

Subjection of the masses and popular appeal: the growth of contemporary demagoguery

Maurício Fontana Filho⁽¹⁾

Data de submissão: 24/8/2020. Data de aprovação: 8/10/2020.

Abstract - This article aims at comparing the use of demagogic discourse between the 2012 and 2016 United States Presidential Election. The investigation follows specific electoral discourses as a means to achieve such goal. Through an analysis of the discourse of Elizabeth Warren and the principal discussions in the presidential elections of 2012 between Mitt Romney and Barack Obama, and the 2016's between Donald J. Trump and Hillary Clinton, it is possible to delimitate the level of influence of the language in the debates and the presence or absence of demagoguery. This investigation has as its method the phenomenological, and makes use of the technic of bibliographical research, as well as of document collection and analysis as a means to verify the discourses in point. The conclusion finds a growth of demagoguery from one election to the other.

Keywords: Barack Obama. Demagogic discourse. Donald Trump. Hillary Clinton. Mitt Romney.

Submissão das massas e apelo popular: o crescendo da demagogia contemporânea

Resumo - Este artigo visa comparar o uso de discurso demagógico nas eleições presidenciais estadunidenses de 2012 e 2016. Procede-se de modo a investigar discursos eleitorais específicos como meio de perseguir tal objetivo. Através da análise do discurso de Elizabeth Warren e das principais discussões nas eleições de 2012 entre Mitt Romney e Barack Obama, e de 2016 entre Donald J. Trump e Hillary Clinton é possível delimitar o grau de influência da linguagem nos debates e a presença ou não de demagogia. A investigação tem como método o fenomenológico, e utiliza da técnica da pesquisa bibliográfica, e também a de análise e coleta documental como revolvimento para verificar os discursos em questão. Conclui-se de modo a atribuir um crescendo de demagogia de uma eleição para a outra.

Palavras-chave: Barack Obama. Discurso demagógico. Donald Trump. Hillary Clinton. Mitt Romney.

Introduction

The Republican Party and the Democrat Party have more equivalences than differences, but the look upon the economy is an historical mark of divergence. The first tends to defend less invasion of the State, while the second foments such invasion by attributing goals of welfare. These few differences, sometimes, are neglected through demagoguery, making it harder for the elector to choose his representatives. It is a common tactic the use of confusion by political representatives aiming at reaching into political power.

According to François Guizot (2008), representativeness is founded in the premise that the only sources of a right to power are reason, justice and truth. Representativeness is an impulse that tries to remove reason, justice and truth out of society to apply to the practical

¹ Especializando em Ciências Sociais pela Universidade Passo Fundo, UPF. Bacharel em Direito pela Universidade Regional do Noroeste do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul, UNIJUI. Bolsista voluntário no projeto de pesquisa "Finanças partidárias: equilíbrios organizacionais nos partidos políticos brasileiros (1995-2017)". Departamento de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Ijuí/RS, Brasil. [*mauricio442008@hotmail.com](mailto:mauricio442008@hotmail.com). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1347-8903>.

needs of the government. Initially, those who governed were the people who had physical aptitudes that allowed them to enforce their will upon others. As society evolved, however, it searched for individuals with virtuous tendencies and wisdom to govern.

The principle of representativeness searches for the wisest members of a society, to govern it. The representative model of rule is an evolution from the model in which the physically strongest had the power. The main objective of representativeness is to extract from society's core a true and wise aristocracy, through which the former can be rightfully governed and the second can rightly govern. A representative government will only exist as long as three elements come together: the division of powers, periodical elections and government publicity. This article explores the electoral element, more precisely, the demagoguery that is used as a means to fool the voters during the electoral campaign.

This study investigates the influence derived from language in the elections. It aims to compare the presidential debates of the elections of 2012 and 2016 in order as to identify whether demagoguery has increased or decreased over time. To corroborate the hypothesis of an increase of demagoguery, the objects of study are the three debates of 2012 as well as the three of 2016. In addition, it is meant to explore a specific speech given by Elizabeth Warren in 2017, which is used as an example of contemporary demagoguery.

Materials and methods

The method is the phenomenological, using bibliographical research techniques as well as of document collection and analysis with the aim as to verify the discourses in point. The investigation proceeded by watching multiple times the 2012 and 2016 election debates, available on the internet; the same happening with Warren's speech. Notes were taken and, afterwards, a context was presented with the purpose of a better understanding of the elections in the United States of America.

The phenomenological method makes use of experience-based reasoning to examine research objects. According to this approach, an investigation on the effect of demagoguery can be carried out by looking at the language and the tone used by the candidates. These elements can explain their inclinations.

The following are the main indicators of demagoguery: a) the number of interruptions that the candidates made to each other, being even more valid when it occurred against the moderator. b) The tone of voice used, whether calm, aggressive, hysterical, combative or simply and significantly loud screaming. c) The use of sarcasm, irony or any pun type joke. d) The occurrence of fallacies, sophisms, pleonasms or anachronisms. e) The tactics used outside of the field of the debate, in order to humiliate or demean an opponent. f) Not responding, ignoring or simply attacking the moderator. g) Trying to confuse the public through any tactics whatsoever.

Results and discussion

Guizot (2008) notes the absence of effectivity on election systems when the intentions of presidential candidates cannot be truly understood. An election is effective as long as the people choose their leaders and understand what is it that they would do while in power. Demagoguery subtracts the possibility of such an understanding. "The objective of an election is, evidently, identify the most capable and reliable people in the country. The plan is to discover and bring to light the true and legitimate aristocracy, that one who is freely accepted by the masses over whom power will be wielded." (GUIZOT, 2008, p.637, our translation).

To satisfy this end it is not enough merely to convoke the voters and telling them to choose whom they may want. On the contrary, the voters must have the opportunity to understand the minutia of their role, and, together, enter into an agreement about how to fulfill the expectations of it. If the voters do not know each other nor are they familiarized with the men who request

their vote, then this goal is evidently frustrated. If so happens, the result of such elections will not be of free choice nor represent the real wishes of the electorate. An election is by its own nature a sudden act that does not leave much opportunity for deliberation. If this act is a) unconnected to the prior habits and actions of the electorate. If this act b) is not, in some way, a result of prior deliberation and the expression of common opinion, then it will be too easy to take the voters by surprise or let them only hear the enthusiasm of the moment; and the election will be deficient in sincerity (GUIZOT, 2008).

In this way, it is intended to show that an improper process of choosing representatives implies, necessarily in an arbitrary use of the vote that is incompatible with reason, justice and truth. In other words, a voter supplied with information that contradicts reality is one who deposits his confidence in another who has proposed untrue and impossible possibilities (GUIZOT, 2008).

Political rights presuppose circumstances that can favor the casting of votes. The voter must understand what he is doing and why; in other words, the effects of the action in which he engages. If the voter does not have conscience of what he is doing, the process fails and the exercise loses its representative character. How could he ever be represented if the elected candidate is not who he claims to be? The expectations imposed upon political freedom can only be satisfied as long as the way to the polls is not filled with obstacles and intransigencies (GUIZOT, 2008).

“Demagogues search influence and political power by appealing to prejudice, emotions, fears and public expectations. They do not clarify, but threat and play rhetorical games,” says Ron Paul (2013, p.77, our translation). Demagogy is the enemy of freedom because it makes it harder for a true debate to happen, aiming only at corrupting the electors, reducing them to a position of servitude not to the reason contained in an argument, but to an exploitation of people’s feelings, that is, while the interlocutor receives power in the politic spectrum (PAUL, 2013).

The seven debates between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas that occurred in 1858 are a precise example on what is about the political discourse: a circus. The political debate, to the masses, is represented as an escape route from a boring and annoying way of living. The cannons used to sound loud and bands used to play high, all this happening in concomitance to the candidates entering the debate arena. Why is that? It has to make it more appealing to the crowds. Applause and shouts frequently interrupted the discourses of the candidates. Their rhetoric, filled with great gesticulation and humor: to arouse the crowds (LANE, 2015).

Debating is entertainment. Demagogy is entertainment. It is under the premise that governing is boring that all of this pompous apparatus takes place. In a government, the governor is stuck with uncounted legal limitations, as well as parliamentary ones, which impede him from satisfying every one of his campaign promises, while, during the political debates, everything is possible. What really matters is the pleasure derived from intense rhetorical wars, which tends to justify elections such as the former Governor of California, in 2003, the actor *Exterminator* Arnold Schwarzenegger and the other actor and professional wrestler, Jesse Ventura: the entertainment in its peak, and delivered by professionals (LANE, 2015).

This idea of political debates as an entertainment responds well the question of *what did happen on the presidential elections of 2016*. It responds how the former host of *The Apprentice* television show, Donald J. Trump, won the 2016 presidential victory. He no longer would be the mere host of a television show, but has become the host of the *Show of Government* (REMICK, 2016). All of this fits inside the proposal of Milton and Rose Friedman’s (2017) offer and demand rationality: the masses beg for entertainment, and the most apt to do so will satisfy their needs. It happens while the suppliers ascend in the political sphere. That is the main reason for the crescendo of contemporary demagogy. As the demands for entertainment and

emotional appeal grow, so it will grow the interest to fulfill them. The masses beg for it, while the political force grants their request. In this way, points us Philippe Kourilsky (2013, p.134-135, our translation) that:

The Media appeal excessively to the emotional and affective public instances. The journalistic method continually diverts from the primordial rule of objective exposition, that preconizes the separation of facts and their judgments – that will be, therefore, nothing more than opinions confusedly motivated. [...] The Media's system is not the only one nor is it the principal responsible for the deficit of information available to the citizen. It is clearly adapted to its "customers".

It is something that has been getting worse over the years. It is not entirely the fault of the press: the way in which people consume the news has been changing, which gives greater importance to the clicks received and thus stimulates sensationalism (CLINTON, 2018). "Still, they have part of the responsibility." (CLINTON, 2018, p.110, our translation).

The adaptation proposed by Kourilsky (2013) surrounds the idea of offer and demand as a Media interaction: the people beg for violent deaths in the news, therefore, the Media satisfies such need. The people want to see political debates that are more fun, so, as a corollary, the candidates appointed by their respective parties have such characteristics in order to give what the people expect. They make the debates more exciting because doing otherwise would displease the people and, therefore, impede them from reaching political power.

By calling racist a political representative and saying that he is a defender of the drug use for children are the typical examples of demagoguery, as well as being called of being against the war on terror or any international military expansion. Alternatively, even being called on defending the burning of national flags: for that, the name of unpatriotic individual lies around. Those that question the war on pornography tend to be called pedophiles; having no faith is taken as hating God and everyone that believes in one. These are tendentious topics used as tools by demagogues and tend to impede an honest discussion from happening, but more than that, its use puts the opposite candidate in tough conditions of being elected or even heard during a debate (PAUL, 2013).

In the United States, the wars that happened between the Bush-Obama periods were fomented under excuses such as Promoting goodness and democracy to other countries; making the world safe for democracy; taking away from the world the bad men; stopping radical Islam; cooling down the dangers of North Korea; protecting the oil; reconstructing the Middle East. All of these deeds were done through armed actions and military expansions throughout the Middle East and Central Asia. The government of the United States continually supported dictatorial governments, such as Saddam Hussein's, but when the conditions made themselves propitious, they started to see him as an enemy (PAUL, 2013).

Some governors are capable of fooling themselves to a point of believing that their desire to expand influence in the world is in truth an altruistic concern in defense of democracy and human rights. As if intervening in the sovereignty of another nation based on something so abstract and undetermined could have been a reasonable motive that would deserve acclaim and authorize military expansion (SINGER, 2004).

Being against military expansion would be taken as being unpatriotic, anti-USA, and even inhumane, against democracy, against the troops and so on. Imagine a soldier after the wartime that receives medals for having defended the constitution and their nation in his time in a war that violates the constitution. In 2011, the United States still supported dictatorships in Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Libya. They say these countries used to attack the militant Islam because it had hate and jealousy of the United States and its people because of their prosperity and freedom. The State and the conventional Media tend to agree in the matter of imposing propaganda and distortion, which satisfies their interests for power and control over the masses (PAUL, 2013).

The noble lie is all but noble. The government lies to manipulate the public opinion and, therefore, get satisfying results, as from war and redistribution of resources. The principle of lying for the goal of beneficiating the people is defended in every government, no matter the party in power. A noble lie is taken as the means to an end: the end of creating a reasonable society. The prerogative of lying is only granted to those that detain the political power; after all, lying to the State is a crime passible of punishment. The logic is precise: the powerful may lie at will, while the weak must subject to the mercy of the law (PAUL, 2013).

These are some commonly used fallacies displayed in political debates: a) *the red fish*: a quick change in the object of discussion to occult a possible absence of answer. b) *The straw man*: an erroneous representation of an argument to make it easier to be attacked. c) *The slippery slope*: if A is permitted, then B, in an inexorable way will occur. d) *Ad hominem*: a personal attack upon the character or physical of the opponent with the intention of also attacking the argument. e) *Appeal to authority*: being an authority on a matter makes the claim truthful (MORRIS, 2016).

Stanley Milgram (1983, p.161, author's emphasis, our translation) tells us about the fallacy of the *appeal to authority*:

The subordinates react with secure consideration to each word pronounced by the president. The ideas mentioned originally by people of low *status* are not frequently heard, but when repeated by the president they will be saluted with enthusiasm.

Following such logic, an authority is seen as a transcendental unit, reaching beyond mere individuals; they are super-men naturally deserving of acclaim. Such is the thought evoked by the Fallacy of Appeal to Authority. Other fallacies are f) *the cherry picker*, which means making use of data at will and ignoring what is not compatible, and what is not favorable to the specific line of reason. g) *The appeal to tradition* reflects the intention to say something that was done in the past in a way as to comply that, just because it was a product of the past, it would be necessarily right, as if a historical precedent could make an action filled with value (MORRIS, 2016).

The duty of the proof falls upon those that claim the matter, instead of those who deny it. The one that promotes the object is who is required to demonstrate its veracity, not his opponent. The inverse proposal tend to be imposed upon people. A common mistake can be found in innumerable encounters in the political rhetoric, that is, to the end of using it as a tool for putting the opponent against the wall and against the audience. If the opponent does not controvert the allegations, the public would take him as an incapable and undeserving of acclaim. On the other hand, if he does controvert the allegations, he is playing the demagoguery game started by his opponents, which goes in detriment of the public's interests for information (SPENCER, 1982).

Melanie Joy (2014, p.105, author's emphasis, our translation) directs the appeal to tradition by proposing that, in order to attack such fallacy, people "[...] must establish the difference between *natural* and *justifiable*." She points out that, by saying that eating meat is something natural and, therefore, justifiable – fallacy of appeal to tradition –, the same would apply to infanticide and rape, cannibalism and homicide, ancient practices that would have been legitimized by tradition, if following the same logic. They are natural practices because they are very old, but are they justifiable? An action is not justifiable just because it has its roots grown deep into the earth. The justification makes the practice, not its naturalness (JOY, 2014).

Elizabeth Warren (2017), from the Democratic Party of Massachusetts, has made use of emotional appeal in vast segments of her discourse in an attempt to impede an act that would reduce the taxation in her state. Her main point was that, if there were any cuts in taxation that went to public healthcare, people would die, such was the cruelty of the Republican Party's intention. *The republicans want to take away your right to healthcare! Babies will suffer! The malformed will suffer! Republicans hate the elderly! Republicans hate families!* Those were her

shouts. She even presented the case of a person with extreme necessities that would slowly fall down to her death without public aid. The senator's aim was not an argument *per se*, but victimizing herself in a will to look caring to the audience. The money that would not be invested in Welfare-State policies was, according to her, blood money; after all, lives would be paying the price for these taxation cuts.

Warren's (2017) logic can be used by saying that many people need kidneys, therefore, people ought to get the congress to approve a *Mandatory Kidney Transplant* for every individual that has two kidneys and, if there would exist any opposite force against such a measure, those people would surely want people to die. Imagine that car accidents kill many people every year, so, by using the senator's logic, to reduce such misfortunes, the congress should approve a speed limit of 10 miles per hour. In addition, certainly, if there were any opposition, those people would have wanted people to die; alcohol kills people, as well does gluten, should the congress pass law bills to limit the individual's reach to those items? If there is an opposition, do they necessarily want people to die? Is it that simple? According to the senator's logic, it is (ERNST, 2017).

Warren's (2017) rationality is the absence of rationality. It has flaws because it is as extreme as it is combative upon other people and parties that think differently from her. Not only the senator ignores the merit in question, that is, *why do we need less taxation?* However, she also calls the opposite party *an evil entity*. She goes into the fallacy of ad hominem and finishes up with the slippery slope when proposing that an abstract old woman that is 80 years old and has mental and physical problems, trembles everywhere in her body and lives alone, would need public money. Moreover, if she does not get the money, she would necessarily fall from the stairs, get broken up, go to the hospital, but as no one would aid her, she would go back home, fall from the stairs again, and this time she would die. The problem in the senator's rhetoric is that, she is imagining a bunch of complex situations that act as a corollary of the first one, and she goes on constructing what is going to happen to a woman she has created for an example.

In the end, Warren (2017) even says that republican senators that wanted to diminish the incidence of taxation would cause her made up 80-year-old woman's death. But she does not stop right there, and goes on saying that the republican senators have taken away the oxygen tanks of children, and that, when their parents cannot pay for them, it is the republican's fault for whatever happens. According to her, the parents might have to mortgage their house to pay for their son's treatment, they would go bankrupt, and that is the republican's fault for happening.

The discourses here presented are demagogic and reveal no intention of making public the information that surrounds the interests at stake. Demonizing people and parties is not of the interest of the people, but of professional politicians for prevailing in power. A free market enthusiast may say that a reduced number of taxes and regulations fomented by the State is something productive; in the other hand, a Welfare-State promoter would disagree, arguing that the State must regulate the transactions between individuals to contain their selfishness and aid the poor and weak. Warren (2017) did nothing like that. She has showed only verbal attacks and ill intentions of engaging into a rational and important debate.

The first official presidential debate of 2012, out of three, occurred between Mitt Romney, representing the Republican Party, and Barack Obama, representing the Democrat Party. It happened in October 3, in Denver, Colorado. The moderator was Jim Lehrer. The candidates, during the first debate, rarely interrupted each other, while the moderator, in an impartial way, gave them all the freedom of expression that his position permitted, ignoring the time limit and rarely interrupting their discourses. Both candidates were relatively respectful regarding one another, keeping their discourses focused upon the political merit of their propositions. Both

their discourses were kept in a relatively honest tone, to the delight of the audiences (ASHWORTH, 2012c).

Obama made use of some fallacious tactics to create general commotion, like inferring that 28 years ago he had become the luckiest man on earth for having married Michelle, so he gave her, on air, a happy birthday. He proposed having aided young people for the four years he was in office and that autistic kids would suffer if Romney won the presidential race, corollary of tax cuts. Obama said his grandmother helped raising him and died three days before he was elected president, being her a working and independent woman that began as a secretary and ended up as a company vice-president. He even went as far as to say that his grandfather died a while back. Obama said that his opponent thinks the United States does not need more teachers, while he says otherwise (ASHWORTH, 2012c).

Romney, on the other hand, constantly evoked an appeal to the emotion of the people by talking about how he had been requested aid by people on several occasions: a woman in Ohio had apparently grabbed his arm and asked for help. A woman came to him and said she could not pay up her needs, blaming the flawed public healthcare promoted by Obama; another woman, with a baby in her arms, asked for his help and said that her husband had had four jobs of half time in the last weeks, a sign of despairing times during the Obama administration. Romney said he could help them, and would, but his opponent could not (ASHWORTH, 2012c).

The second official presidential debate of 2012 occurred between Mitt Romney, representing the Republican Party, and Barack Obama, representing the Democrat Party. It happened in October 16, in Hempstead, New York. The moderator was Candy Crowley. The moderator was partial towards Obama as she did not allow Romney to reply the attacks derived from his opponent, but when the attacker was Romney, she would allow such courtesy towards Obama. When he did not receive such courtesy, Obama would just *make* his voice grow louder, his words quicker and intense; he would just *take* his reply out of the moderator. Romney did not use such tactic that preyed the authority of the moderator. The moderator had also constantly interrupted the candidates, impeding the debate from flowing. Obama constantly interrupted his opponent, while Romney only did it in one occasion (ASHWORTH, 2012a).

Obama said that his opponent defended the good of only a few, while himself wanted it for everyone. Again, Obama brought up his family by saying that he had a single mother that went to school while took care of two children, worked hard every day and made great sacrifices so that he could get everything he needed. He brought up his grandmother again and the same secretary story of the first debate. The last four years were tough, but he achieved a lot, said Obama, and to finish what he started he would need four more years, while Romney would have never done as much as he had (ASHWORTH, 2012a).

According to Obama, Romney does not have the personality qualities of a leader, and that such was shown when he tried to politicize terrorist attacks, treating a tragedy as a situation for personal gain of influence. Obama said that *we are not like that*, that he does not do that, and that it was horrible. He said he cried with the families after the terrorist attack, and had to comfort them. There was a mother, said Obama, that had her son about to die with a bullet in the head and, after a month, the son was all right (ASHWORTH, 2012a).

Romney, as did happen in the first debate, went on to say that people used to grab him asking for a savior. He said he could fix the economy, while his opponent could not. He said that *we need a better United States for our children*, and that he could achieve such goal; said his father was a Mexican and he loves immigrants. He even said that, after a terrorist attack that had happened in the United States Embassy in Benghazi, Libya, Obama tried to camouflage the incident and went to Las Vegas, in a political event. Romney ends up telling the audience that such way of acting is not worth of a real leader (ASHWORTH, 2012a).

The third and final official presidential debate of 2012 occurred between Mitt Romney, representing the Republican Party, and Barack Obama, representing the Democrat Party. It happened in October 22, in Boca Raton, Florida. The moderator was Bob Schieffer. The moderator was impartial, giving voice to the candidate's replies and rarely interrupting them. Obama frequently interrupted Romney, while the second did so again only once (ASHWORTH, 2012b).

Obama declared that he imposed sanctions upon Iran because of their nuclear actions, which happened in concomitance to Romney's private deals with the Chinese, neglecting the people. He said that, if Romney knew a lot about the economy, it would be because he invested in foreign companies, instead of investing in his own people: *he does not believe in us*, said Obama, *why should we believe in him*, he asks. Obama said that he went to the holocaust museum in Storok and said that the dead children could have been his sons. He even brought up the subject of a little girl called Peyton that had told him that Bin Laden's death had helped her get over her father's death on the incident of 11 of September, 2002 (ASHWORTH, 2012b).

Romney was much more succinct on his approach in this final debate. He seemed exhausted after a long electoral run. His points were less aggressive and his tone lacked conscience. According to Romney, Obama was weak and conducted the country in a shameful manner. He said Obama was not as patriot as himself. People were suffering and it is a mere corollary of the four-year period of Obama's government. In the end, Romney said *I love teachers*, defending himself against Obama in a desperate way (ASHWORTH, 2012b).

"In the beginning of the electoral campaign, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump were the candidates with the highest level of rejection in the history of presidential elections. A third of the citizens had an unfavorable perception of Hillary and 40% of Trump", points out Manuel Castells (2017, p.45, our translation). Therefore, the circumstances prior to the debates were already unfavorable for both sides. Another point is the Media coverage, depicting Trump in a massive way as an incapable and crazy person.

The first official presidential debate of 2016, out of three, occurred between Donald J. Trump, representing the Republican Party, and Hillary Clinton, representing the Democrat Party. It happened in September 26, in Hempstead, New York. The moderator was Lester Holt. He was partial towards Hillary and such could be verified on the context of the questions: when attacking Hillary, an answer would suffice, but when attacking Trump, many questions would follow the first one. Both of the candidates, during the first debate, made use of powerful demagogic and unethical discourses. They interrupted each other constantly and made it clear that they did not respect the authority of the moderator by ignoring the limits of time imposed upon them for each answer; they evaded questions and exalted themselves as virtuous beings, as well as their oppositions as vicious ones. The most important question evaded by Hillary was about the e-mails with sensible information about government incongruences she had deleted, while Trump would not talk about the liberation of his declaration of tax returns (COLLINS, 2016).

Hillary started on by saying that her father was very poor and worked hard to make a living, while the father of her opponent was a rich man that left 40 million dollars as inheritance to him. She said that the day of the debate was the day of her granddaughter's birthday, and wished her a happy birthday, as did Obama in 2012. According to Hillary, Trump hated Latinos, African-Americans and hated women. She said that Trump was a close friend to the Russian president, Vladimir Putin, and, therefore, an enemy of the United States. Hillary, on the other hand, declared herself a close friend of the first black president in the United States history, Barack Obama, who loved her very much. According to her, Trump could not take a hold of himself while on Twitter and surely would bomb other countries as a corollary of his instabilities if he were president. When asked about her actions towards invading other

countries as a Secretary of State, she said it was a sign of character to proceed in such a manner (COLLINS, 2017; ASHWORTH, 2012c).

Trump's fallacious assertions were generally different and harder to categorize. Very often, he would mumble about himself in a positive tone, and when it was his opponent's turn of speaking, he would interrupt with a few *no, no, that is a lie, she lies*. Trump quoted many articles that supposedly made him look richer and more successful, but no sources were ever presented to who had ever said that or when. He spoke a lot about how bad things were, but never how he could deal with them. According to him, he has been through everywhere in the United States, while his opponent did not leave the house during the presidential campaign, so she could not be a good president (COLLINS, 2017).

On October 7, a tape that existed since 2005 about Trump using aggressive language towards women was leaked by the *Washington Post* with the intention of impeding him from going further into the presidential elections. That happened two days before the second presidential debate (NELSON, 2016). On the same 7 October, Julian Assange, the *WikiLeaks*, published Hillary Clinton's e-mails in his website. Such e-mails made it clear how absent of veracity were her campaign discourses. If during the debates she promised aiding the poor and taxing the rich, the e-mails showed the extreme contrary. Dirty campaign tactics that could have been used in the primaries, like calling Bernie Sanders a sexist and rapist were found. Bernie Sanders were her old Democratic Party competitor and an old threat on her being appointed the nominee of the Democrat Party for presidency (FRIZELL, 2016).

Between the 8th and 27th days of 2016, twenty-one women *affirmed* that Trump had molested them in some way. The facts would have taken place in the period between 1980 and 2010, but were only brought up to the public during the final two presidential debates (JAMIESON; JEFFERY; PUGLISE, 2016). Around 90 minutes before initiated the second debate, Trump promoted a surprise press conference, during which, four women affirmed having being raped; three by Bill Clinton, husband of Hillary, and one was the rape victim of a man that had been defended in court by Hillary in 1975. Each one of them had around 30 seconds to express their acceptance to the republican candidate and their ill will towards Hillary, who was taken as an extension of the supposed vile acts perpetrated by her husband as well as a perpetrator of cruel acts herself (DIAZ, 2016).

The second official presidential debate of 2016 happened in October 9, in Saint Louis, Missouri. There were two moderators, Martha Raddatz and Anderson Cooper. Both moderators were partial towards Hillary, but mostly Raddatz, who, in many segments, did not allow Trump to defend himself with a reply when attacked by Hillary. Both moderators interrupted Trump constantly, but that did not happen towards Hillary, as well as her time limit was not inspected properly as much as Trump's. Both the candidates ignored the time limits and interrupted each other with great frequency (BLAKE, 2016). This debate had many expectations, mostly derived from exterior events, both relating to the leaked tape and the leaked e-mails. These matters were discussed during the debate.

According to Hillary, Trump hated women, African-Americans, Muslims, patriots, Mexicans, children, disabled people and immigrants. She said that she wanted to be a president for all the people, not like her opponent that wanted to be it just for the rich. She brought up in her discourse the sexist tape, and said that it was a horrible thing to happen while children watched television; also, she proposed that Trump's discourses would be used to recruit fighting Jihadists and that Russia had hacked information from the United States to put Trump in power. Hillary pointed out that she wanted to invest in poor hard working people, while her opponent wanted to invest in evil rich men that preyed upon the working families. She said people sent her letters and loved her, while Trump was hated. *He is not a true leader, but a violent man*, said Hillary (BLAKE, 2016).

Trump began his speech working on a leaked audio in which Hillary mocks a woman for having being raped as much as she brags about her juridical defense of the rapist being successful. The second point he made was about how evil her husband is by having raped three women, all of them brought to the debate by Trump as well as the one that was involved in the leaked audio. According to him, Hillary had called his voters deplorables, sexists, racists, Islam and homophobes. Trump said that Hillary lied and all her discourses were memorized; that she had hate in her heart and that if he was elected, Hillary would find herself in jail. When asked another time about the offensive tape that came up, Trump said that Bill Clinton did much worse (BLAKE, 2016). Again, Trump made use of the same disruptive interruptions with the *no, no, no*, and *that is not true, she lies* type of lines.

Both candidates frequently used the fallacies of appeal to authority and red fish. With Trump, when saying that, according to Bernie Sanders, Hillary did not have a good judgment, while Hillary said that, according to many republicans and experts, Trump did not have a good character. When asked about important matters regarding their way of governing, both candidates evaded the questions, attacking each other and regarding themselves as virtuous gods. Even if Trump's allegations toward Hillary were true, that was neither the place nor the time for such comments. Bill Clinton could have raped someone, but that was not the right moment to bring up remarks such as those. They were in a political debate, and should have kept their pace inside the political sphere. Instead, they chose to make use of emotional tactics, jokes and accusations (BLAKE, 2016).

The first two presidential debates of 2016 can be considered the most horrible and obscure debates that have happened in the modern time, and the reason is that very little political merit was discussed. Mostly, the candidates attacked one another and exalted themselves as great leaders and good people. They yelled shouts and grunts, interrupted each other constantly, ignored the authority of the moderators and made it clear that these elections were all about a show to the public: to be won by the best entertainer, for which Trump had an entire life of professional experience (CASSIDY, 2016).

John Stuart Mill (2006) tells us about the political personalities and the superficial surroundings that are around them:

Presidents, ministers, heads of parties and their followers, are all electoral propagandists. All the community keeps itself focused upon their mere political personalities and the entire public question is discussed and decided by worrying less about their merits than the expected purpose of the presidential election. (MILL, 2006, p.206, our translation).

The third and final official presidential debate of 2016 happened in October 19, in Paradise, Nevada. The moderator was Chris Wallace and was the only one that acted in an impartial way throughout the three 2016 debates. Both the contestants interrupted each other frequently, ignored the time limits and tried to deceive the audiences with dishonest language as before (POLITICO STAFF, 2016).

Hillary made use of the same *I fight for the poor and my opponent fights for the rich* argument. She quoted a woman named Carla that was afraid for her parents being deported, which would happen if Hillary did not become president, as well as families destroyed through the expulsion of immigrants proposed by Trump. On the other hand, she would be a mother to them. According to her, Trump was a traitor, an ally and a puppet of Vladimir Putin. After that, she compared him with herself by saying that a) while she was giving speeches on racial discrimination throughout the country her opponent was being sued. b) While she worked on building new schools, her opponent took a loan out of his rich father for 14 million dollars. c) While she visited other countries in defense of women, her opponent offended women. d) While she was hunting down Osama Bin Laden, her opponent engaged in a show called *The Apprentice* (POLITICO STAFF, 2016).

The democrat candidate spoke of Trump as a terrible man, a rapist and a women hater, and everyone that voted for him would be agreeing to the hate he shows towards women and to the future of his politics: daughters and granddaughters. She used the same point that did Obama on the 2012 presidential debates, the reasoning of *that is not who we are* affirmative. You get to choose, said Hillary, between a path of diversity or a path of destruction and chaos; a path of a patriot or a path of a man that hates patriots, disabled, Mexicans, women; that supports violent people and embarrasses democracy. Hillary brought up the subject of a little immigrant boy that was bleeding, and said that that was the face of the repression of Trump's policies. Then, she spoke of a nightclub assassin who had killed dozens of people. Finishing up, she linked this assassin to Trump by saying that both of them were born in the same neighborhood (POLITICO STAFF, 2016).

The republican candidate did not need to attack his opponent as much, corollary of all the information leaked out and of the vicious circumstances created for the second debate. Therefore, his use of demagoguery was more limited compared to hers. Trump called Hillary a puppet and a vile woman, proposing that he had created an empire while his opponent created the terrorist group of ISIS. Throughout his speech, in many occasions, he would bring up the thought a) that the country was suffering and that it was very sad. b) That people were dying and such was very sad. c) That the situation was awful and could have been different if Obama had not ruined everything with his flawed will, and that it was all very sad (POLITICO STAFF, 2016).

Trump's strategy was fundamentally concentrated upon the Media. He discovered, since the primaries, how to stay always in the Media without the need to pay for it. In exchange of scandalous and polemical declarations that the social networks and the means of communication rapidly reported, generally to criticize, Trump understood, by his own Media experience, that the essential is to be in the media, most of all in television, even if it is in a negative way. It was a constant presence that monopolized the discussion around him and around his person on the matter of what was said about him and about what he responded (CASTELLS, 2017).

Trump succeeded in achieving that no one would talk about subjects or even Hillary Clinton, but about himself (CASTELLS, 2017). Hillary Rodham Clinton (2018, p.81, our translation) herself said, on her book, that, "there was nothing that looked like a 'normal day', and the press did not cover 'normal' campaign speeches. What interested them was a constant diet of conflict and scandal."

"All the campaign surrounded Trump, on his simplistic message and the feeble and predictable response from Hillary." (CASTELLS, 2017, p.43, our translation). Trump became the president of the United States because his control over the Media was very intense: he knew that if he kept on expressing his polemical thoughts, the Media would not let him go. People were always speaking of him. They were speaking of him in a good way or in a bad way, but he was always in the center of the debate, and that got him enough votes to beat his opponent (CASTELLS, 2017).

Trump's relation to the electorate was direct, in rallies to crowds, with incendiary discourses (CASTELLS, 2017). "In the past, mass meeting in public became more and more rare; through these are the only means of exercising a really effective influence on the people" (HITLER, 2018, p.98). The reason is that here the influence comes from direct personal contact. Additionally, in this way the support of large sections of the people can be obtained (HITLER, 2018).

Conclusions

In Warren's 2017 speech, there was a try of demonizing her party's opponents by demagogic speech. Her objective was to impede the opposing party from prevailing. To achieve

such, a dividing rhetoric of good and evil, of them and us, was created. With her speech, one must wonder how far she is willing to go in order as to achieve her goals. Her opposing party is formed of professional colleagues of work. They serve the same profession as she does. Demonizing a different set of ideas for the point of reaching power is a preview of what the election debates hold.

The analysis of the 2012 election shows an initial mutual understanding and respect between candidates, and also a present will of debating issues relevant to their political surroundings, but that grew towards an angry and desperate dispute for approval. Obama saw how well his opponent went after the first debate, which forced him to go deeper into emotional appeal in the last two. With such logic, candidates that see no escape from losing, even if well intended at first, tend to be ready to dive deep into demagoguery to remain capable of being elected. As the debates became more intense, the candidates started to ignore the values they seemed to hold dear at first. In the end, neither one cared very much for anything else, but to win the election race. Romney remained more passive than his democrat competitor did. The level of demagoguery did not reach nearly as high as the following four years would show. The influence of language varied at times because of the candidate's voracity, being during the third debate the most protuberant.

Studying the 2016 debates, from the beginning, there were neither respect nor good intentions between both candidates. The moderators, strongly influenced by the Media, did not turn up to be impartial as the 2012's. The use of influence and economic power was a clear will to suppress their opponents through any means possible. The level of demagoguery was tremendous. There is yet to be seen an election dispute that shows higher intensity and animosity. The public did not have five minutes of political debate filled with good reasoning and moderateness. The candidates picked policies, yelled and attacked each other just as voraciously as they lied and interrupted the moderators. The influence of language was present from the moment that preceded the debates until the very end of the electoral race. Every resource to control public opinion was employed.

As long as the people do not see through demagoguery, there is nothing to talk about on representativeness or even a simple idea of democracy. Funny men shall govern the people, and enrich themselves in the process. Either humanity develops itself as individuals, or it shall fall together as a governed unit. Following the analysis made upon the above-mentioned discourses, it is possible to note that the use of demagoguery not only subtracts the political freedom of the elector, but it nourishes the masses that watch the spectacle. The narrated cases are not alone among many citable examples. This kind of conduct, antagonistic to the principle of representativeness, is a consequence of peoples uninteresting will towards politics as a mean to resolve complex problems that, after each day, turn themselves harder to be understood, if say engaged at all.

References

ASHWORTH, Nate. Video: Watch the 2nd Presidential Debate from Hofstra University. **Election Central**, Washington, 16 Oct. 2012. Available at:
<<http://www.uspresidentialelectionnews.com/2012/10/video-watch-the-2nd-presidential-debate-from-hofstra-university/>>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

ASHWORTH, Nate. Video: Watch the Final Presidential Debate from Boca Raton. **Election Central**, Washington, 22 Oct. 2012. Available at:
<<http://www.uspresidentialelectionnews.com/2012/10/video-watch-the-final-presidential-debate-from-boca-raton/>>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

ASHWORTH, Nate. Video: Watch the First Presidential Debate from the University of Denver. **Election Central**, Washington, 3 Oct. 2012. Available at: <<http://www.uspresidentialelectionnews.com/2012/10/video-watch-the-first-presidential-debate-from-the-university-of-denver/>>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

BLAKE, Aaron. Everything that was said at the second Donald Trump vs. Hillary Clinton debate, highlighted. **The Washington Post**, Washington, 9 Oct. 2016, Available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/10/09/everything-that-was-said-at-the-second-donald-trump-vs-hillary-clinton-debate-highlighted/?utm_term=.0683d500caf0>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

CASSIDY, John. The Nastiest Presidential Debate of All Time. **The New Yorker**, New York, 10 Oct. 2016. Available at: <<https://www.newyorker.com/news/john-cassidy/the-nastiest-presidential-debate-of-all-time>>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

CASTELLS, Manuel. **Ruptura**: a crise da democracia liberal. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2017.

CLINTON, Hillary Rodham. **Lo que pasó**. Nueva York: Simon & Schuster, 2018.

COLLINS, Kaitlan. Elections: everything Said During Tonight's Presidential Debate Between Donald Trump And Hillary Clinton. **The Daily Caller**, Washington, 26 Sept. 2016. Available at: <<http://dailycaller.com/2016/09/26/everything-said-during-tonights-presidential-debate-between-donald-trump-and-hillary-clinton/>>. Access in: 8 jan. 2018.

DIAZ, Daniella; ZELENY, Jeff. Trump appears with Bill Clinton accusers before debate. **CNN**, Atlanta, 10 Oct. 2016. Available at: <<http://edition.cnn.com/2016/10/09/politics/donald-trump-juanita-broadrick-paula-jones-facebook-live-2016-election/index.html>>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

ERNST, Douglas. Elizabeth Warren, allies mocked over rhetoric in hit YouTube parody: 'People will die!'. **The Washington Times**, Washington, 29 Jun. 2017. Available at: <<https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/jun/29/elizabeth-warren-allies-mocked-over-health-care-rh/>>. Access in: 10 jan. 2018.

FRIEDMAN, Milton; FRIEDMAN, Rose. **Livre para escolher**. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2015.

FRIZELL, Sam. What Leaked Emails Reveal About Hillary Clinton's Campaign. **Time**, New York, 7 Oct. 2016, Available at: <<http://time.com/4523749/hillary-clinton-wikileaks-leaked-emails-john-podesta/>>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

GUIZOT, François. **A história das origens do governo representativo na Europa**. Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks; 2008.

HITLER, Adolf. **Mein Kampf**. United States: White Wolf, 2018.

JAMIESON, Amber; JEFFERY, Simon; PUGLISE, Nicole (2016). A timeline of Donald Trump's alleged sexual misconduct: who, when and what. **The Guardian**, New York, 13 Oct. 2016. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/oct/13/list-of-donald-trump-sexual-misconduct-allegations>>. Access in: 11 jan. 2018.

JOY, Melanie. **Por que amamos cachorros, comemos porcos e vestimos vacas:** uma introdução ao carnismo: o sistema de crenças que nos faz comer alguns animais e outros não. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2014.

KOURILSKY, Philippe. **O manifesto do altruísmo:** questionamentos políticos, sociais e filosóficos sobre o individualismo e a necessidade do coletivo. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2013.

LANE, Charles. It's not just Donald Trump — politics has always been about entertainment. **The Washington Post**, Washington, 5 Aug. 2015. Available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/politics-as-spectacle/2015/08/05/97bc3e86-3b88-11e5-b3ac-8a79bc44e5e2_story.html?utm_term=.93336c12d659>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

MILGRAM, Stanley. **Obediência à autoridade:** uma visão experimental. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1983.

MILL, John Stuart. **Considerações sobre o Governo Representativo.** São Paulo: Escala, 2006.

MORRIS, Hannah. Fallacies In Politics: Can you spot them?. **The Odyssey Online**, Vancouver, 26 Jul. 2016. Available at: <<https://www.theodysseyonline.com/fallacies-politics>>. Access in: 6 oct. 2020.

NELSON, Libby. “Grab ’em by the pussy”: how Trump talked about women in private is horrifying. **Vox**, New York, 7 Out. 2016. Available at: <<https://www.vox.com/2016/10/7/13205842/trump-secret-recording-women>>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

PAUL, Ron. **Definindo a liberdade:** 50 questões fundamentais que afetam a nossa liberdade. São Paulo: Instituto Ludwig Von Mises Brasil, 2013.

POLITICO STAFF. Full transcript: Third 2016 presidential debate. **Politico**, Arlington, 20 Oct. 2016. Available at: <<https://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/full-transcript-third-2016-presidential-debate-230063>>. Access in: 6 oct. 2020.

REMICK, David. An American Tragedy. **The New Yorker**, New York, 9 Nov. 2016. Available at: <<https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/an-american-tragedy-2>>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.

SINGER, Peter. **Um só mundo:** a ética da globalização. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004.

SPENCER, Herbert. **The man versus the state:** with six essays on government, society, and freedom. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982.

WARREN, Elizabeth. Senator Warren Delivers Remarks on the Republican Health Care Bill. **Senator Elizabeth Warren**, Massachusetts, 22 Jun. 2017. Available at: <https://www.warren.senate.gov/?p=press_release&id=1699>. Access in: 6 aug. 2020.