

Week 2 (2020-09-07 00:04)

Marketing techniques are not limited solely to selling products and concepts to consumers. They can be applied in multiple facets of life, wherever ideas need to be communicated and audiences need to be persuaded. And by combining both marketing and rhetorical techniques, political messages can be made more focused and effective.

A key idea in marketing that is often used outside of a business setting is segmentation . This refers to the division of consumers into smaller groups based on shared variables : demographic, geographic, psychographic, and behavioristic. In rhetoric, this concept is still incredibly useful, though the "consumer" is replaced by an audience or citizen.



<https://www.politico.com/news/2020/08/27/pelosi-biden-trump-debate-403598>

In the BMI study, market segmentation strategies are defined as, "management strategies whereby information about market segments is used in designing programs that appeal to those segments (Dickson and Ginter 1987)." This directly relates to political matters, because while they're not addressing the health of individuals, these messages *do* relate to the everyday lives of citizens. By appealing to specific market segments, these political messages can have a greater impact .

In this quote, Nancy Pelosi is speaking directly to a large audience with one thing in common—their nationality . This is an example of a demographic variable . By addressing this demographic, which isn't quite as specific as it could be, Pelosi is able to ensure that her message is able to reach a larger audience and be heard by the American public at large.

One segment that is also being appealed to, though to a lesser degree, is Democrats . Specifically, this is a psychographic variable based on lifestyle . Her words are more effective to this segment in particular because of her credibility as a prolific Democrat in the government. This credibility is the rhetorical appeal of ethos .

In this case, the psychographic variable is tied to geographic variables as well. Because Democrats are more likely to live in population-dense urban areas, people who live in those areas may find Pelosi's messages to be more appealing than people living in rural areas.

This source can also be interpreted by different segments in different ways, whether or not Pelosi intended it to. Trump's legitimacy as a debater depends entirely on how the public views him. Republicans and Democrats, two main segments of Americans, will both take this message in opposite ways depending on whether or not they view Trump's words as lies.

My one friend texts me:

"No debates. Contest no matter the circumstances. No clear results. Chaos in the streets. This is a coup, folks" [1]<https://t.co/kKk2DZBRks>

— Ryan James Girdusky (@RyanGirdusky) [2]August 27, 2020

In the Porsche case study, the brand began "segmenting their target audience and creating messages and products that resonate with each segment and ultimately repositions the brand without losing its core customers." For this source, the target audience was originally one friend, but expanded when he posted it on Twitter.

The audience this message is meant to appeal to is this man's Twitter following. Because he is a conservative writer, his following is primarily made up of Republicans. This is an example of a psychographic variable. Like Democrats, geography also plays a role in segmentation here. Republicans are more likely to live in less populated places, such as suburban and rural areas.

Like before, certain demographics are more likely to become Republicans, so the message must appeal to them as well. The variables of this segment are age, race, income, and religion. Republicans are commonly older, white Christians in the middle- and upper-classes. Because the source is a tweet, access to internet also plays a role in who it is meant to address.

One rhetorical appeal used here is pathos. The language used, especially "chaos" and "coup," incites fear in the audience by creating an attack on values they hold dear. The Republican segment, composed of various privileged demographics, is afraid of losing their relatively stable lives and their false sense of "law and order." By using fear, the message resonates more and instills urgency in readers.

Query for CNN employees: do you tell the truth to your loved ones? To your children, spouses and parents, and your friends, too? Or do you lie to everyone as outrageously as you lie to the US public in garbage work like this?[3]<https://t.co/KfRtgBmvS5>

— Lee Smith (@LeeSmithDC) [4]August 29, 2020

The audience for this tweet is CNN employees, though the original poster did publish it on a public platform. The goal is to get a reply and make those employees think about what they are supporting.

The tweet very clearly addresses the perceived demographic variables of CNN employees . They have children, spouses, and parents. This portrays the average CNN employee as being young or middle-aged parents . The secondary audience, Lee Smith's twitter followers, are mostly Republicans , which I discussed above.

He invokes pathos by using strong language . "Outrageous lies" and "garbage work" create feelings of indignation and wound the pride of these employees, whose very livelihoods are being insulted. In addition, their relationships with friends and family are being attacked, as well as their integrity.

Because I began with Pelosi's comment on Trump's legitimacy, here are other sources about his lies. These affect the American people in general, and other smaller segments influence how they may feel about what Trump says.

[5]This video lists just a few of Trump's lies during his RNC speech.

[6]This is a list of lies Trump has told specifically about COVID-19.

[7]Here is an opinion piece detailing Trump's lies and potential problems that may arise from them.

There is a downside to relying heavily on segmentation. By tailoring messages only to one segment, his Republican supporters, Trump loses legitimacy and alienates other audiences.

1. <https://t.co/kKk2DZBRks>
2. https://twitter.com/RyanGirdusky/status/1299039799492435973?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw
3. <https://t.co/KfRtgBmvS5>
4. https://twitter.com/LeeSmithDC/status/1299808741102149632?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw
5. <https://youtu.be/Kq0CtHbYIzA>.
6. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2020/08/trumps-lies-about-coronavirus/608647/>
7. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/08/28/trumps-parade-desperate-lies-reveals-one-big-awful-truth/>

Week 3 (2020-09-13 23:46)

Trump's untruthful comments regarding COVID-19 are numerous, [1]well-documented, and have frightening implications for the current state of America. Since the beginning of the year, Trump has downplayed, deferred, and straight-up lied about the severity of the pandemic.

In a new book by famed journalist Bob Woodward, it has been revealed that Trump knew full well how bad the virus could be and deliberately chose to lie about this knowledge. In a quote from an [2]NPR article, "In early February, Trump was well aware of the dangers of the coronavirus and chose to downplay the public health threat to Americans." Due to this decision, millions of Americans were infected and hundreds of thousands are dead. Had the president to act in a transparent way and speak the truth, these lives could have been saved.

Instead, he wasted time casting blame on the World Health Organization while the situation worsened. Lawrence Gostin, head of the O'Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law at Georgetown University and director of a WHO collaborating center on global health law, says, "that public trust is gained when 'you level with the American population' and tell what's known about a situation, what's still unclear and when and how the uncertainties will be resolved." Trump's actions increased distrust in the government and caused an unnecessary widespread panic.

In [3]another article about this same issue, it is reported that Trump responded "disgraceful" to a concerned reporter's question about lying to the American people. "Such a terrible question and the phraseology,' Trump immediately shot back. 'I didn't lie.'" A common response to when Trump is called out on one of his [4]over 20,000 lies.

The Woodward tapes are shocking not because we can't believe Trump would lie, but because they reveal he knows what he's doing.
He's sinister.

— The Lincoln Project (@ProjectLincoln) [5]September 11, 2020

In another case of knowing what he's doing, Trump makes an effort to legitimize his actions by referencing Churchill during World War II. He tries to echo the same words, but in reality does the exact opposite.

I asked scholars of Winston Churchill about Trump's claim that concealing the danger of the coronavirus, to keep people "calm," was like what Churchill did during the war.

There was a lot of scoffing. [6]<https://t.co/AWpYQfkgMj>

— Daniel Dale (@ddale8) [7]September 13, 2020

Trump claims that his lies and downplaying of the virus were meant to prevent panic, much like the famous phrase "Keep Calm and Carry On." Experts on Churchill, however, note that what Trump has done are nothing like what he intended to replicate.

"In speech after speech, rather than leave out the threat, as Trump does, he warned explicitly of the Nazi danger. He had warned of the danger throughout the 1930s, when he was in the wilderness, and he never deviated,' said Nicholas Shakespeare, a novelist and biographer who wrote a book about how Churchill became prime minister. He said: 'Churchill's language was virtually the opposite of calm. It was aimed to embolden and stir and fortify and uplift and unify.'"

Rather than uplift and unify the American people in a time of crisis, Trump did what he does best: suppress and divide. His lying was supported wholeheartedly by his die-hard fanbase of blind followers, even after science has proven time and time again what really needs to be done in order to stop the virus and begin recovery. By lying, about COVID-19 and other matters, Trump has created an environment so hostile that even the smallest of issues are made viciously political, leading to serious harm in a divided American public.

1. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2020/08/trumps-lies-about-coronavirus/608647/>
2. <https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2020/09/11/911968726/woodward-book-casts-new-light-on-trumps-fight-with-who>
3. <https://www.politico.com/news/2020/09/10/trump-counterattack-against-bob-woodward-411625>
4. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/07/13/president-trump-has-made-more-than-20000-false-or-misleading-claims/>
5. https://twitter.com/ProjectLincoln/status/1304551950357204992?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw
6. <https://t.co/AWpYQfkgMj>
7. https://twitter.com/ddale8/status/1305162479866122241?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw

Week 4 (2020-09-20 19:38)

In this first tweet, one side addresses the other side by saying how they would solve an issue, specifically abortion. It's very clear that they don't think the other side actually cares about this issue in the way they claim to, and list the reasons why. The original message shows how the Pro-Choice advocates would address the issue of abortion and makes a sarcastic comment about the opposing view. This is an example of someone speaking as if they understand the other side, while in reality their opinion is based on stereotypes.

I definitely support all of these things. I am pro-life but I also fully understand that the ACTUAL best way to eradicate abortion is not to criminalize it, but to make birth control, healthcare, and childcare/positive parenting work culture so available that abortion is obsolete

— BLM (@RebelsRunDeep) [1]September 19, 2020

In the reply, the Pro-Life supporter states their own opinion, but goes on to acknowledge the truth behind the original post. Even though they maintain their own belief that abortions should not be done, they see that there are other aspects of Pro-Choice politics that allow the two sides to exist together. In addition, they don't try to start an argument and convince the original poster to change their beliefs. This person is willing to see the truth in the other side's opinion despite potential conflict with their side.

I think you're the first pro life person I've ever seen eye to eye. I feel like people after forget that most women don't WANT an abortion, they need other options the prevent pregnancy before it happens. Very insightful.

— That One Chick Lexi (@alexsel3) [2]September 19, 2020

The second reply shows further understanding between two sides. They acknowledge a truth that is very rarely spoken about (that women don't WANT abortions) and agree with the need for other options, which is addressed in both the original post and the first reply. At the end, they compliment the reply. This exchange shows that not all issues are completely two-sided and that supporters on either side can be able to find truths in the other. Even on a problem as contentious as abortion, common ground and solutions that satisfy both sides can be found.

During the workshop, I felt annoyed. I was an observer in the red group, which does not align with my own political beliefs. I tried to go in with an open mind, since I understand the importance of having a civil discussion with someone who holds different beliefs, but everything they said just sounded like an excuse to me. Whenever someone would share their own beliefs, which were surprisingly liberal at times, I would get frustrated wondering why they would support some Republican politicians who do their best to implement policies opposite to those beliefs. I do not understand how someone can claim to respect others and be in favor of human rights while at the same time giving power to people who are actively stripping those rights away. Even though I was on board with the idea of learning to understand the other side, it was difficult for me to be empathetic with someone who has certain beliefs yet votes for Republican leaders who most certainly do not support those issues.

I do think there is a worth in simply understanding rather than convincing. I've found that the issues I'd want to convince the other side on are the same ones they feel very strongly about and are very critical to their worldview. For example, issues such as LGBTQ rights and Pro-Choice are very closely tied to religion for many conservatives, something that they hold dear and will most likely not change. Instead of starting an argument and making the other person think that I'm attacking their personal values, it's easier to try and see where they're coming from and not pushing the issue.

I think in some cases having an understanding of the other side can help convince them, but only for smaller, less personal issues. If someone has an opinion because of ignorance or lack of experience with the topic, then understanding this and trying to educate them can potentially be an effective way of convincing them. However, simply understanding a core issue, one that a person wholeheartedly believes and integral to their worldview, will do nothing in helping to convince them to change. If anything, they may get angrier that you see how personal an issue is to them and still feel the need to change it.

I think that Braver Angels-style discussion might be able to have collaborative rhetoric, but only in a controlled environment. In a class, for example, people know what the expectations for discussion are and respect everyone else on the basis that they will be respected in turn. Outside of this controlled environment, there are no set guidelines and people are free to speak and react as they please. In a "real" conversation, I think that trying to use Braver Angels techniques may come off as patronizing or insincere, and that may cause the rhetoric to become even more combative.

1. https://twitter.com/RebelsRunDeep/status/1307359455986642944?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw
2. https://twitter.com/alexsel3/status/1307377639905062912?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw

Week 5 (2020-09-28 02:02)

In July, the Hispanic-owned company Goya found itself in the midst of a controversy when the CEO publicly praised Trump's leadership. This led to a boycott, primarily by left-leaning Latino Americans. At the same time, many white Republicans who have never bought from the brand began a "boycott" in order to support the CEO and, by extension, Trump. [1]Beans became another way of polarizing American society.

" By the time [2] Ivanka Trump tweeted

an endorsement of Goya, one thing had become clear: In a polarized country, at a polarized time, the buying of beans had become a political act."

Similarly to how having a fixed or fluid worldview can be linked to being part of a particular political party, using certain products can be tied to that party. According to Hetherington and Weiler, "Many of the decisions Americans make in their everyday lives—where to live, what kind of work to pursue, where to go to school, where to worship, what to watch on television, where to eat, what to drink—are influenced by the same worldview that informs their political opinions" (61). Someone like Ivanka Trump, a white Republican woman of European descent, is unlikely to eat Goya regularly, yet she began endorsing the brand because doing so suddenly aligned with her political beliefs.

Hey, these Goya beans are really yummy!

Here's why I'm supporting [3]@GoyaFoods in the face of the stupidest boycott of 2020 [4]pic.twitter.com/bhcjdNlMrZ
— Dinesh D'Souza (@DineshDSouza) [5]July 13, 2020

In this tweet, noted conservative Dinesh D'Souza admits to not normally using Goya products. He does, however, normally use whatever opportunity he can to glorify Trump and demonize Democrats. In his fixed worldview, those who endorse conservative economic ideals such as free market capitalism, which is what he claims the Goya CEO is doing, should be supported.

Senator Ted Cruz, a Republican, also weighed in on the issue by saying, "Anytime anyone dares disagree from their rigid orthodoxy, they seek to punish, cancel or destroy to the dissenter." This statement contradicts the standard ideas of fixed and fluid worldviews. Cruz is claiming that Democrats, generally of fluid worldviews, are opposing someone based of rigid orthodoxy, something generally claimed by fixed Republicans.

The [6]Goya debate also draws attention to a larger issue: the role of ethnic identity in politics.

" In an era of activist shopping, when consumers are ever more vocal about tying their purchasing power to their politics, Mr. Unanue's comments run the risk of alienating his company's core market."

Fixed and fluid worldviews do have a correlation to political party, but mostly for white voters. *Prius or Pickup?* states, " For several reasons, then, racial and ethnic minorities play a crucial role in American politics. Yet they are also different from whites, in that their worldview and their politics do not align in the same way that white voters' do. Instead, minorities' group identities trump their worldviews when picking a side" (54). Hispanic voters who feel betrayed by the Goya CEO's support of Trump will stop buying his products because they value their culture and don't want to support leaders who attack them for it, even if that means losing a pantry staple.

Supporting the boycott for cultural concerns is also a very left way of doing things, since fluid worldviews often include more interest in preserving diversity. "You can't just tell a part of our story and exalt a part of our story, and also profit off our pain and our joys, but not really truly be inclusive in our community," Ms. Garcia continued, before criticizing the company's leadership for a lack of diversity. "You can take our money, but we don't have a seat at their table." This quote ties back to identity as well, because Hispanic consumers who previously swore by Goya may take the CEO's comments as a personal attack on their family and background.

Supporting a company and voting have some similarities, especially if the CEO of said company throws his hat in with a historically hostile leader. *Prius or Pickup?* reads, "Whether Hispanics have more fixed worldviews or not, it's easy to see why present-day GOP messaging creates inhospitable terrain for those who identify as Latino or Hispanic, and their voting habits make this clear" (52). Regardless of worldview, Republicans are unpopular with Latino voters. This can be seen with Goya as well, with consumer loyalties changing at the drop of a hat based on political beliefs. In their eyes, boycotting beloved products is less painful than supporting a politician who despises their very identity. This is another instance of even the most mundane of everyday things being affected by political views.

1. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/19/us/goya-trump-hispanic-vote.html>
2. <https://twitter.com/IvankaTrump/status/1283221019684110337>
3. https://twitter.com/GoyaFoods?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw
4. <https://t.co/bhcjdNlmrZ>
5. https://twitter.com/DineshDSouza/status/1282755880010817536?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw
6. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/10/dining/goya-foods-trump.html>

WHY ATHENS MUST HAVE PLAYS AND CULTURE! (2020-11-22 21:24)

Thank you, Mister President, for allowing me to present this speech, and to my fellow assemblymen for listening. My late brother, Nicius, was a good friend of both the democrats and oligarchs, so I do hope you'll grant me the same respect and hear out my proposal. Today, I am imploring you all to pass legislation in support of the arts, specifically funding for *all* traditional arts and religious festivals. By funding the arts you will not only be making Athens a livelier city, but also supporting it intellectually, culturally, and economically.

Athens as we know it today is war-torn and lifeless, still ruined by conflict and the tyrannical reign of the Thirty. Sparta, a place colder and more horrible than Athens at its worst, looks upon our once-great city and laughs! Should we as Athenians accept this shame by tucking our tails between our legs and going about our lives with our heads down, or should we restore Athens to its former glory? After the ordeals of the past that tore us apart, we need a way to create unity between all Athenians. By establishing a culture of arts that is recognizably and proudly Athenian, we could bridge the gaps between factions, connect those in the city and those outside, and once again reassert Athens as the center of the cultural sphere, signaling our resurgence in the world.

Reestablishing Athenian culture through the arts will impact not only the people of Athens, but also our neighboring cities and tributaries. I firmly believe that Athens should make art-not war. The arts have a wider, more effective reach than traditional military endeavors, spreading Athenian culture without endangering our citizens. People from even the furthest of distances will gaze upon our city with awe, all thanks to our impressive artistic culture. But *true* Athenian art cannot be experienced anywhere but Athens, and the draw to experience it firsthand will be alluring enough to overshadow the dangers and drudgery of travel. Tourists to Athens will be a great help for local businesses, increasing our economy. And with the small investment this legislation will require, only the price of a small fleet, funding the arts will quickly pay for itself and bring prosperity to Athens. Those who fall in love with our great city may even choose to establish their own businesses here and become citizens, bringing even more wealth to Athens.

On the topic of citizenship, we recently passed legislation regarding the education of slaves who wish to become citizens of Athens. Traditional plays are extremely intellectually stimulating, serving as an easy, accessible way of conveying important topics, including the history of Athens, moral lessons, and religion. By funding plays, you will be educating the future citizens of Athens while at the same time reaffirming those lessons in the minds of current Athenians.

As the final part of my proposal, I would like to request funding for religious festivals. Our great and benevolent gods, Poseidon in particular, have done so much for Athens and for the assembly, and we should return the favor. Festivals for our gods will honor them and gain us their favor, perhaps without even the need for sacrifice (However, I am willing to sacrifice myself if that means getting this legislation passed).

Thank you for giving your time to me. Please consider giving your money to the arts as well.

Unfortunately, the production of Aristophanes' *Frogs* had to be postponed due to COVIDUS-403. Please support its performance at next year's Dionysia!
