513050802567049. Much of the research that characterizes globalization as neoliberal comes from studies of anti-globalization movements, such as Peter Van Aelst and Stefaan Walgrave, "New Media, New Movements? The Role of the Internet in Shaping the 'Anti-globalization' Movement," *Information, Communication & Society* 5, no. 4 (2002): 465–93, https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180208538801 and; Rosie Meade, "Mayday, Mayday! Newspaper Framing Anti-Globalizers," *Journalism* 9, no. 3 (2008): 330–52, https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884907089011.

[10] Molefi Kete Asante, "The Rhetoric of Globalisation: The Europeanisation of Human Ideas," *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 1, no. 2 (2006): 153, https://doi.org/10.2167/md054.0.

[11] Nilanjana Bardhan, "Constructing the Meaning of Globalization: A Framing Analysis of The PR Strategist," *Journal of Public Relations Research* 25, no. 5 (2013): 394, https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2013.788447.

[12] Peter C. Fiss and Paul M. Hirsch, "The Discourse of Globalization: Framing and Sensemaking of an Emerging Concept," *American Sociological Review* 70, no. 1 (2005): 29–52, https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240507000103.

[13] Fiss and Hirsch; Paolo Nino Valdez and Gene Marie Flores, "Language, Politics and Economics in an Era of Globalization," *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 14, no. 2 (2019): 188–94, https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2019.1605965.

[14] Stephen John Hartnett, "Google and the 'Twisted Cyber Spy' Affair: US–Chinese Communication in an Age of Globalization," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97, no. 4 (2011): 411–34, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2011.608705.

[15] Marcos Ancelovici, "Organizing against Globalization: The Case of ATTAC in France," *Politics & Society* 30, no. 3 (2002): 429, https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329202030003003.

[16] Castells calls for the conception of a global public sphere as a result of rapidly expanding globalization. As a result, he argues, we should not only consider national governance and public sphere, but also global governance. Manuel Castells, "The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (2008): 78–93.

[17] Dustin Harp, Summer Harlow, and Jaime Loke, "The Symbolic Annihilation of Women in Globalization Discourse: The Same Old Story in U.S. Newsmagazines," *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 21, no. 5 (2013): 263–77, https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870.2013.842434.

[18] Koeli Moitra Goel, "In Other Spaces: Contestations of National Identity in 'New' India's Globalized Mediascapes," *Journalism & Communication Monographs* 20, no. 1 (March 2018): 4–73, https://doi.org/10.1177/1522637917750131; Colin Hay and Nicola Jo-Anne Smith, "How Policy-Makers (Really) Understand Globalization: The Internal Architecture of Anglophone Globalization Discourse in Europe," *Public Administration* 88, no. 4 (2010): 903–27, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2010.01863.x; Skilling, "'We Must Agree on Our Vision'"; John C. Carpenter, "Creating English as a Language of Global News Contraflow: Al Jazeera at the Intersection of Language, Globalization and Journalism," *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research* 10, no. 1 (2017): 65–83, https://doi.org/10.1386/jammr.10.1.65_1.

[19] Skilling, "'We Must Agree on Our Vision.'"

[20] Christof Demont-Heinrich, "Beyond Culture and (National) Identity? Language, Globalization and the Discourse of Universal Progress in American Newspaper Coverage of English," *Journal of International & Intercultural Communication* 1, no. 2 (2008): 137, https://doi.org/10.1080/17513050801891960.

[21] Peter Garrett, Betsy Evans, and Angie Williams, "What Does the Word 'Globalisation' Mean to You?: Comparative Perceptions and Evaluations in Australia, New Zealand, the USA and the UK," *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 27, no. 5 (2006): 392–412, https://doi.org/10.2167/jmmd396.1; Christof Demont-Heinrich, "Language, Globalization, and the Triumph of Popular Demand: The Discourse of Populism in American Prestige Press Coverage of the Global Hegemony of English," *Communication Review* 12, no. 1 (2009): 20–49, https://doi.org/10.1080/10714420802716247.

[22] Jamie Shinhee Lee, "'Everywhere You Go, You See English!': Elderly Women's Perspectives on Globalization and English," *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 13, no. 4 (2016): 319–50, https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2016.1190654.

[23] Stewart McCain, *The Language Question under Napoleon*, War, Culture and Society, 1750-1850 (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 102.

[24] Ulrich Beck, *Power in the Global Age: A New Global Political Economy*, trans. Kathleen Cross (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), 259, emphasis mine; David Meren, *With Friends Like These: Entangled Nationalisms and the Canada-Quebec-France Triangle, 1944-1970* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2012).

[25] Skilling, "'We Must Agree on Our Vision'"; Teresa Heinz Housel, "Australian Nationalism and Globalization: Narratives of the Nation in the 2000 Sydney Olympics' Opening Ceremony," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 24, no. 5 (2007): 446–61, https://doi.org/10.1080/07393180701695348.

[26] Alev Çinar, "Globalism as the Product of Nationalism: Founding Ideology and the Erasure of the Local in Turkey," *Theory, Culture & Society* 27, no. 4 (2010): 91, https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276410372236.

[27] Kerstin Lueck, Clemence Due, and Martha Augoustinos, "Neoliberalism and Nationalism: Representations of Asylum Seekers in the Australian Mainstream News Media," *Discourse & Society* 26, no. 5 (2015): 608–29, https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926515581159.

[28] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 1991), 6–7.

[29] Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*.

[30] Anderson, 45.

[31] Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensons of Globalization* (Minneanapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 5.

[32] Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 1995), 6.

[33] Billig, *Banal Nationalism*.

[34] Pille Petersoo, "What Does 'We' Mean?: National Deixis in the Media," *Journal of Language & Politics* 6, no. 3 (2007): 419–36, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.6.3.08pet; Laura Costelloe, "Discourses of Sameness: Expressions of Nationalism in Newspaper Discourse on French Urban Violence in 2005," *Discourse & Society* 25, no. 3 (2014): 315–40, https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926513519533.

[35] Cynthia J. White, "Banal Nationalism and Belonging within the Echoed Imagined Community," *Journal of Language & Politics* 14, no. 5 (2015): 627–44, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.14.5.01whi.

[36] Vera Slavtcheva-Petkova, "Rethinking Banal Nationalism: Banal Americanism, Europeanism, and the Missing Link between Media Representations and Identities," *International Journal of Communication* 8 (2014): 43–61.

[37] Jinnie Jinyoung Yoo and Wei-Na Lee, "Calling It Out: The Impact of National Identity on Consumer Response to Ads With a Patriotic Theme," *Journal of Advertising* 45, no. 2 (2016): 244–55, https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2015.1065778; White, "Banal Nationalism and Belonging within the Echoed Imagined Community"; Nadje Al-Ali and Nicola Pratt, "Between Nationalism and Women's Rights: The Kurdish Women's Movement in Iraq," *Middle East Journal of Culture & Communication* 4, no. 3 (2011): 339–55, https://doi.org/10.1163/187398611X590192; Lyndon C. S. Way and Aysun Akan, "Electricity and Nationalism: Different Nationalisms in Turkish News Media Coverage of Cypriot Events," *Global Media Journal: Mediterranean Edition* 7, no. 1 (2012): 18–28; Costelloe, "Discourses of Sameness"; Belinda A. Stillion Southard, "Crafting Comopolitan Nationalism: Ellen Johnson Sirleaf's Rhetorical Leadership," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 103, no. 4 (2017): 395–414, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2017.1360508. It should be noted that, despite the varying research that has been conducted in many different countries, our current conception of "the nation" is based on Western ideals. Kundai Chirindo points out that "sub-Saharan Africa challenges the culturally and linguistically homogenous contours drawn around this entity" because African countries are often made up of micronations. These small ethnic communities largely operate postnationally outside the state. Although my research concerns a country that finds itself firmly situated in the West and consequently with a Western understanding of the nation, it is important to understand that this concept is not universally understood or followed elsewhere. Kundai Chirindo, "Micronations and Postnational Rhetorics," *Women's Studies in Communication* 41, no. 4 (2018): 384, https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2018.1551686.

[38] Yoo and Lee, "Calling It Out."

[39] For more information about the practice and history of nation branding and national identity, see Samuel Pehrson and Eva G. T. Green, "Who We Are and Who Can Join Us: National Identity Content and Entry Criteria for New Immigrants," *Journal of Social Issues* 66, no. 4 (2010): 695–716, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01671.x; Ruth Wodak and Salomi Boukala, "European Identities and the Revival of Nationalism in the European Union,"

*Journal of Language & Politics* 14, no. 1 (2015): 87–109, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.14.1.05wod; Jenni Riihimäki, "At the Heart and in the Margins: Discursive Construction of British National Identity in Relation to the EU in British Parliamentary Debates from 1973 to 2015," *Discourse & Society* 30, no. 4 (2019): 412–31, https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926519837394.

[40] Christine Quail, "Anatomy of a Format: So You Think You Can Dance Canada and Discourses of Commercial Nationalism," *Television & New Media* 16, no. 5 (2015): 473, https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476414543527; Zala Volcic and Mark Andrejevic, "Nation Branding in the Era of Commercial Nationalism," *International Journal of Communication* 5 (2011): 598–618.

[41] Uğur Gündüz and Burcu Kaya Erdem, "The Concept of Virtual Nationalism in the Digital Age: Social Media Perspectives of Turkey," *Communication Today* 8, no. 2 (2017): 18–29; Shakuntala Rao, "Making of Selfie Nationalism: Narendra Modi, the Paradigm Shift to Social Media Governance, and Crisis of Democracy," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 42, no. 2 (2018): 166–83, https://doi.org/10.1177/0196859917754053; Lee Pierce, "A Rhetoric of Traumatic Nationalism in the Ground Zero Mosque Controversy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 100, no. 1 (2014): 53–80, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2014.888461; Hamilton Bean, Lisa Keränen, and Margaret Durfy, "'This Is London': Cosmopolitan Nationalism and the Discourse of Resilience in the Case of the 7/7 Terrorist Attacks," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 14, no. 3 (2011): 427–64, https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2011.0018.

[42] Scholars have given many names to this type of nationalism, including far-right nationalism, white nationalism, extreme nationalism, radical nationalism, and populist ultra-nationalism.

[43] Manuela Caiani and Patricia Kröll, "Nationalism and Populism in Radical Right Discourses in Italy and Germany," *Javnost-The Public* 24, no. 4 (2017): 336–54, https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2017.1330084.

[44] Giorgos Katsambekis and Yannis Stavrakakis, "Revisiting the Nationalism/Populism Nexus: Lessons from the Greek Case," *Javnost-The Public* 24, no. 4 (2017): 394, https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2017.1330087.

[45] Catherine Fieschi reminds us that "Nationalism is one of the main components of fascism." Catherine Fieschi, *Fascism, Populism, and the French Fifth Republic: In the Shadow of Democracy* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2004), 106.

[46] White nationalism has been covered in both academia and popular press. See, for example, Stephanie L. Hartzell, "Alt-White: Conceptualizing the 'Alt-Right' as a Rhetorical Bridge between White Nationalism and Mainstream Public Discourse," *Journal of Contemporary Rhetoric* 8, no. 1/2 (2018): 6–25; Luke O'Brien, "The Making of an American Nazi," *The Atlantic*, December 2017, https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2017/12/the-making-of-an-american-nazi/544119/; Vera Bergengruen and W. J. Hennigan, "'We Are Being Eaten

From Within.' Why America Is Losing the Battle Against White Nationalist Terrorism," *Time*, August 8, 2019, https://time.com/5647304/white-nationalist-terrorism-united-states/.

[47] Michael Löwy and Francis Sitel, "The Far Right in France: The Front National in European Perspective," in *The Politics of the Right*, ed. Leo Pantich and Greg Albo (London: The Merlin Press, 2015), 54.

[48] G. M. Tamás, "Ethnicism After Nationalism: The Roots of the New European Right," in *The Politics of the Right*, ed. Leo Pantich and Greg Albo (London: The Merlin Press, 2015), 118–35; Michel Eltchaninoff, *Inside the Mind of Marine Le Pen* (London: Hurst and Company, 2017); Enzo Traverso, *The New Faces of Fascism*, trans. David Broder (New York: Verso, 2019). Aurelien Mondon has also argued that the European far-right brand of nationalism is characterized by the shift from a focus on class to focus on race and the narrative that the white working class "suffer[s] from the unfair competition brought about not by neo-liberal globalisation, but by the immigrant working class." Aurelien Mondon, "Limiting Democratic Horizons to a Nationalist Reaction: Populism, the Radical Right and the Working Class," *Javnost-The Public* 24, no. 4 (December 2017): 370, https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2017.1330085.

[49] Ruth Breeze, "Positioning 'the People' and Its Enemies: Populism and Nationalism in AfD and UKIP," *Javnost-The Public* 26, no. 1 (2019): 99, https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2018.1531339.

[50] Henri Tajfel and John Turner, "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict," in *Organizational Identity: A Reader*, ed. Mary Jo Hatch and Majken Schultz (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 56–65.

[51] Sue Wright, *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

[52] Fouillée, quoted in Edmond Marc Lipiansky, *L'identité Française: Représentations, Mythes, Idéologies* (La Garenne-Colombes: L'Espace Européen, 1991), 146.

[53] Lipiansky, 146.

[54] Ruth Wodak and Salomi Boukala, "European Identities and the Revival of Nationalism in the European Union," *Journal of Language & Politics* 14, no. 1 (2015): 88, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.14.1.05wod.

[55] John Hutcheson et al., "U.S. National Identity, Political Elites, and a Patriotic Press Following September 11," *Political Communication* 21, no. 1 (2004): 28, https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600490273254.

[56] Jason Gilmore, "American Exceptionalism in the American Mind: Presidential Discourse, National Identity, and U.S. Public Opinion," *Communication Studies* 66, no. 3 (2015): 301–20, https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2014.991044; Milford, "National Identity, Crisis, and the

Inaugural Genre," 25; Hutcheson et al., "U.S. National Identity, Political Elites, and a Patriotic Press Following September 11," 46.

[57] Jonathan Borden, "Effects of National Identity in Transnational Crises: Implications of Social Identity Theory for Attribution and Crisis Communications," *International Journal of Communication* 10 (2016): 377–97.

[58] Qiaolei Jiang, "Celebrity Athletes, Soft Power and National Identity: Hong Kong Newspaper Coverage of the Olympic Champions of Beijing 2008 and London 2012," *Mass Communication & Society* 16, no. 6 (2013): 888–909, https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2013.789528.

[59] Tamara Banjeglav, "Political Rhetoric and Discursive Framing of National Identity in Croatia's Commemorative Culture," *Journal of Language & Politics* 17, no. 6 (2018): 858–81, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.17074.ban; Ekaterina Kalinina and Manuel Menke, "Negotiating the Past in Hyperconnected Memory Cultures: Post-Soviet Nostalgia and National Identity in Russian Online Communities," *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics* 12, no. 1 (2016): 59–74, https://doi.org/10.1386/macp.12.1.59_1.

[60] Peter Teo and Cui Ruiguo, "Imag(in)Ing the Nation," *Journal of Language & Politics* 14, no. 5 (2015): 645–64, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.14.5.02teo.

[61] Banjeglav, "Political Rhetoric and Discursive Framing of National Identity in Croatia's Commemorative Culture."

[62] Riihimäki, "At the Heart and in the Margins."

[63] Liza Hopkins, "Citizenship and Global Broadcasting: Constructing National, Transnational and post-national identities," *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 23, no. 1 (2009): 19–32, https://doi.org/10.1080/10304310802596333.

[64] Kalinina and Menke, "Negotiating the Past in Hyperconnected Memory Cultures"; Aya Yadlin-Segal, "Constructing National Identity Online: The Case Study of #IranJeans on Twitter," *International Journal of Communication* 11 (2017): 2760–83.

[65] Charles M. Rowling, Penelope Sheets, and Timothy M. Jones, "Frame Contestation in the News: National Identity, Cultural Resonance, and U.S. Drone Policy," *International Journal of Communication* 7 (2013): 2231–53.

[66] Snobra Rizwan, "National Identity Premises in Pakistani Social Media Debate over Patriotism," *Journal of Language and Politics* 18, no. 2 (2019): 291–311, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.17020.riz.

[67] Kevin Coe and Rico Neumann, "Finding Foreigners in American National Identity: Presidential Discourse, People, and the International Community," *International Journal of Communication* 5 (2011): 819–40.

[68] Marinus Ossewaarde, "The National Identities of the 'Death of Multiculturalism' Discourse in Western Europe," *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 9, no. 3 (2014): 173–89, https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2014.912655.

[69] Sabina Mihelj, "The European and the National in Communication Research," *European Journal of Communication* 22, no. 4 (2007): 443–59, https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323107083061; Michał Krzyżanowski, "International Leadership Re-/Constructed?," *Journal of Language & Politics* 14, no. 1 (2015): 110–33, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.14.1.06krz; Wodak and Boukala, "European Identities and the Revival of Nationalism in the European Union"; Riihimäki, "At the Heart and in the Margins"; Pehrson and Green, "Who We Are and Who Can Join Us."

[70] Aysel Morin and Ronald Lee, "Constitutive Discourse of Turkish Nationalism: Ataturk's Nutuk and the Rhetorical Construction of the 'Turkish People,'" *Communication Studies* 61, no. 5 (2010): 486, https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2010.515895.

[71] Mary E. Stuckey, "One Nation (Pretty Darn) Divisible: National Identity in the 2004 Conventions," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8, no. 4 (2005): 639–56.

[72] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59, no. 1 (1973): 79, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637309383155.

[73] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, *Man Cannot Speak for Her: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric* (Westport: Praeger, 1989).

[74] Bonnie J. Dow and Mari Boor Tonn, "'Feminine Style and Political Judgement in the Rhetoric of Ann Richards," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79, no. 3 (1993): 288, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639309384036; For more work extending the feminine style, see Jane Blankenship and Deborah C. Robson, "A 'Feminine Style'; in Women's Political Discourse: An Exploratory Essay," *Communication Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (1995): 353–66, https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379509369982.

[75] For example Vigil's study of ten convention speeches given by presidential nominees' spouses between 1992 and 2012 were all found to rely on, to some degree, the feminine style: Tammy R. Vigil, "Feminine Views in the Feminine Style: Convention Speeches by Presidential Nominees' Spouses," *Southern Communication Journal* 79, no. 4 (2014): 327–46, https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2014.916339; Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Trevor Parry-Giles, "Gendered Politics and Presidential Image Construction: A Reassessment of the 'Feminine Style,'" *Communication Monographs* 63 (1996): 337.

[76] Karrin Vasby Anderson, "From Spouses to Candidates: Hillary Rodham Clinton, Elizabeth Dole, and the Gendered Office of U.S. President," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 1 (2002): 105–32, https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2002.0001; Kristina Horn Sheeler and Karrin Vasby Anderson, *Woman President: Confronting Postfeminist Political Culture* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2013).

[77] Sheeler and Anderson, *Woman President: Confronting Postfeminist Political Culture*, 9.

[78] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetorical Presidency: A Two-Person Career," in *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency*, ed. Martin J. Medhurst (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1996).

[79] Campbell.

[80] Campbell; Kathleen Hall Jamieson, *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 25–34.

[81] Teri Finneman and Ryan J. Thomas, "First Ladies in Permanent Conjuncture: Grace Coolidge and 'Great' American Womanhood in the New York Times," *Women's Studies in Communication* 37, no. 2 (2014): 220–36, https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2014.911232.

[82] Campbell, "The Rhetorical Presidency: A Two-Person Career," 191; Karrin Vasby Anderson, "The First Lady: A Site of 'American Womanhood,'" in *Leading Ladies of the White House: Communicaton Strategies of Notable Twentieth-Century First Ladies*, ed. Molly Meijer Wertheimer (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005), 11.

[83] Campbell, "The Rhetorical Presidency: A Two-Person Career"; Mary Ellen Brown, "Feminism and Cultural Politics: Television Audiences and Hilary Rodham Clinton," *Political Communication* 14, no. 2 (1997): 255, https://doi.org/10.1080/105846097199489; Betty Houchin Winfield, "The Making of an Image: Hillary Rodham Clinton and American Journalist," *Political Communication* 14, no. 2 (1997): 241, https://doi.org/10.1080/105846097199470; Charlotte Templin, "Hillary Clinton as Threat to Gender Norms: Cartoon Images of the First Lady," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 23, no. 1 (1999): 20–36, https://doi.org/10.1177/0196859999023001002; Karrin Vasby Anderson, "'Rhymes with Rich': 'Bitch' as a Tool of Containment in Contemporary American Politics," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2, no. 4 (1999): 599–623; Shawn J. Parry-Giles, "Mediating Hilary Rodham Clinton: Television News Practices and Image-Making in the Postmodern Age," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 17, no. 2 (June 2000): 205–26, https://doi.org/10.1080/15295030009388390. Research has also been conducted on political spouses who make the foray into running for office themselves: Erica Scharrer, "An 'Improbable Leap': A Content Analysis of Newspaper Coverage of Hillary Clinton's Transition from First Lady to Senate Candidate," *Journalism Studies* 3, no. 3 (2002): 393–406, https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700220145614; Anderson, "From Spouses to Candidates". For more research about other first ladies such as Eleanor Roosevelt, Lady Bird Johnson, Nancy Reagan, Barbara Bush, and more, see Molly Meijer Wertheimer, *Inventing a Voice: The Rhetoric of American First Ladies of the Twentieth Century* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004); Molly Meijer Wertheimer, ed., *Leading Ladies of the White House: Communication Strategies of Notable Twentieth-Century First Ladies* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005). The concept of the first lady was further complicated in during the 2016 presidential election when Bill Clinton acted as a political spouse and potential "first gentleman": Roseann M. Mandziuk, "Whither the Good Wife? 2016

Presidential Candidate Spouses in the Gendered Spaces of Contemporary Politics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 103, no. 1/2 (2017): 136–59, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2016.1233350.

[84] Jenni M. Simon and Abby M. Brooks, "The 'First' Coverage of the First Lady: E-Racing the Mom-in-Chief," *Women & Language* 40, no. 1 (2018): 15–35; Maureen Ebben and Teresita Garza, "When They Go Low, We Go High: First Lady Michelle Obama's Feminist Rhetoric of Inclusion," *Women & Language* 40, no. 1 (Winter2017 2018): 83–100; Ruth E. Page, "'Cherie: Lawyer, Wife, Mum': Contradictory Patterns of Representation in Media Reports of Cherie Booth/Blair," *Discourse & Society* 14, no. 5 (2003): 559–79, https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265030145002; Chin-Chung Chao, Yahui Zhang, and Jie Li, "The 'First' First Lady of China and the 'First Black' First Lady of America: The Role of Liyuan Peng and Michelle Obama in the Media's Portrayal," *China Media Research* 14, no. 1 (2018): 53–61; Elza Ibroscheva, "The First Ladies and the Arab Spring: A Textual Analysis of the Media Coverage of the Female Counterparts of Authoritarian Oppression in the Middle East," *Feminist Media Studies* 13, no. 5 (2013): 871–80, https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2013.838377.

[85] Jamieson, *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership*, 13.

[86] Jamieson, *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership*.

[87] Diane Feinstein was able to transcend the femininity/competency double bind in her television advertisements for Congress by positioning herself as an outsider who was tough, but also caring and inclusive: David B. Sullivan, "Images of a Breakthrough Woman Candidate: Dianne Feinstein's 1990, 1992, and 1994 Campaign Television Advertisements," *Women's Studies in Communication* 21, no. 1 (1998): 7–26, https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.1998.10162411; Gubernatorial candidate Jennifer Granholm used the "unruly woman" frame to complicate the frame of beauty queen upon which she had been bestowed by the media: Kristina Horn Sheeler, "Beauty Queens and Unruly Women in the Year of the Woman Governor: Jennifer Granholm and the Visibility of Leadership," *Women's Studies in Communication* 33, no. 1 (2010): 34–53, https://doi.org/10.1080/07491401003669927.

[88] See, for example, Ingrid Bachmann, Dustin Harp, and Jamie Loke, "Covering Clinton (2010-2015): Meaning-Making Strategies in US Magazine Covers," *Feminist Media Studies* 18, no. 5 (2018): 793–809, https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2017.1358204; James Devitt, "Framing Gender on the Campaign Trail: Female Gubernatorial Candidates and the Press," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (2002): 445–63, https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900207900212; Anna-Maria Renner and Lena Masch, "Emotional Woman – Rational Man? Gender Stereotypical Emotional Expressivity of German Politicians in News Broadcasts," *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research* 44, no. 1 (2019): 81–103, https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2017-0048; Elza Ibroscheva and Maria Raicheva-Stover, "Engendering Transition: Portrayals of Female Politicians in the Bulgarian Press," *Howard Journal of Communications* 20, no. 2 (2009): 111–28, https://doi.org/10.1080/10646170902869429; Debby Vos, "The Vertical Glass Ceiling: Explaining Female Politicians' Underrepresentation in Television News," *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research* 38, no. 4 (2013): 389–410,

https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2013-0023; Cathy Jenkins, "Women in Australian Politics: Mothers Only Need Apply," *Pacific Journalism Review* 12, no. 1 (2006): 54–63; Maryam Ben Salem, "Media Coverage of Women in the Arab Political Sphere," *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research* 3, no. 3 (2010): 177–89, https://doi.org/10.1386/jammr.3.3.177_1.

[89] Dustin Harp, Jaime Loke, and Ingrid Bachmann, "Hillary Clinton's Benghazi Hearing Coverage: Political Competence, Authenticity, and the Persistence of the Double Bind," *Women's Studies in Communication* 39, no. 2 (2016): 193–210, https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2016.1171267; Jessica Ritchie, "Creating a Monster," *Feminist Media Studies* 13, no. 1 (2013): 102–19, https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2011.647973; Lorina Culic, "The Image of Politician Women in the Romanian Media," *Journal of Media Research* 5, no. 3 (2012): 79–94; Jayeon Lee and Young-shin Lim, "Gendered Campaign Tweets: The Cases of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump," *Public Relations Review* 42, no. 5 (2016): 849–55, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.07.004.

[90] Amanda Haraldsson and Lena Wängnerud, "The Effect of Media Sexism on Women's Political Ambition: Evidence from a Worldwide Study," *Feminist Media Studies* 19, no. 4 (2019): 525–41, https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2018.1468797.

[91] Shawn J. Parry-Giles, *Hillary Clinton in the News: Gender and Authenticity in American Politics* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2014), 11.

[92] Parry-Giles, 12.

[93] Wilma Rule, "Parliaments of, by, and for the People: Except for Women?," in *Electoral Systems in Comparative Perspective: Their Impact of Women and Minorities*, ed. Wilma Rule and Joseph F. Zimmerman (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1994.), 16.

[94] Sheri Kunovich and Pamela Paxton, "Pathways to Power: The Role of Political Parties in Women's National Political Representation," *American Journal of Sociology* 111, no. 2 (2005): 505–52.

[95] Rule, "Parliaments of, by, and for the People: Except for Women?" For more information on the hierarchy of "women-friendly" to "women-unfriendly" electoral systems, see Table 2.3 on pages 27 and 28.

[96] Marcia Lynn Whicker and Todd W. Areson, "The Maleness of the American Presidency," in *Women in Politics: Outsiders or Insiders?*, ed. Lois Lovelace Duke (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1993), 166.

[97] Most U.S. American presidents have held at least one of three positions before being elected: vice-president, U.S. senator, or governor: Whicker and Areson, "The Maleness of the American Presidency."

[98] Lindsey Meeks and David Domke, "When Politics Is a Woman's Game," *Communication Research* 43, no. 7 (2016): 895–921, https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215581369; See also: Shannon C. McGregor, Regina G. Lawrence, and Arielle Cardona, "Personalization, Gender, and Social Media: Gubernatorial Candidates' Social Media Strategies," *Information, Communication & Society* 20, no. 2 (2017): 264–83, https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1167228.

[99] Janet McCabe, "States of Confusion: Sarah Palin and the Politics of US Mothering," *Feminist Media Studies* 12, no. 1 (2012): 149–53, https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2011.640009; Jaime Loke, Dustin Harp, and Ingrid Bachmann, "Mothering and Governing: How News Articulated Gender Roles in the Cases of Governors Jane Swift and Sarah Palin," *Journalism Studies* 12, no. 2 (2011): 205–20, https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2010.488418.

[100] Susan Fountaine, "What's Not to Like?: A Qualitative Study of Young Women Politicians' Self-Framing on Twitter," *Journal of Public Relations Research* 29, no. 5 (2017): 219–37, https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2017.1388239.

[101] Cornelia Ilie, "'Behave Yourself, Woman!' Patterns of Gender Discrimination and Sexist Stereotyping in Parliamentary Interaction," *Journal of Language & Politics* 17, no. 5 (2018): 594–616, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.18015.ili.

[102] Ignacio Moreno Segarra and Karrin Vasby Anderson, "Political Pornification Gone Global: Teresa Rodríguez as Fungible Object in the 2015 Spanish Regional Elections," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 105, no. 2 (2019): 5, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2019.1595102.

[103] Joachim Aström and Martin Karlsson, "The Feminine Style, the Male Influence, and the Paradox of Gendered Political Blogspace," *Information, Communication & Society* 19, no. 11 (2016): 1636–52, https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1154088; Young-Im Lee, "From First Daughter to First Lady to First Woman President: Park Geun-Hye's Path to the South Korean Presidency," *Feminist Media Studies* 17, no. 3 (2017): 377–91, https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2016.1213307; Maruša Pušnik and Gregor Bulc, "Women in Their Own Reflection: Self-Representation of Women Politicians in the Slovenian Press," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 25, no. 4 (2001): 396–413; Berit von der Lippe and Tarja Väyrynen, "Co-Opting Feminist Voices for the War on Terror: Laura Bush Meets Nordic Feminism," *European Journal of Women's Studies* 18, no. 1 (2011): 19–33, https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506810386082; Mandy R. Manning, "The Rhetoric of Equality: Hillary Rodham Clinton's Redefinition of the Female Politician," *Texas Speech Communication Journal* 30, no. 2 (2006): 109–20; Liesbet van Zoonen, "The Personal, the Political and the Popular: A Woman's Guide to Celebrity Politics," *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9, no. 3 (2006): 287–301, https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549406066074.

[104] See, for example, Karrin Vasby Anderson, "Every Woman Is the Wrong Woman: The Female Presidentiality Paradox," *Women's Studies in Communication* 40, no. 2 (2017): 132–35, https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2017.1302257; Manning, "The Rhetoric of Equality"; Harp,

Loke, and Bachmann, "Hillary Clinton's Benghazi Hearing Coverage"; Bachmann, Harp, and Loke, "Covering Clinton (2010-2015)"; Ryan Neville-Shepard and Jaclyn Nolan, "'She Doesn't Have the Stamina': Hillary Clinton and the Hysteria Diagnosis in the 2016 Presidential Election," *Women's Studies in Communication* 42, no. 1 (2019): 60–79, https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2019.1575301; David S. Kaufer and Shawn J. Parry-Giles, "Hillary Clinton's Presidential Campaign Memoirs: A Study in Contrasting Identities," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 103, no. 1/2 (2017): 7–32, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2016.1221529; Karrin Vasby Anderson, "Presidential Pioneer or Campaign Queen? Hillary Clinton and the First-Timer/Frontrunner Double Bind," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 20, no. 3 (2017): 525–38, https://doi.org/10.14321/rhetpublaffa.20.3.0525; Flemming Schneider Rhode and Tisha Dejmanee, "Effeminate Speech on New Media: @HillaryClinton's Public Intimacy through Relational Labor," *International Journal of Communication* 10 (2016): 486–507; Lindsey Meeks, "Is She 'Man Enough'? Women Candidates, Executive Political Offices, and News Coverage," *Journal of Communication* 62, no. 1 (2012): 175–93, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01621.x; Rebecca M. L. Curnalia and Dorian L. Mermer, "The 'Ice Queen' Melted and It Won Her the Primary: Evidence of Gender Stereotypes and the Double Bind in News Frames of Hillary Clinton's 'Emotional Moment,'" *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication* 15, no. 1 (2014): 26–32, https://doi.org/10.1080/17459435.2014.955589.

[105] van Zoonen, "The Personal, the Political and the Popular"; Rukhsana Ahmed, "Interface of Political Opportunism and Islamic Extremism in Bangladesh: Rhetorical Identification in Government Response," *Communication Studies* 60, no. 1 (2009): 82–96, https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970802623633; Douglas M. Ponton, "The Female Political Leader: A Study of Gender-Identity in the Case of Margaret Thatcher," *Journal of Language & Politics* 9, no. 2 (2010): 195–218, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.9.2.02pon; Annamari Huovinen and Hanna Weselius, "'No Smiling, Please, Ms Prime Minister!': Constructing a Female Politician on the Cover of a News Magazine," *Catalan Journal of Communication & Cultural Studies* 7, no. 1 (2015): 3–20, https://doi.org/10.1386/cjcs.7.1.3_1; Kristina Horn Sheeler and Karrin Vasby Anderson, "Gender, Rhetoric, and International Political Systems: Angela Merkel's Rhetorical Negotiation of Proportional Representation and Party Politics," *Communication Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (2014): 474–95, https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2014.922484; Celina Van Dembroucke, "Exploring Media Representations of Argentina's President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner," *Feminist Media Studies* 14, no. 6 (2014): 1056–70, https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2014.882858; Chantal Bourgault du Coudray, "A 'Disappointing' Leader: The Postmaternalism of Public Feminist Commentary on Julia Gillard," *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 30, no. 3 (2016): 274–83, https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2016.1166556; Natalia Aruguete and Mario Riorda, "An Image Is Worth a Thousand Policies: The Discursive Strategy of Electoral Campaigns of Winning Candidates in Latin America," *Communication & Society* 29, no. 2 (2016): 173–91, https://doi.org/10.15581/003.29.2.145-159; Lee, "From First Daughter to First Lady to First Woman President"; Stillion Southard, "Crafting Comopolitan Nationalism: Ellen Johnson Sirleaf's Rhetorical Leadership"; Denisa Oprea, "'The Yokel from Teleorman': Representations of Romanian Prime Minister in Satirical News Websites," *Journal of Media Research* 12, no. 2 (2019): 74–92, https://doi.org/10.24193/jmr.34.4; Catherine Van Halsema, "Merkel the Mutti? A

Linguistic Analysis of Domestic Language in European News Media Coverage of Angela Merkel," *Women & Language* 42, no. 1 (2019): 7–22, https://doi.org/10.34036/WL.2019.002; Liziane Guazina, Hélder Prior, and Bruno Araújo, "Framing of a Brazilian Crisis: Dilma Rousseff's Impeachment in National and International Editorials," *Journalism Practice* 13, no. 5 (2019): 620–37, https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2018.1541422.

[106] Eltchaninoff, *Inside the Mind of Marine Le Pen*; Michel Marian, "La Résistible Ascension de Marine Le Pen," *Esprit* 374, no. 5 (2011): 95–103; Daniel Stockemer and Mauro Barisione, "The 'New' Discourse of the Front National under Marine Le Pen: A Slight Change with a Big Impact," *European Journal of Communication* 32, no. 2 (2017): 100–115, https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323116680132; Georgiana Ghiciuc, "La Campagne Présidentielle Française de 2012: Une Bataille de Mots. Aperçu Des Instances d'hostilité Employées Par Les Cinq Premiers Candidates Sur Leurs Blogs et Sites Officiels," *Argumentum: Journal of the Seminar of Discursive Logic, Argumentation Theory & Rhetoric* 10, no. 2 (2012): 133–49; Michelle Hale Williams, "A New Era for French Far Right Politics? Comparing the FN under Two Le Pens," *Análise Social* 46, no. 201 (2011): 679–95.

[107] "Marine Le Pen Is Elected French MP but Far-Right Front National Falls Flat with Just Eight Seats," *The Telegraph*, June 19, 2017, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/06/19/marine-le-pen-elected-french-mp-far-right-front-national-falls/.

[108] Angelique Chrisafis, "Who Are the Gilets Jaunes and What Do They Want?," *The Guardian*, December 7, 2018, sec. World news, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/dec/03/who-are-the-gilets-jaunes-and-what-do-they-want; Le Figaro, "«Gilets jaunes» : le point sur ce samedi de rentrée," Le Figaro, September 7, 2019, http://www.lefigaro.fr/actualite-france/le-point-sur-la-rentree-des-gilets-jaunes-20190907.

[109] Maurice Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Québécois," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73, no. 2 (1987): 139, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638709383799.

[110] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric.", emphasis mine

[111] Stein, Sarah R., "The '1984' Macintosh Ad: Cinematic Icons and Constitutive Rhetoric in the Launch of a New Machine," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 2 (2009): 162–92, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630209384369; Thieme, Katja, "Constitutive Rhetoric as an Aspect of Audience Design: The Public Texts of Canadian Suffragists," *Written Communication* 27, no. 1 (2010): 36–56, https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088309353505; Charles Goehring and George N. Dionisopoulos, "Identification by Antithesis: The Turner Diaries as Constitutive Rhetoric," *Southern Communication Journal* 78, no. 5 (2013): 369–86, https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2013.823456.

[112] Helen Tate, "The Ideological Effects of a Failed Constitutive Rhetoric: The Co-Option of the Rhetoric of White Lesbian Feminism: Women's Studies in Communication: Vol 28, No 1," *Women's Studies in Communication* 28, no. 1 (2010): 1–31,

https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2005.10162482; For another study about failed constitutive rhetoric in the context of American politics, see Kenneth S. Zagacki, "Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches," *Western Journal of Communication* 71, no. 4 (2007): 272–93, https://doi.org/10.1080/10570310701653786.

[113] Taylor's work on Barry Goldwater shows how Goldwater was able to create a new conservative identity in the United States in the1960s: Andrew Taylor, "Barry Goldwater: Insurgent Conservatism as Constitutive Rhetoric," *Journal of Political Ideologies* 21, no. 3 (2016): 242–60, https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2016.1204764.

[114] Robert Elliot Mills, "The Pirate and the Sovereign: Negative Identification and the Constitutive Rhetoric of the Nation-State," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 17, no. 1 (2014): 105–36, https://doi.org/10.14321/rhetpublaffa.17.1.0105.

[115] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," 142.

[116] Morin and Lee, "Constitutive Discourse of Turkish Nationalism," 486.

[117] Cecil Jenkins, *A Brief History of France: People, History, and Culture* (Philadelphia: Running Press, 2011), 26.

[118] Jenkins, *A Brief History of France: People, History, and Culture*.

[119] David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2001), 8.

[120] Bell, 8.

[121] Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France*; McCain, *The Language Question under Napoleon*.

[122] Dominique Estival and Alastair Pennycook, "L'Académie Française and Anglophone Language Ideologies," *Language Policy* 10, no. 4 (2011): 330, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-011-9215-6.

[123] Estival and Pennycook, "L'Académie Française and Anglophone Language Ideologies."

[124] Peter McPhee, *The French Revolution, 1789-1799* (Oxford University Press, 2001); Georges Lefebvre, *The Coming of the French Revolution*, trans. R.R. Palmer (Princeton University Press, 2005).

[125] Lefebvre, *The Coming of the French Revolution*, 172.

[126] Patrice Gueniffey, "The First Republic," in *The French Republic: History, Values, Debates*, ed. Edward Berenson, Vincent Duclert, and Christophe Prochasson, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (London: Cornell University Press, 2011).

[127] Jenkins, *A Brief History of France: People, History, and Culture*.

[128] Alain Finkielkraut, *L'identité Malheureuse* (Paris: Stock, 2013), 86.

[129] Finkielkraut, *L'identité Malheureuse*.

[130] Lipiansky, *L'identité Française*, 147.

[131] Lipiansky, 35. To see a chart of dozens of French traits, see page 37 of Lipiansky.

[132] Quoted in Finkielkraut, *L'identité Malheureuse*, 105.

[133] Jenkins, *A Brief History of France: People, History, and Culture*, 26.

[134] Jenkins, *A Brief History of France: People, History, and Culture*.

[135] Charles Cogan, *French Negotiating Behavior: Dealing with La Grande Nation* (Washington, D.C: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2003), 13.

[136] Cogan, 71.

[137] Cogan, *French Negotiating Behavior*.

[138] Donald M. G. Sutherland, *The French Revolution and Empire: The Quest for a Civic Order* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Inc., 2003).

[139] Jenkins, *A Brief History of France: People, History, and Culture*, 281.

[140] Jenkins, 269.

[141] Michael Kelly, "Laïcité and Atheism in France," *French Cultural Studies* 28, no. 1 (2017): 112.

[142] Every year, the French government conducts a study of the state of *laïcité* in France: Viavoice Paris, "État Des Lieux de La Laïcité En France" (l'Obervatoire de la laïcité, February 1, 2019), 3, https://www.gouvernement.fr/etat-des-lieux-de-la-laicite-en-france-sondage-realise-par-viavoice-pour-l-observatoire-de-la.

[143] Jenkins, *A Brief History of France: People, History, and Culture*, 269–71.

[144] Lipiansky, *L'identité Française*.

[145] Cogan, *French Negotiating Behavior*, 124.

[146] Harvey G. Simmons, *The French National Front: The Extremist Challenge to Democracy* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 216.

[147] Nonna Mayer, "From Jean-Marie to Marine Le Pen: Electoral Change on the Far Right," *Parliamentary Affairs* 66, no. 1 (2013): 160–78, https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gss071.

[148] Jenkins, *A Brief History of France: People, History, and Culture*.

[149] Fieschi, *Fascism, Populism, and the French Fifth Republic: In the Shadow of Democracy*.

[150] Elisabeth Zerofsky, "A French Republican Party?," May 28, 2015, https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/a-french-republican-party There are other more extreme far-right groups in France, such as the Frexit group Union Populaire Républicaine, but this party has much less popular support in France. uSee the party's website, www.upr.fr for more information about the group.

[151] John Lichfield, "France's New Two-Party System: Center vs. Extreme," Politico, March 27, 2019, https://www.politico.eu/article/france-new-two-party-system-center-vs-extreme/.

[152] "French Election 2017: How Does the Voting System Work?," *The Week UK*, April 5, 2017, //www.theweek.co.uk/french-election-2017/84240/french-election-2017-how-does-the-voting-system-work.

[153] Elise Vincent, "Terrorisme : quatre ans après le 13-Novembre, la France face à une menace en profonde mutation," *Le Monde*, November 13, 2019, https://www.lemonde.fr/societe/article/2019/11/13/terrorisme-quatre-ans-apres-le-13-novembre-la-france-face-a-une-menace-en-forte-recomposition_6018919_3224.html.

[154] "Immigration : le regard des Français," Institut français d'opinion publique, December 4, 2018, https://www.ifop.com/publication/le-regard-des-francais-sur-limmigration/.

[155] Lanna Hollo, "Islamophobia Is on the Rise in France," *Al Jazeera*, November 5, 2019, https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/islamophobia-rise-france-191105083245903.html.

[156] Eleanor Beardsley, "France Ends State Of Emergency After Nearly 2 Years," NPR, All Things Considered, December 28, 2017, https://www.npr.org/2017/12/28/574314844/france-ends-state-of-emergency-after-nearly-2-years.

[157] "France-President Emmanuel Macron's Approval Rating," Politico, accessed November 27, 2019, https://www.politico.eu/europe-poll-of-polls/france/.

[158] Jess McHugh, "After a Violent 'Yellow Vest' Anniversary, What's Next for the Movement?," Fortune, November 25, 2019, para. 8, https://fortune.com/2019/11/25/yellow-vest-protests-gilets-jaunes-anniversary/.

[159] Löwy and Sitel, "The Far Right in France: The Front National in European Perspective," 54.

[160] LDaniel Stockemer, *The Front National in France: Continuity and Change under Jean-Marie Le Pen and Marine Le Pen* (Springer, 2017), 30; Löwy and Sitel, "The Far Right in France: The Front National in European Perspective."

[161] Cécile Alduy and Stéphane Wahnich, *Marine Le Pen Prise Aux Mots: Décryptage Du Nouveau Discours Frontiste* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2015), 166–67.

[162] Yasmeen Serhan, "How Being a Woman Helped Marine Le Pen," *The Atlantic*, April 19, 2017, para. 2, https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2017/04/how-being-a-woman-helped-marine-le-pen/522456/.

[163] Caroline Lambert, "French Women in Politics: The Long Road to Parity," *Brookings Institute* (blog), May 1, 2001, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/french-women-in-politics-the-long-road-to-parity/.

[164] Alduy and Wahnich, *Marine Le Pen Prise Aux Mots*, 222.

[165] Christine Delphy, *Un Universalisme Si Particulier: Féminisme et Exception Française (1980-2010)*, Collection "Nouvelles Questions Féministes" (Paris: Syllepse, 2010), 106.

[166] Alison Hird, "French Local Authority Fined for Putting Too Many Women in Top Jobs," RFI, August 30, 2019, para. 3, http://www.rfi.fr/en/france/20190830-french-local-authority-fined-putting-too-many-women-top-jobs; Gender partiy goes both ways. In August 2019, a company was fined for having too many women managers: David Chazan, "French Council Fined for Having Too Many Female Managers," *The Telegraph*, August 30, 2019, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2019/08/30/french-council-fined-having-many-female-managers/.

[167] Rainbow Murray, "Towards Parity Democracy? Gender in the 2012 French Legislative Elections," *Parliamentary Affairs* 66, no. 1 (2013): 198, https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gss072.

[168] Murray, "Towards Parity Democracy?"

[169] Terri E. Givens, "The Radical Right Gender Gap," *Comparative Political Studies* 37, no. 1 (2004): 30–54, https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414003260124.

[170] Mayer, "From Jean-Marie to Marine Le Pen," 162.

[171] Mayer, "From Jean-Marie to Marine Le Pen."

172 Serhan, "How Being a Woman Helped Marine Le Pen" According to the French Institute for Public Opinion (IFOP), Le Pen's presidential run in 2017 garnered near equal votes from men and women.

173 Murray, "Towards Parity Democracy?"

174 Lauren Collins, "The Feminism of France's Minister for Gender Equality," *The New Yorker*, February 19, 2018, https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/02/26/the-feminism-of-frances-minister-for-gender-equality.

175 Malliga Och, "Macron and Trudeau Shouldn't Be so Proud of Appointing Women to Their Cabinets," The Conversation, July 1, 2017, http://theconversation.com/macron-and-trudeau-shouldnt-be-so-proud-of-appointing-women-to-their-cabinets-79990.

176 Carol Kuruvilla, "UN Panel Declares France's 'Burqa Ban' Violates Muslim Women's Rights," HuffPost, October 23, 2018, para. 6, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/france-muslim-burqa-ban-united-nations_n_5bcf2280e4b055bc9484d703.

177 Kuruvilla, para. 10.

178 "Pools in France Close after Women Defy Burkini Ban," Al Jazeera, June 27, 2019, https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/06/pools-france-close-women-defy-burkini-ban-190627055424354.html.

179 In 2018, the UN Human Rights Committee found that the ban on full-face covering violates the rights of Muslim women in France. While the decision may not force France to change its laws, it may change legal rulings over the ban in the future: Kuruvilla, "UN Panel Declares France's 'Burqa Ban' Violates Muslim Women's Rights."

180 "France Fines Hundreds under New Harassment Law," *BBC News*, April 30, 2019, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-48104247; Eleanor Beardsley, "Despite New Sexual Harassment Law, French Women Say #MeToo Has Fallen Short," NPR, All Things Considered, May 4, 2019, https://www.npr.org/2019/05/04/720307808/despite-new-sexual-harassment-law-french-women-say-metoo-has-fallen-short.

181 Frank Andrews, Yelena Peigne, and Judith Vonberg, "Catherine Deneuve Denounces #MeToo in Open Letter," CNN, January 10, 2018, https://www.cnn.com/2018/01/10/europe/catherine-deneuve-france-letter-metoo-intl/index.html.

182 Misgav Har-Peled, "#BalanceTonPorc: The Story behind Pigs and Lust," The Conversation, April 26, 2018, http://theconversation.com/balancetonporc-the-story-behind-pigs-and-lust-92491.

183 Collins, "The Feminism of France's Minister for Gender Equality."

[184] Laure Fourquet, "As Deaths Mount, France Tries to Get Serious About Domestic Violence," *The New York Times*, September 3, 2019, https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/03/world/europe/france-domestic-violence.html; Saskya Vandoorne, "137 Women Have Been Killed by Their Partners in France This Year. Critics Blame a 'Deeply Sexist Society,'" *CNN*, November 26, 2019, https://www.cnn.com/2019/11/21/europe/france-femicide-intl/index.html.

[185] Vandoorne, "137 Women Have Been Killed by Their Partners in France This Year. Critics Blame a 'Deeply Sexist Society,'" para. 24.

[186] Vandoorne, paras. 45–46.

[187] Simmons, *The French National Front*; Roussel, 1985, 95 quoted in Edward G. Declair, *Politics on the Fringe: The People, Policies, and Organization of the French National Front* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 12.

[188] Declair, *Politics on the Fringe: The People, Policies, and Organization of the French National Front*, 38.

[189] Declair, *Politics on the Fringe: The People, Policies, and Organization of the French National Front*.

[190] Löwy and Sitel, "The Far Right in France: The Front National in European Perspective."

[191] Declair, 117. For the complete outcome of a poll comparing the National Front elite opinion and French public opinion, see Table 5.1 on page 119 in Declair

[192] Eltchaninoff, *Inside the Mind of Marine Le Pen*.

[193] Aisch et al.

[194] Declair, *Politics on the Fringe: The People, Policies, and Organization of the French National Front*, 313.

[195] Cas Mudde, *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[196] Nonna Mayer and Pascal Perrineau, "Why Do They Vote for Le Pen?," *European Journal of Political Research* 22, no. 1 (1992): 123, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1992.tb00308.x.

[197] Stockemer, *The Front National in France*.

[198] Aurelien Mondon, "Nicolas Sarkozy's Legitimization of the Front National: Background and Perspectives," *Patterns of Prejudice* 47, no. 1 (2013): 23, https://doi.org/10.1080/0031322X.2012.735128.

[199] Mondon, 39.

[200] After initial National Front victory in 1984, the party further advanced by winning about 10% of the vote in the 1986 and 1988 legislative elections, and Jean-Marie won about 15% of the vote in both the 1988 and 1995 presidential elections. During the 1980s, 90s, and early 2000s, the party also won several local and mayoral elections in cities such as Toulon and Orange: Michael Ray, "National Front: History, Members, & Platform," Encyclopedia Britannica, accessed November 26, 2019, https://www.britannica.com/topic/National-Front-political-party-France.

[201] Jean-Marie has publicly stated numerous times that gas chambers during the Holocaust were "a mere detail of history" in World War II. He has repeated this since 1987 and has publicly made these comments in both Germany and the European Parliament. France has strict laws against Holocaust denial: Angelique Chrisafis, "Jean-Marie Le Pen Fined Again for Dismissing Holocaust as 'Detail,'" *The Guardian*, April 6, 2016, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/apr/06/jean-marie-le-pen-fined-again-dismissing-holocaust-detail.

[202] Stockemer, *The Front National in France*, 44.

[203] Stockemer, 45.

[204] Angelique Chrisafis, "French Presidential Election: Hollande on Top but Le Pen Delivers Record Result," *The Guardian*, April 22, 2012, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/apr/22/french-presidential-election-hollande-le-pen-sarkozy; Aisch et al., "How France Voted."

[205] Ghiciuc, "La Campagne Présidentielle Française de 2012: Une Bataille de Mots. Aperçu Des Instances d'hostilité Employées Par Les Cinq Premiers Candidates Sur Leurs Blogs et Sites Officiels," 141.

[206] Nossiter, "European Vote Reveals an Ever More Divided France."

[207] Löwy and Sitel, "The Far Right in France: The Front National in European Perspective."

[208] Mayer, "From Jean-Marie to Marine Le Pen"; Williams, "A New Era for French Far Right Politics?"

[209] Marian, "La Résistible Ascension de Marine Le Pen," 96.

[210] Marian, 97.

[211] Williams, "A New Era for French Far Right Politics?," 692.

[212] Alduy and Wahnich, *Marine Le Pen Prise Aux Mots*.

[213] Williams, "A New Era for French Far Right Politics?," 690.

[214] Eltchaninoff, *Inside the Mind of Marine Le Pen*, 58.

[215] Alduy and Wahnich, *Marine Le Pen Prise Aux Mots*.

[216] Eltchaninoff, 41

[217] Eltchaninoff, *Inside the Mind of Marine Le Pen*, 41.

[218] Stockemer and Barisione, "The 'New' Discourse of the Front National under Marine Le Pen: A Slight Change with a Big Impact," 107.

[219] Dorit Geva, "Daughter, Mother, Captain: Marine Le Pen, Gender, and Populism in the French National Front," *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 1-26, 2018, 3, https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxy039.

[220] Serhan, "How Being a Woman Helped Marine Le Pen," para. 9.

[221] Katie L. Gibson and Amy L. Heyse, "'The Difference Between a Hockey Mom and a Pit Bull': Sarah Palin's Faux Maternal Persona and Performance of Hegemonic Masculinity at the 2008 Republican National Convention," *Communication Quarterly* 58, no. 3 (2010): 251, https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2010.503151.

[222] Gibson and Heyse, "'The Difference Between a Hockey Mom and a Pit Bull.'"

[223] Geva, "Daughter, Mother, Captain," 16.

[224] Mayer, "From Jean-Marie to Marine Le Pen"; Saphora Smith, "An Army of Women Quietly Backs France's Far-Right Would-Be President," NBC News, April 21, 2017, https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/french-elections-marine-le-pen-backed-quiet-army-women-n748136.

[225] Stockemer and Barisione, "The 'New' Discourse of the Front National under Marine Le Pen: A Slight Change with a Big Impact," 111.

[226] Stockemer and Barisione, "The 'New' Discourse of the Front National under Marine Le Pen: A Slight Change with a Big Impact."

[227] Fieschi, *Fascism, Populism, and the French Fifth Republic: In the Shadow of Democracy*.

[228] Simmons, *The French National Front*, 163.

[229] Stockemer and Barisione, "The 'New' Discourse of the Front National under Marine Le Pen: A Slight Change with a Big Impact," 104.

[230] Eltchaninoff, *Inside the Mind of Marine Le Pen*, 58.

[231] Alduy and Wahnich, *Marine Le Pen Prise Aux Mots*, 66–67.

[232] Alduy and Wahnich, 262.

[233] Löwy and Sitel, "The Far Right in France: The Front National in European Perspective," 65.

[234] Stockemer, *The Front National in France*, 33.

[235] Stockemer, 34.

[236] Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 301.

[237] Burke, 412.

[238] Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, "Marine Le Pen Abandons Frexit Crusade 'Error,'" *The Telegraph*, May 21, 2017, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2017/05/21/marine-le-pen-abandons-frexit-crusade-error/.

[239] Marine Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017* (Rassemblement National, 2017), para. 21, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CqrNAnzZb0I.

[240] Marine Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," Marine 2017, March 11, 2017, para. 9, https://web.archive.org/web/20170327133039/https://www.marine2017.fr/2017/03/11/reunion-publique-a-chateauroux/.

[241] Le Pen, para. 15.

[242] Marine Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017* (Line Press, 2017), para. 13, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OkQyTc_lkdQ.

[243] Marine Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," Rassemblement National, May 2, 2019, para. 16, https://rassemblementnational.fr/discours/metz-discours-de-marine-le-pen-1er-mai/.

[244] Le Pen, paras. 13, 55.

[245] Le Pen, para. 60.

[246] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 43.

[247] Marine Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)* (Rassemblement National, 2015), paras. 21, 24, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u6htj9WUzKQ.

[248] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 31; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 6.

[249] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 64.

[250] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 27; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 76; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, paras. 7–8; Marine Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon" (February 5, 2017), paras. 158–159, https://www.medias-presse.info/grand-discours-de-programme-de-marine-le-pen-le-5-fevrier-2017-a-lyon-texte-et-video/68929/.

[251] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 30.

[252] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 16.

[253] Marine Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," RN - Rassemblement National, February 20, 2018, para. 105, https://rassemblementnational.fr/discours/discours-de-marine-le-pen-a-laon-aisne/.

[254] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," paras. 100–101.

[255] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 153; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 42.

[256] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," paras. 152–153.

[257] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 12; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," paras. 185–186.

[258] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 117.

[259] Le Pen, para. 126.

[260] Le Pen, para. 127.

[261] Le Pen, paras. 40, 98.

[262] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 19; Also see Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 123 and ; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 87.

[263] Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 406; Brian L. Ott and Eric Aoki, "The Politics of Negotiating Public Tragedy: Media Framing of the Matthew Shepard Murder," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 5, no. 3 (2002): 492.

[264] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 10; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 75; Marine Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31) : discours de Marine Le Pen," Rassemblement National, March 3, 2019, para. 52, https://rassemblementnational.fr/videos/reunion-publique-a-bessieres-31-discours-de-marine-le-pen/.

[265] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 73; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 25.

[266] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 13.

[267] Le Pen, para. 63.

[268] Le Pen, para. 63.

[269] Le Pen, para. 63.

[270] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 22.

[271] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 60; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 197.

[272] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 30.

[273] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 37.

[274] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 45; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 166.

[275] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 23; Marine Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84) : discours de Marine Le Pen," RN - Rassemblement National, January 22, 2019, para. 96, https://rassemblementnational.fr/discours/reunion-publique-au-thor-84-discours-de-marine-le-pen/; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," paras. 21–22.

[276] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 72.

[277] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 27.

[278] Le Pen, para. 2.

[279] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 151; Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 42.

[280] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 96. Also see: Le Pen, para. 83 and Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 9.

[281] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 5.

[282] Le Pen, para. 28.

[283] Le Pen, para. 30.

[284] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," paras. 22–23.

[285] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 27.

[286] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 7.

[287] Le Pen's use of the word "Europeanist" denotes a positive view of Europe and the E.U. Le Pen, paras. 9–10.

[288] Although Le Pen focuses much of her energy on portraying Macron as a globalist, she also accuses Angela Merkel perpetrating similar offenses. Focusing mostly on Merkel's seemingly lax immigration policies, Le Pen argues that Merkel's policies have allowed Macron to follow suit in erasing French identity through similar globalizing and immigration policies.

[289] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 13; Also see: Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)"; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon."

[290] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 13; Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 91.

[291] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 15.

[292] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 18; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 66; Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 45.

[293] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 20.

[294] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 37.

[295] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 45.

[296] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, paras. 13–15.

[297] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 13; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 11.

[298] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 194.

[299] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 33; Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," paras. 33–34; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 59.

[300] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 38.

[301] Le Pen, para. 217; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," paras. 14, 135, 140; Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 70; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 102.

[302] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," paras. 14, 26.

[303] Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 8.

[304] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 17; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 5.

[305] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 35.

[306] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," paras. 62, 75.

[307] In her 2017 speech announcing her candidacy for president, Le Pen uses the term "Jihadist globalization" to describe threats to the French border and interior threats to French culture Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 24.

[308] Le Pen, para. 58.

[309] This is not a new talking point for Le Pen. In a 2015 speech in Corsica, she says that the French flag has often been seen as antiquated and tacky by politicians who prefer the E.U. flag over that of France: Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 49; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," paras. 17–19.

[310] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 46.

[311] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 2.

[312] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 58.

[313] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 103; Marine Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour," Europe 1, April 24, 2017, para. 8, https://www.europe1.fr/politique/verbatim-le-discours-de-marine-le-pen-au-soir-du-premier-tour-3309374.

[314] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 64.

[315] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 62; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 26.

[316] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 28; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," paras. 91–92.

[317] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 19.

[318] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 35.

[319] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 63; Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour," paras. 9–10.

[320] By focusing on threats against which to show the superiority of the French people, Le Pen echoes what Julia Khrebtan-Hörhager found in her analysis of the rhetorical strategies employed at Paris's Musée du Quai Branly: constituting Frenchness through the inferiority of the Other. Julia Khrebtan-Hörhager, "Musée Du Quai Branly: The Heart of Darkness in La Cité de La Lumière," *Communication, Culture & Critique* 11, no. 2 (2018): 315–40, https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcy006.

[321] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 22; Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 12.

[322] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 38.

[323] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 53; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 23.

[324] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 55.

[325] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 53.

[326] Le Pen, para. 41.

[327] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 43.

[328] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 54.

[329] Le Pen, para. 55.

[330] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, paras. 35, 55.

[331] In 2016, about two million of France's over 6 million immigrants immigrated from European countries. Over 1.5 million immigrated from just Algeria and Morocco, with over one million more immigrants from other African countries, and nearly 250,000 from Turkey. "Immigrants by Country of Birth," Institut national d'études démographiques, n.d., https://www.ined.fr/en/everything_about_population/data/france/immigrants-foreigners/countries-birth-immigrants/.

[332] Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 7.

[333] Luis Sáenz de Viguera Erkiaga, "Sacrificial Victim: Taking the Nation Apart in Thomas Vinterberg's The Hunt," *Studies in European Cinema* 15, no. 2/3 (2018): 162–79, https://doi.org/10.1080/17411548.2018.1460055; Hywel Bishop and Adam Jaworski, "'We Beat 'Em': Nationalism and the Hegemony of Homogeneity in the British Press Reportage of Germany versus England during Euro 2000," *Discourse & Society* 14, no. 3 (2003): 243–71, https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265030143001.

[334] Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994); de Viguera Erkiaga, "Sacrificial Victim," 163–64.

[335] M. Mosheer Amer, "The Discourse of Homeland: The Construction of Palestinian National Identity in Palestinian Secularist and Islamist Discourses," *Critical Discourse Studies* 9, no. 2 (2012): 118, https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.656374; While this may be a popular nationalistic talking point, Ginna Husting, reminds us that homogeneity is incompatible with democracy. Drawing on Hannah Arendt, Husting writes "Construction of a homogenous, harmonious nation is a politics of elimination, of erasure and censorship, and is antithetical to a vibrant democratic process." Ginna Husting, "Neutralizing Protest: The Construction of War, Chaos, and National Identity through US Television News on Abortion-Related Protest, 1991," *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (2006): 164, https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420600633089.

³³⁶ Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 40.

³³⁷ Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 59; Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*.

³³⁸ Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 61.

³³⁹ Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 22.

³⁴⁰ Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 16.

³⁴¹ Le Pen, para. 18.

³⁴² Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 47; Le Pen consistently links immigration to terrorism and terrorism delinquency Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, paras. 35, 51; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 55; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 19.

³⁴³ Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 24.

³⁴⁴ Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 19.

³⁴⁵ Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 29.

³⁴⁶ Le Pen, para. 29.

³⁴⁷ Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 21.

³⁴⁸ Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 29.

³⁴⁹ Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 49; Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 54.

³⁵⁰ Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 51.

³⁵¹ Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 22.

³⁵² Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon"; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux."

³⁵³ Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)."

[354] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 45; Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 32.

[355] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 32.

[356] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 22.

[357] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 33.

[358] Le Pen, para. 34.

[359] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon."

[360] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 44.

[361] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon."

[362] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 44.

[363] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 44.

[364] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," paras. 83, 85.

[365] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 24; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 12.

[366] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 35.

[367] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," paras. 54-57. France currently practices strict secularism, and many of these fears that Marine Le Pen mentions (such as ability to wear a Muslim veil or pray in pubic) are currently strictly forbidden in public places.

[368] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 133.

[369] Le Pen, para. 150.

[370] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux."

[371] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 41.

[372] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 171; In her Marseille speech, Le Pen says that she does not "want the French people to get

used to living with this poison." Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 44; Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*.

[373] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 149; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 12.

[374] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 14; Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," paras. 61, 64; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 66.

[375] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 47.

[376] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 31.

[377] Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 406.

[378] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 217; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 103.

[379] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 39.

[380] Le Pen, para. 41.

[381] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 41.

[382] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 226; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 15; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 8.

[383] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 223.

[384] In her 2015 speech in Corsica, Le Pen tells the United States "France is not your vassal, but your ally." Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 51.

[385] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 233.

[386] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 85; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," paras. 36–37.

[387] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 11, emphasis mine.

[388] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," paras. 45–46.

[389] Le Pen, para. 52.

[390] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 55; See also: Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 41.

[391] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 21.

[392] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 31; Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour," para. 14.

[393] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 221.

[394] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 53.

[395] Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 406.

[396] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 3.

[397] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 8.

[398] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 21; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 97.

[399] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," paras. 220–221.

[400] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 66.

[401] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*; Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)."

[402] Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour"; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 71.

[403] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 69.

[404] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 54.

[405] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 53.

[406] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 67.

[407] Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour," para. 18.

[408] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," paras. 71–72.

[409] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*.

[410] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 27; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 11; Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 114.

[411] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 5.
[412] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 63.

[413] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 10; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 17.

[414] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 233.

[415] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 69.

[416] *Patrie* is more than just a homeland or county. The invocation of *patrie* also invokes feelings of pride and profound patriotism in one's country.

[417] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 3.

[418] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 18.

[419] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 10.

[420] Le Pen, para. 23.

[421] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 42.

[422] Robert Asen argues that citizenship should be considered a mode of public engagement and, as such, is a performance. Robert Asen, "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90, no. 2 (2004): 189–211; Engin F. Isin and Greg M. Nielson conceptualize citizenship as constituted through "acts." Engin F. Isin and Greg Marc Nielsen, "Introduction: Acts of Citizenship," in *Acts of Citizenship*, ed. Engin F. Isin and Greg Marc Nielsen (New York: Zed Books, 2008), 1–12; Belinda Stillon Southard points out that everyday practices constitute state-recognized citizenship performances. Belinda A. Stillion Southard, *How to Belong: Women's Agency in a Transnational World* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018); Also see David Held, *Models of Democracy*, 3rd ed. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006).

[423] Engin F. Isin, "Theorizing Acts of Citizenship," in *Acts of Citizenship*, ed. Engin F. Isin and Greg Marc Nielsen (New York: Zed Books, 2013), 3.

[424] Isin, 3.

[425] Hopkins, "Citizenship and Global Broadcasting: Constructing National, Transnational and Post-National Identities."

[426] Ersula J. Ore, for example, writes about how lynching was a state-sanctioned performance of white citizenship, while Blacks were not considered worthy of citizenship. Ersula J. Ore, *Lynching: Violence, Rhetoric, and American Identity*, Race, Rhetoric, and Media Series (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2019); For more about increasing mobility of citizenship in a globalized world, see: Stillion Southard, *How to Belong: Women's Agency in a Transnational World*; Alessandra Beasley Von Burg, "Stochastic Citizenship: Toward a Rhetoric of Mobility," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 45, no. 4 (2012): 351–75; Raka Shome, "Space Matters: The Power and Practice of Space," *Communication Theory* 13, no. 1 (2003): 39–56, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2003.tb00281.x.

[427] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 56.

[428] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 12.

[429] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 6; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 75.

[430] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 19.

[431] See, for example Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 36; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 57; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 95.

[432] Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 48; In her speech in Bessières, Le Pen mentions the suffering of the Gilets Jaunes along with "poor workers, modest retirees, and single mothers." Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 35.

[433] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 135; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 44.

[434] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 8; Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 43.

[435] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 9; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 6; Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour," para. 15.

[436] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 53.

[437] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 27.

[438] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon"; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux"; Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)."

[439] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 26.

[440] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon"; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 37.

[441] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)"; Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)"; Le Pen also briefly mentions the local in 2017, saying "We are for the local against the global." Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 139.

[442] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 73.

[443] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 79.

[444] Le Pen, paras. 91, 82.

[445] Le Pen, para. 91; Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 80.

[446] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 57; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 64.

[447] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 126.

[448] Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour," para. 16.

[449] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 76.

[450] Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour," paras. 16, 4.

[451] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 36; Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 98.

[452] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 76; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 71.

[453] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 6; Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 108.

[454] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 61.

[455] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," paras. 29, 123, 133.

[456] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 8.

[457] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 29; Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 65.

[458] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 56.

[459] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 186.

[460] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, paras. 25, 36.

[461] Le Pen, para. 36.

[462] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 10.

[463] Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 105; Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 119.

[464] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 11.

[465] Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 101; Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 52.

[466] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 186.

[467] Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour," para. 5.

[468] Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon," para. 97.

[469] Eltchaninoff, *Inside the Mind of Marine Le Pen*, 97.

[470] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 12.

[471] Le Pen, para. 13; Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 42.

[472] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 68.

[473] Le Pen called her movement a revolution in five of the ten speeches analyzed here: Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*; Le Pen, "Grand Discours – Programme de Marine Le Pen Le 5 Février 2017 à Lyon"; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux"; Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)."

[474] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 19.

[475] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 13.

[476] For more on contemporary far-right French movements and post-truth, see Jayson Harsin, "Post-Truth Populism: The French Anti-Gender Theory Movement and Cross-Cultural Similarities," *Communication, Culture & Critique* 11, no. 1 (March 2018): 35–52, https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcx017.

[477] Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 46.

[478] Le Pen, para. 65.

[479] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux," para. 232.

[480] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 16.

[481] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*; Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Châteauroux"; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*.

[482] Le Pen, *Discours de Marine Le Pen à Marseille - Présidentielles 2017*, para. 18.

[483] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 48; Le Pen, *Meeting de Marine Le Pen / Paris - France 17 Avril 2017*, para. 5.

[484] Le Pen, "Réunion publique au Thor (84)," para. 109.

[485] Le Pen, "Metz - Discours de Marine Le Pen (1er mai)," para. 102.

[486] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 156.

[487] Le Pen, *Marine Le Pen En Meeting En Corse (Ajaccio, 28 Novembre)*, para. 74.

[488] Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 145.

[489] Le Pen, "VERBATIM-Le Discours de Maine Le Pen Au Soir Du Premier Tour," para. 12.

[490] Le Pen, "Réunion publique à Bessières (31)," para. 44.

491 Le Pen, "Discours de Marine Le Pen à Laon (Aisne)," para. 132.

492 Le Pen, para. 139.

493 Chrisafis, "Who Are the Gilets Jaunes and What Do They Want?"; In addition to the Yellow Vests protest, a 46-day strike over pension reform shut down many parts of the country from December 2019 to January 2020: Jeffrey Schaeffer, "New Street Protests in France amid Pension Strikes," Associated Press, January 16, 2020, https://apnews.com/735631a1fa66f22312993bee035b9a3c; Sandrine Amiel, "After the Strike, Will France Face More Radical Forms of Protest?," euronews, January 20, 2020, https://www.euronews.com/2020/01/20/as-strike-ends-will-france-face-more-radical-forms-of-protests.

494 K. Biswas, "Opinion | How the Far Right Became Europe's New Normal," *The New York Times*, February 4, 2020, sec. Opinion, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/04/opinion/far-right-europe-austria.html; "One in 10 EU Voters Support Far-Right Populist Parties," *Deutsche Welle*, April 26, 2019, https://www.dw.com/en/one-in-10-eu-voters-support-far-right-populist-parties/a-48497813.

495 Casey Ryan Kelly, "Donald J. Trump and the Rhetoric of Ressentiment," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 106, no. 1 (2020): 4–5, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2019.1698756.

496 Kelly, 7.

497 Kelly, 7.

498 Geva, "Daughter, Mother, Captain," 3.

499 Agnes Poirier, "Marine Le Pen's Woman Card," Al Jazeera, April 30, 2017, https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2017/04/france-marine-le-pen-illusion-feminism-170430075026580.html.

500 Angelique Chrisafis, "'We Feel Very Close to Her': Can 'fake Feminist' Marine Le Pen Win the Female Vote?," *The Guardian*, March 18, 2017, sec. World news, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/mar/18/front-national-anger-marine-le-pen-female-supporters; Poirier, "Marine Le Pen's Woman Card."

501 Geva, "Daughter, Mother, Captain," 2.

502 Campbell, *Man Cannot Speak for Her*.

503 Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860," *American Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (1966): 152, https://doi.org/10.2307/2711179.

[504] Sara Hayden, "Family Metaphors and the Nation: Promoting a Politics of Care through the Million Mom March," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89, no. 3 (2003): 211, https://doi.org/10.1080/0033563032000125313.

[505] Valeria Fabj, "Motherhood as Political Voice: The Rhetoric of the Mothers of Plaza de Mayo," *Communication Studies* 44, no. 1 (1993): 1.

[506] Jennifer A. Peeples and Kevin M. DeLuca, "The Truth of the Matter: Motherhood, Community and Environmental Justice," *Women's Studies in Communication* 29, no. 1 (2006): 81, https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2006.10757628.

[507] Mari Boor Tonn, "Militant Motherhood: Labor's Mary Harris 'Mother' Jones," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82, no. 1 (1996): 1–21, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639609384137.

[508] Jamieson, *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership*; Loke, Harp, and Bachmann, "Mothering and Governing: How News Articulated Gender Roles in the Cases of Governors Jane Swift and Sarah Palin."

[509] Gibson and Heyse, "'The Difference Between a Hockey Mom and a Pit Bull.'"

[510] Stephen W. Richey, "Joan of Arc - A Military Appreciation," Saint Joan of Arc Center, accessed April 27, 2020, http://www.stjoan-center.com/military/stephenr.html.

[511] Richey.

[512] Morin and Lee, "Constitutive Discourse of Turkish Nationalism."

[513] Taylor, "Barry Goldwater," 242–43.

[514] Taylor, 243.

[515] Notable exceptions include Stillion Southard, *How to Belong: Women's Agency in a Transnational World*; Julia Khrebtan-Hörhager, "Intersectional Othering and New Border Cultures: Lessons From Italy," *Women's Studies in Communication* 42, no. 2 (April 3, 2019): 125–29, https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2019.1605193; Thomas McCloskey, "'We Must Not Forget That God Created Us Equal': Putin and American Exceptionalism," *Southern Communication Journal* 84, no. 1 (January 2019): 44–56, https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2018.1540016; Zhen Sun, "Challenging the Dominant Stories about the Boxer Rebellion: Chinese Minister Wu Ting-Fang's Narrative," *Chinese Journal of Communication* 1, no. 2 (June 2008): 196–202, https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750802287984.

[516] "French Polls, Trends and Election News for France," Politico, accessed April 18, 2020, https://www.politico.eu/europe-poll-of-polls/france/.

[517] A record-low voter turnout and the growth of COVID-19 led French officials to postpone the second round of voting, which was originally supposed to take place on March 22, 2020.

"France Suspends Local Elections Because of Covid-19," *The Economist*, March 19, 2020, https://www.economist.com/europe/2020/03/19/france-suspends-local-elections-because-of-covid-19.

[518] "France: Far-Right Marine Le Pen to Run for President Again," Deutsche Welle, January 16, 2020, https://www.dw.com/en/france-far-right-marine-le-pen-to-run-for-president-again/a-52034080.