

Masks and Caricatures:
Prosopopoeia, Ethopoeia, and the Effect of Social Media on Canadian Political
Leaders' Debates

by

Monique Kampher

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
in fulfilment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
English

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2023

© Monique Kampher 2023

Examining Committee Membership

The following served on the Examining Committee for this thesis.

The decision of the Examining Committee is by majority vote.

External Examiner

Dr. David Beard
Professor, Rhetoric
University of Minnesota Duluth

Supervisor

Dr. Randy Allen Harris
Professor, English Language and Literature, and
The Cheriton School of Computer Science
University of Waterloo

Internal Members

Dr. Michael John MacDonald
Associate Professor, English Language and Literature
University of Waterloo

Dr. Anna Lennox Esselment
Associate Professor, Political Science
Associate Dean, Graduate Studies
University of Waterloo

Internal-External Member

Dr. Robert Danisch
Professor, Communication Arts
University of Waterloo

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

This dissertation examines the recent effect of social media on televised political leaders' debates through the lens of *ethos*. It features two case studies from two Canadian federal elections: the 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate, and the 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate. It opens the lens of *ethos* through the tools of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, ethotic moves which respectively incorporate *ethoi* beyond the immediate speaker, and characterize the *ethoi* of others. With the emergence of participatory digital media, leadership debates are increasingly constrained and shaped to serve social media. I argue that there is an increased pressure on political parties to have their leader adopt a mask, or perform another's *ethos*, through *prosopopoeia*, while also characterizing, or depicting another's *ethos*, through *ethopoeia*. Both moves capitalize on the Aristotelian ethotic qualities of *phronesis*, *arete*, and *eunoia*. I develop this argument by analyzing political parties' and political leaders' debate-related social media posts from Canada's 2015 and Canada's 2019 federal elections. I examine political parties' and political leaders' debate-related posts on three social media platforms: Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, from the 2015 and the 2019 election campaign timeframes. In examining the parties' and leaders' top shared Facebook posts, top retweeted Twitter posts, and top liked Instagram posts, I identify six major debate-related themes for 2015, and six major debate-related themes for 2019. Examining the posts within these themes reveals how *ethos* is refracted in social media, moderately in 2015, and vigorously in 2019, and how the rhetorical moves *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* infiltrate the political parties' and leaders' social media accounts. A significant finding of this study is political debates are changing because of social media in a way that foregrounds issues of *ethos*. In 2015, it was more prominent for debate content to move out *onto* social media, whereas in 2019, debate content is being shaped *for* social media. In both cases, but more so in 2019, the

forces of social media fostered *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*. This research contributes to the fields of rhetoric, social media, and political communication by demonstrating how debates, and democracy, are being (re)shaped by social media, and brings precision to the rhetorical figures *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* as figures of argumentation. This critical investigation into the effect of social media on political leaders' debates reveals the rhetorical influence social media has on political parties, political leaders, and ultimately voters.

Acknowledgements

With immense respect and gratitude, I would like to express my utmost appreciation and reverence to my doctoral supervisor, Dr. Randy Allen Harris. Your guidance, teachings, encouragement, and support throughout my doctoral journey, fostered the completion of this dissertation, and I am so grateful and honoured to have you as my mentor. To my doctoral supervisory committee, Dr. Michael John MacDonald, and Dr. Anna Lennox Esselment, your knowledge, expertise, and support in this accomplishment is greatly valued, and I am so appreciative for your guidance. To my Rhetoric Agraphia team, Devon Moriarty, Kyle Gerber, Dr. Saeed Sabzian, Kem-Laurin Lubin, George Ross, Diana Moreno Ojeda, as well as my colleagues Dr. Ashley Irwin, Rebecca Anderson, Stephanie Samboo, Dr. Christin Wright-Taylor, and Marie-Agnes Pilon, I appreciate our camaraderie, our ‘pomodoro’ meetings, and the opportunities where we could speak ‘rhetoric’ together, learning from each other and supporting each other to be our best. I would also like to thank RhetCanada, The Canadian Society for the Study of Rhetoric, for presenting to me the various ways rhetoric is used, Michelle Irving, who introduced me to Python’s Twint code, and Chris Sun, who helped me to use it. And to the professors, instructors, administrative staff, fellow graduate students, who have joined me on this journey, through your teachings, our conversations, and your friendships, I thank you!

It takes a village, and I would like to recognize my village, who have helped to make this achievement possible. A special thank you to the White Oaks Montessori School teachers, educators, administrators, and staff, for your care and talent in providing my children with a warm and supportive environment where they can learn, prosper, and grow. To those on this journey with me, Barbara Ward, John Hogenbirk, Chantal Hogenbirk, Chloé Hogenbirk, Jonathan Kampher, Heinz Kampher, Barbara Goodale, the late James Ward, Robert Ward

and family, Joseph Ward and family, the late Daniel Ward and family, the Kampher family, Lambert Hogenbirk, Tiffany Hogenbirk Bernardo and family, Lauren Hogenbirk and family, Jenny Le, Theresa Malinowska Stone, Angela Loughlin, Dr. Goli Khorsandian, Dr. Ken Miura, Cristina Gelsomini, Dr. Vanessa Carnovale, Candice Hundak Hapers, Eddie Savarese Jr., Scott Savarese, Peter Kucherepa, Dr. Cristina Stefan, Ian Moss, Isla Reynolds, Simon Vincent, Maria Da Fonte, Dr. Ron Sheese, Dr. Andrew Schmitz, and to all of my loving family, extended family, friends, colleagues, supporters, students, and cheer-er-on-ers, your encouragement kept me focused and working diligently towards completing this doctorate, and I appreciate you.

Financially, this dissertation was made feasible through internal and external funding received throughout the course of my graduate studies at the University of Waterloo. Funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) (2020-2021), Ontario Graduate Scholarships (OGS) (2018-2019; 2019-2020; [2020-2021]; 2021-2022), University of Waterloo's President's Graduate Scholarships (2018-2019; 2019-2020; 2020-2021; 2021-2022), and internal and external auxiliary grants and scholarships assisted with this project.

To my mother, Barbara Sheila Ward, I admire you and respect you immensely. You are my inspiration. Your encouragement and support, in so many ways throughout this entire process means the world to me. I love you and thank you.

To my husband, John Hogenbirk, I appreciate your unwavering support. Your trust and confidence in me and in this process is forever cherished. I love you.

To my daughters, Chantal Hogenbirk and Chloé Hogenbirk, you amaze me each and every day. I love you always and forever and I am so proud of you. I completed this doctorate for you.

We did it!

Dedication

For my mother, Barbara,
my husband, John,
and my little ladies, Chantal and Chloé—
Everything is possible

Table of Contents

Examining Committee Membership	ii
Author’s Declaration	iii
Abstract	iv
Acknowledgements	vi
Dedication	viii
List of Figures	xiii
List of Tables	xlii
List of Abbreviations	xliii
1. Shaping Political Leaders’ Debates: Social Media and the Fostering of <i>Prosopopoeia</i> and <i>Ethopoeia</i>	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. (Constructed) <i>Ethos</i> of Political Leaders	4
1.3. Social Media and its Effect on Debates	6
1.3.1. Facebook	7
1.3.2. Twitter	8
1.3.3. Instagram	9
1.4. The Networking of Social Media	9
1.5. The Methodologies for Studying the Influence of Social Media on Political Debates	13
1.6. Masks and <i>Prosopopoeia</i>: The Performance of Another’s <i>Ethos</i>	16
1.7. Caricatures and <i>Ethopoeia</i>: The Depiction of Another’s <i>Ethos</i>	22
1.8. Social Media Fosters <i>Prosopopoeia</i> and <i>Ethopoeia</i>	28
1.9. Sorting Out the Rhetorical Figures	32
1.10. Texts and Sampling Procedures	36
1.10.1. Study Data for Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate	36
1.10.2. Study Data for Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate	40
1.11. Overview	43
2. Descriptive Synopses: Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate and Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate	48
2.1. The Leaders in Canada’s 2015 Federal Election	48
2.2. The Format of Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate	49
2.3. Leaders’ <i>Ethos</i> in Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate	50
2.3.1. Stephen Harper	50
2.3.2. Justin Trudeau	51
2.3.3. Thomas Mulcair	52
2.3.4. Elizabeth May	53

2.4.	Descriptive Synopsis of Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate	53
2.4.1.	Segment One: Economy	54
2.4.2.	Segment Two: Energy and Environment.....	59
2.4.3.	Segment Three: Democracy	63
2.4.4.	Segment Four: Foreign Policy and Security	66
2.4.5.	Closing Remarks.....	69
2.5.	The Leaders in Canada’s 2019 Federal Election	70
2.6.	The Format of Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate	71
2.7.	Leaders’ <i>Ethos</i> in Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate	73
2.7.1.	Justin Trudeau.....	73
2.7.2.	Andrew Scheer	74
2.7.3.	Jagmeet Singh.....	74
2.7.4.	Elizabeth May.....	75
2.7.5.	Yves-François Blanchet.....	75
2.7.6.	Maxime Bernier.....	76
2.8.	Descriptive Synopsis of Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate.....	76
2.8.1.	Theme One: Leadership in Canada and the World.....	78
2.8.2.	Theme Two: Polarization, Human Rights, and Immigration	82
2.8.3.	Theme Three: Indigenous Issues	85
2.8.4.	Theme Four: Affordability and Income Security	88
2.8.5.	Theme Five: Environment and Energy.....	91
2.8.6.	Pseudo-Closing Remarks.....	96
3.	2015 Analysis: Social Media, <i>Prosopopoeia</i>, and <i>Ethopoeia</i> in Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate	100
3.1.	The Moderate Influence of Facebook on Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate	101
3.1.1.	Recirculating Edited Versions of Leaders’ Closing Remarks	101
3.1.2.	Asserting a Party’s Leader “Wins” the Debate	109
3.2.	The Moderate Influence of Twitter on Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate	115
3.2.1.	Requesting Followers to “Agree” With and Share Parties’ and Leaders’ Debate-Related Posts	116
3.2.2.	Reinforcing Leaders’ Debate-Related Talking Points and Zingers.....	123
3.3.	The Moderate Influence of Instagram on Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate	130
3.3.1.	Providing Followers with a Behind-The-Scenes Intimate View of Leaders	130
3.3.2.	Curating Information and Visuals in Favour of a Particular Leader	134
3.4.	Chapter Summation.....	136
4.	2019 Analysis: Social Media, <i>Prosopopoeia</i>, and <i>Ethopoeia</i> in Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate	138
4.1.	The Vigorous Influence of Facebook on Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate	139
4.1.1.	Constructing an Ideological and Rhetorical Divide Between Parties and Leaders	139
4.1.2.	Curating Favourable Leader Posts by ‘Cherry-Picking’ Traditional Media	148

4.2. The Vigorous Influence of Twitter on Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate	154
4.2.1. Providing a Debate ‘Do-Over’ for Leaders	154
4.2.2. Affording Parties and Leaders with a Platform to Debate Contentious Issues	162
4.3. The Vigorous Influence of Instagram on Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate	166
4.3.1. Associating Leaders’ Partners and Family with the Debate	166
4.3.2. Incorporating Emotional Appeals in Leaders’ Visual Performances	171
4.4. Chapter Summation.....	176
5. Comparison Analysis: Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate Compared to Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate	179
5.1. Facebook: Affordances and Constraints Fostering <i>Prosopopoeia</i> and <i>Ethopoeia</i> in Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate Compared to Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate.....	182
5.1.1. Recirculating Edited Versions of Leaders’ Closing Remarks: 2015 Compared to 2019	184
5.1.2. Asserting a Party’s Leader “Wins” the Debate: 2015 Compared to 2019.....	188
5.1.3. Constructing an Ideological and Rhetorical Divide Between Parties and Leaders: 2019 Compared to 2015	190
5.1.4. Curating Favourable Leader Posts by ‘Cherry-Picking’ Traditional Media: 2019 Compared to 2015	195
5.1.5. Implications of Facebook’s Evolution on Political Leaders’ Debates	197
5.2. Twitter: Affordances and Constraints Fostering <i>Prosopopoeia</i> and <i>Ethopoeia</i> in Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate Compared to Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate.....	201
5.2.1. Requesting Followers to “Agree” With and Share Parties’ and Leaders’ Debate-Related Posts: 2015 Compared to 2019	202
5.2.2. Reinforcing Leaders’ Debate-Related Talking Points and Zingers: 2015 Compared to 2019	204
5.2.3. Providing a Debate ‘Do-Over’ for Leaders: 2019 Compared to 2015	206
5.2.4. Affording Parties and Leaders with a Platform to Debate Contentious Issues: 2019 Compared to 2015	210
5.2.5. Implications of Twitter’s Evolution on Political Leaders’ Debates	212
5.3. Instagram: Affordances and Constraints Fostering <i>Prosopopoeia</i> and <i>Ethopoeia</i> in Canada’s 2015 <i>Maclean’s</i> Leaders’ Debate Compared to Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate.....	214
5.3.1. Providing Followers with a Behind-The-Scenes Intimate View of Leaders: 2015 Compared to 2019.....	215
5.3.2. Curating Information and Visuals in Favour of a Particular Leader: 2015 Compared to 2019	218
5.3.3. Associating Leaders’ Partners and Family with the Debate: 2019 Compared to 2015...219	
5.3.4. Incorporating Emotional Appeals in Leaders’ Visual Performances: 2019 Compared to 2015	221
5.3.5. Implications of Instagram’s Evolution on Political Leaders’ Debates	221
5.4. Chapter Summation.....	224
6. Conclusion: Canada’s (Re)shaped Federal Leaders’ Debates	227

6.1. Chapter Summaries	227
6.2. Key Findings and Contributions	230
6.3. Limitations	232
6.4. Future Research	234
6.5. Conclusion	237
Bibliography	239
Appendices	270
Glossary	271

List of Figures

Appendices can be found as a separate but connected document within the UWSpace submission.

Figure 0-1: Facebook's Conservatives: Post Text: Stephen Harper shows #ProvenLeadership and wins first debate! SHARE if you agree #elxn42 #macdebate // Image Text: Prime Minister Harper wins first debate! Proven leadership for a strong Canada. // (2015-08-06; 22:28; 6,747 likes; 2,945 shares; 1,923 comments) (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2015a)

Figure 0-2: Facebook's Conservatives: Post Text: Prime Minister Stephen Harper made the clear choice last night. Canadians need Proven Leadership to keep Canada safe, and our economy strong. #elxn42. // Video: Harper states, "Ladies and gentlemen, this election is about who has the proven experience to keep Canada safe and our economy strong. We know that, beyond our shores, the global economy remains in a state of turmoil and uncertainty. <edit> Since the end of the global financial crisis, we have the best economic growth, the best job creation, and the best growth in middle class incomes among any of the advanced, developed nations. <edit> we have a balanced budget with lower taxes, increased money for the things that matter, transfers for health care, education, for infrastructure, and for benefits for families like yours. <edit> – there has been and there is no better place and no better prospects for your family than this country, Canada. On October the 19th I ask for your support so together we can continue to build the best country in the world." Video Text: Proven Leadership for a Strong Canada. (2015-08-07; 12:30; 69,950 views; 4,513 likes; 1,095 shares; 731 comments) (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2015c)

Figure 0-3: Facebook's Conservatives: Post Text: This election is about leadership. // Image Text: Proven leadership for a strong Canada. "This is an election about leadership on the big issues, the issues that affect us all: our economy, and our nation's security." PM Stephen Harper. August 2, 2015. (2015-08-06; 20:59; 4,856 likes; 800 shares; 681 comments) (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2015b)

Figure 0-4: Facebook's Harper: Post Text: I am sure if you have teenagers you'll agree with me - these two are well-practiced debaters! (2015-08-06; 17:06; 2,037 likes; 227 shares; 778 comments) (Harper 2015a)

Figure 0-5: Facebook's Liberals: Post Text: He did us proud. Share if you agree. // Image Text: "This was prime time and Justin Trudeau was clearly ready." – Craig Oliver, CP24. (2015-08-07; 13:44; 2,826 likes; 1,092 shares; 304 comments) (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2015b)

Figure 0-6: Facebook's Liberals. Post Text: The reviews are in. Please share to show your support. Web Link Text: The Reviews Are In: First round goes to Trudeau (2015-08-08; 09:00; 2,142 likes, 655 shares, 342 comments) (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2015c)

Figure 0-7: Facebook's Liberals: Web Link Content from Figure 0-6: The Reviews Are In: First Round Goes To Trudeau (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2015c)

Figure 0-8: Facebook's Liberals: Post Text: The pundits agree! // Image Text: The pundits agree. Les commentateurs sont d'accord. Trudeau shows plan for real change. Trudeau présente son plan pour changer ensemble. "This closer by Trudeau is head and shoulders above the rest." – Andrew Coyne, National Post. "Canada's Trudeau, under pressure, comes out swinging in the debate." – Reuters. "Justin Trudeau's close is excellent. Only goosebumps moment tonight. Good challenge of the Not Ready narrative." – David Coletto, Abacus. "Trudeau passe rapidement à l'attaque tant contre Harper que Mulcair sur économique." – Emmanuelle Latravers, Radio-Canada. "Justin Trudeau's closing statement easily the best for swing voter/undecided." – David Akin. "Trudeau knocks that one out of the park. 'You want a Number Mr. Mulcair, 9. Supreme Court judges. 9.'" – Rosemary Barton, CBC. "Wow Trudeau est surprenant. Harper est prévisible et Mulcair est sur les talons." – Marie Grégoire, Radio-Canada. "Trudeau very strong on veterans. Mulcair too unclear on Ukraine. Harper doesn't win foreign policy section. Surprising." – Ashley Csanady, National Post (2015-08-06; 23:26; 1,001 likes, 491 shares, 164 comments) (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2015a)

Figure 0-9: Facebook's Trudeau: Post Text: Real Change. // Changer ensemble. // Video: Trudeau states, "Mr. Harper has spent millions of dollars on attack ads trying to convince you that I'm not ready for this job. As silly as they are, they do pose an important question. How can you decide whether someone is ready to be your Prime Minister? Here's what I think. In order to know if someone is ready for this job, ask them what they want to do with this job, and why they want it in the first place. I'm a 43-year-old father of three kids, and I love them deeply, and I want them to grow up in the best country in the world, one that we can all be proud of. What I learned from my father is that, to lead this country, you need to love this country, love it more than you crave power. It needs to run through your veins. You need to feel it in your bones. Mr. Harper and I part ways on many issues, but our differences go deeper than just policy. Mr. Harper is dead wrong about one thing. He wants you to believe that better just isn't possible. Well, I think that's wrong. We are who we are, and Canada is what it is, because in our hearts we've always known that better is always possible. An economy that works for the middle class means a country that works for everyone, a country that is strong not in spite of our differences, but because of them. The world needs more of both those things. And after ten years of Mr. Harper, so do we" (2015-08-06; 22:37; 144,458 views; 3,900 likes; 2,101 shares; 576 comments) (Trudeau 2015i)

Figure 0-10: Facebook's Trudeau: Post Text: A better Canada is always possible. // Video: Trudeau states, "Mr. Harper has spent millions of dollars on attack ads," the image cutting to Harper's resumé attack ad against Trudeau, while Trudeau states, "trying to convince you that I'm not ready for this job." The image cuts to Trudeau smiling and shaking hands with people in a crowded room. Trudeau's voiceover continues, "Silly as they are, they do pose an important question. How can you decide whether someone is ready to be your Prime Minister?" The image returns to Trudeau speaking at the debate. He states, "Here's what I think. In order to know if someone is ready for this job, ask them what they want to do with this job, and why they want it in the first place." The image cuts to Trudeau holding his youngest son, Hadrien, in a park setting, giving a high-five to another toddler being held by his father. The image then cuts to

Trudeau's daughter, Ella-Grace, and older son, Xavier, running to him, Trudeau lifting them up onto his lap while watching the Calgary stampede, with Trudeau's voiceover continuing. "I'm a 43-year-old father of three kids, and I love them deeply. I want them to grow up in the best country in the world. One that we can all be proud of." The image cuts to Trudeau in a suit, shaking hands with smiling supporters. Trudeau's voiceover continues, "What I learnt from my father is that to lead this country, you need to love this country. Love it more than you crave power. It needs to run through your veins. You need to feel it in your bones. Mr. Harper and I part ways on many issues, but our issues go deeper than just policy. Mr. Harper is dead wrong about one thing." The image then returns to Trudeau in the debate, stating, "He wants you to believe that better just isn't possible. Well, I think that is wrong. We are who we are, and Canada is what it is, because in our hearts, we've always known that better is always possible." The Liberal post ends with the upbeat music increasing in volume, and an image of the red background with the Liberal logo in white lettering (2015-08-11; 18:58; 109,469 views; 3,944 likes; 1,918 shares; 435 comments) (Trudeau 2015t)

Figure 0-11: Facebook's Trudeau: Post Text: Trudeau to Harper: // Image Text: "Canadians know that you've let them down because you've chosen to give benefits and tax breaks to the wealthiest Canadians." – Justin Trudeau. (2015-08-06; 22:12; 9,432 likes; 1,662 shares; 984 comments) (Trudeau 2015l)

Figure 0-12: Facebook's Trudeau: Post Text: Okay Facebook, I'm turning over my account to the Liberal Party's campaign team for the #macdebate. Watch this page all night. #elxn42 (2015-08-06; 16:17; 3,023 likes; 101 shares; 388 comments) (Trudeau 2015f)

Figure 0-13: Post Text: De retour sur Facebook après le débat... et après un appel avec ma conseillère la plus importante. Merci Sophie. // Back on Facebook post-debate after calling my top advisor. Thanks Sophie (2015-08-06; 23:10; 3,500 likes; 144 shares; 301 comments) (Trudeau 2015c).

Figure 0-14: Facebook's NDP: Post Text: 100,000 more reasons that Canadians are putting their trust in Tom Mulcair to bring change to Ottawa. // Image Text: Low-income workers who will get a raise under the NDP's \$15 federal minimum wage plan: 100,000. Canadians who will get a raise under the Liberal plan: 0. It's time for change in Ottawa. NDP. (2015-08-06; 18:53; 1,610 likes; 827 shares; 391 comments) (Canada's NDP/Le NPD du Canada 2015a)

Figure 0-15: Facebook's NDP: Post Text: When it comes to making the right decisions, Justin Trudeau isn't up to the job. // Video Text: Why did Justin Trudeau vote for Stephen Harper's Bill C-51? Trudeau speaking: "Perhaps it was naïve." Video Text: When it comes to making the right decisions, Justin Trudeau isn't up to the job. It's time for change in Ottawa. Tom Mulcair NDP. (2015-08-11; 17:52; 588 likes; 682 shares; 437 comments) (Canada's NDP/Le NPD du Canada 2015c)

Figure 0-16: Facebook's NDP: Post Text: Calls for change are growing louder – and it isn't difficult to see why. // Image Text: The economy has shrunk in each of the last five months. Many experts say that Canada is already in another recession. Stephen Harper's plan just isn't

working. NDP. (2015-08-06; 14:27; 925 likes; 344 shares; 319 comments) (Canada's NDP/Le NPD du Canada 2015b)

Figure 0-17: Facebook's Mulcair: Post Text: The reviews are in – Tom was “strong”, “prime ministerial”, and the “victor” in last night's debate. #Ready4Change // Image Text: Tom Mulcair wins first leaders debate. “Mulcair was strong” – Laura Payton, CBC News. “prime ministerial” – Michael Den Tandt, National Post. “The strategic victor is Tom Mulcair's NDP” – Nicky Woolf, The Guardian. #Ready4Change. NDP. (2015-08-07; 15:14; 2,118 likes; 944 shares; 371 comments) (Mulcair 2015h)

Figure 0-18: Facebook's Mulcair: Post Text: Canadian's are #Ready4Change. We are too. // Video: Mulcair states, “It is time for change – change that's built on hard work, living within your means, and accountability. These are the values that have guided my 35-years of public service, and these are the values that will continue to guide me. My number one priority is to kickstart the economy and get Canadians working. We will invest in local infrastructure and help small businesses to create jobs. And we understand that good jobs and a clean environment go hand-in-hand. I have fought for Canada my whole life. I know that Canada is the greatest country in the world. But a lot has been lost under the Conservatives. I have the experience to replace Mr. Harper, and the plan to repair the damage that he has done. Canadians are ready for change. We're ready too. I invite you to join us. Thank you.” (2015-08-06; 22:17; 3,379 likes; 673 shares; 555 comments) (Mulcair 2015a)

Figure 0-19: Facebook's Mulcair: Post Text: “This election is about a choice - a choice between four more years of Stephen Harper or this extraordinary team of women and men dedicated to bringing positive change to Ottawa.” – Tom Mulcair in Toronto #Ready4Change // Video: Mulcair states: “Well, you know this is my first debate, and I am looking forward to it. I think that it is going to be an opportunity for Canadians to realize that this election is about choice. A choice between four more years of Stephen Harper or an extraordinary team of women and men dedicated to bringing positive change to Ottawa. We want to replace the politics of fear and division with the politics of hope and optimism. Mr. Harper has given us eight deficits in a row, \$150 billion in new debt added for the future generations to bear, and he's got one of the worst job creation records in Canadian history, in fact he has the worst job creation record since the second world war, and one the worst economic records in a hundred years, you have to go all the way back to the crisis of the 1920s to find someone who's got a worse economic record. So, we know we can do better. We can kickstart the economy, with investments in infrastructure, we can become a champion for manufacturing, we can lower the business tax rates for small and medium sized businesses and help create new jobs. They create 80 per cent of the new jobs. We have a clear plan, to help kickstart the economy, to create jobs, and to replace Mr. Harper's politics of fear and division with our politics of hope.” (2015-08-06; 13:30; 18,000 views; 1,173 likes; 423 shares; 190 comments) (Mulcair 2015e)

Figure 0-20: Facebook's Green: Post Text: “It has been our hallmark for generations that we can disagree w/o being disagreeable” - Elizabeth May. If you agree that Elizabeth should be included to all the Leaders' Debates, please click and share: <http://www.greenparty.ca/en/invite-elizabeth>. // Video: Crosstalk. May states: “I was just going to say isn't it ironic that this segment was supposed to be on our democratic institutions, starting with clips about how much heckling there

is in the House of Commons, how difficult it is to have a civil conversation. We can as Canadians, it's been our hallmark for generations, that we can disagree without being disagreeable, and I would like us to be able to talk about what we do about fixing Parliament because that's an urgent crisis." Video Text: On October 19, vote for a Canada that works. Together. Green. Greenparty.ca (2015-08-07; 16:18; 76,992 views; 2,122 likes; 1,546 shares; 235 comments) (Green Party of Canada - Parti vert du Canada 2015b)

Figure 0-21: Facebook's Green: Image Text: "Tonight confirmed why Elizabeth May should be in all the leaders' debates and why the other party leaders are afraid to debate her." Green. // Post Text: After last night's performance in the Maclean's debate, it is clear Elizabeth May belongs in all the debates. Sign-on today to demand she be included in the remaining leaders' debates: green.ca/qUF. (2015-08-07; 14:23; 2,401 likes; 814 shares; 201 comments) (Green Party of Canada - Parti vert du Canada 2015a)

Figure 0-22: Facebook's Green: Post Text: Demand that Elizabeth May be included in the remaining debates here: green.ca/qUF. // Video: May states, "This may, as we currently stand here on August 6th, be the only debate that involves all of us in an English-language debate, and maybe we won't get a French-language debate. So, I appreciate the opportunity to speak directly to Canadians. I want to say that it will be a shame if we don't have more debates, because as – as comprehensive as the questions were, we have not discussed social policy, we have not discussed how we respond to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, we've not discussed how we must expand our Medicare system to include pharmacare, what we should do for young people who are facing crushing levels of student debts, and their families. We have a lot of issues to discuss. Inequality. Everyone's talking about the middle class, and I support the concern, but the 86 wealthiest families in this country have the same combined wealth as the 11.4 million dollar-million Canadians at the bottom. One-third of Canadians have the combined wealth as the top 86 families. We have to address this." Video Text: On October 19 vote for a Canada that works. Together. Green. Greenparty.ca. (2015-08-08; 10:42; 22,690 views; 1,170 likes; 655 shares; 140 comments) (Green Party of Canada - Parti vert du Canada 2015c)

Figure 0-23: Facebook's May: Post Text: Tune in tomorrow! Elizabeth May joins the Maclean's National Leaders Debate tomorrow night, August 6, starting at 8 pm EDT. For more Information: <http://www.greenparty.ca/en/stand-with-elizabeth> // Image Text: Maclean's debate tomorrow. Elizabeth May debates Stephen Harper, Thomas Mulcair, Justin Trudeau. Green. (2015-08-05; 17:33; 1,704 likes; 730 shares; 208 comments) (May 2015a)

Figure 0-24: Facebook's May: Web Link Text: Elizabeth May. Invite Elizabeth | Green Party of Canada www.greenparty.ca. (2015-08-07; 16:37; 1,232 likes; 532 shares; 232 comments) (May 2015c)

Figure 0-25: Facebook's May: Web Link Content from Figure 0-24: Invite Elizabeth (May 2015c)

Figure 0-26: Facebook's May: Post Text: Calling all Elizabeth May supporters! At 6:00 pm tonight, come to the Toronto broadcast studios at 33 Dundas St. E. to show your support before the Maclean's National Leaders Debate. Wear green! Bring your friends! Then join us at the

Imperial Pub, 54 Dundas St. E., to watch the debate, starting at 8:00 pm. For more information: <http://www.greenparty.ca/en/debate> // Image Text: Join Elizabeth tonight! Green. (2015-08-06; 12:50; 838 likes; 119 shares; 281 comments) (May 2015b)

Figure 0-27: Twitter's CPC Debate: Post Text: .@pmharper shows #ProvenLeadership and wins first debate! RT if you agree #elxn42 #macdebate #cdnpoli // Image Text: Prime Minister Stephen Harper wins first debate! Proven leadership for a strong Canada. (2015-08-06; 70 favourites; 130 retweets) (CPC Debate 2015c)

Figure 0-28: Twitter's CPC Debate: Web Link Text: With @PMHarper Canada is the most admired country in the world: tinyurl.com/pvakmyk #elxn42 #macdebate (2015-08-06; 33 favourites; 100 retweets) (CPC Debate 2015d)

Figure 0-29: Twitter's CPC Debate: Web Link Content from Figure 0-28: Canada is the most admired country in the world content (*CTV News* 2015)

Figure 0-30: Twitter's CPC Debate: Post Text: FACT: #LPC cut health care. #CPC fund health care #elxn42 #macdebate // Image Text: Liberals cut health care transfers by 30% in the 1990s. Justin Trudeau. Just not ready. Conservatives increased health care transfers by nearly 70%. Proven leadership for a strong Canada. (2015-08-06; 21:20; 34 favourite; 100 retweets) (CPC Debate 2015b)

Figure 0-31: Twitter's CPC Debate: Post Text: Conservative support for Ukraine #elxn42 #macdebate // Image Text: Assistance to Ukraine: Four CF-18 fighter jets to Baltic air policing. HMCS Fredericton to NATO maritime forces. Deployed 120 Canadian armed forces members to participate in NATO training exercises. Night/thermal goggles, tactical communications systems, coats, pants, Gore-Tex boots, and gloves. Providing explosive ordnance disposal equipment and tactical medical kits. Leading the military police training program in Ukraine. Deployed 200 Canadian armed forces members to western Ukraine for military training. Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement. Financial support for economic growth security assistance, humanitarian assistance, and democratic support. Proven leadership for a strong Canada. (2015-08-06; 21:37; 26 favourite; 90 retweets) (CPC Debate 2015a)

Figure 0-32: Twitter's Harper: Post Text: I am sure if you have teenagers you'll agree with me - these two are well practiced debaters! #elxn42 #macdebate (2015-08-06; 17:04; 417 likes; 258 retweets; 116 comments) (Harper 2015b)

Figure 0-33: Twitter's Liberals: Post Text: He did us proud. Share if you agree. #elxn42 #cdnpoli // Image Text: "This was prime time and Justin Trudeau was clearly ready." – Craig Oliver, CP24. (2015-08-07; 13:46; 232 likes; 343 retweets; 30 comments) (Liberal Party 2015b)

Figure 0-34: Twitter's Liberals: Post Text: The contradictions speak for themselves. Why does Tom Mulcair keep changing his position on debates? #NDP // Video Text: Tom Mulcair on debates February 2015. Video: Mulcair states, "I'm a big fan of debates as you might of noticed, I enjoy the back and forth of a lively debate" Video Text: "Mulcair to skip debates that don't include Harper." – *Globe and Mail* – July 31, 2015. Video: Mulcair states, "And frankly if there

was a leaders' debate every week of the next election campaign, I'd be there front and centre." Video text: "Tom Mulcair non-committal about Globe, Munk debates." – CBC News – August 5, 2015. Video: Mulcair states, "I believe I am the only leader of a recognized party in parliament that has said I am willing to participate in a debate on women's issues." Video Text: "Mulcair's attendance at women's rights debate uncertain" – metronews.ca – August 4, 2015. Tom Mulcair says whatever suits him at the time about debates. Wonder what he'll say tomorrow? (2015-08-09; 20:12; 57 likes; 105 retweets; 19 comments) (Liberal Party 2015c)

Figure 0-35: Twitter's Liberals: Post Text: (2/2) Harper blames it on sluggish growth around the world, but that's obviously not the case. #Cdnpoli // Image Text: % Growth in G-20 countries (October 2015-March 2015. Canada +0.499%. // (2015-08-06; 20:26; 24 likes; 72 retweets; 1 comment) (Liberal Party 2015a)

Figure 0-36: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: A better Canada is always possible. #elxn42. // Video: Trudeau states, "Mr. Harper has spent millions of dollars on attack ads," the image cutting to Harper's resumé attack ad against Trudeau, while Trudeau states, "trying to convince you that I'm not ready for this job." The image cuts to Trudeau smiling and shaking hands with people in a crowded room. Trudeau's voiceover continues, "Silly as they are, they do pose an important question. How can you decide whether someone is ready to be your Prime Minister?" The image returns to Trudeau speaking at the debate. He states, "Here's what I think. In order to know if someone is ready for this job, ask them what they want to do with this job, and why they want it in the first place." The image cuts to Trudeau holding his youngest son, Hadrien, in a park setting, giving a high-five to another toddler being held by his father. The image then cuts to Trudeau's daughter, Ella-Grace, and older son, Xavier, running to him, Trudeau lifting them up onto his lap while watching the Calgary stampede, with Trudeau's voiceover continuing. "I'm a 43-year-old father of three kids, and I love them deeply. I want them to grow up in the best country in the world. One that we can all be proud of." The image cuts to Trudeau in a suit, shaking hands with smiling supporters. Trudeau's voiceover continues, "What I learnt from my father is that to lead this country, you need to love this country. Love it more than you crave power. It needs to run through your veins. You need to feel it in your bones. Mr. Harper and I part ways on many issues, but our issues go deeper than just policy. Mr. Harper is dead wrong about one thing." The image then returns to Trudeau in the debate, stating, "He wants you to believe that better just isn't possible. Well, I think that is wrong. We are who we are, and Canada is what it is, because in our hearts, we've always known that better is always possible." The Liberal post ends with the upbeat music increasing in volume, and an image of the red background with the Liberal logo in white lettering (2015-08-12; 07:31; 621 likes; 378 retweets; 50 comments) (Trudeau 2015u)

Figure 0-37: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: Stephen Harper broke his promise to never appoint a single Senator. 59 times. #elxn42 // Video Text: In 2006, Stephen Harper promised not to appoint a single Senator. Then, he broke that promise 59 times... and we know how that turned out. (2015-08-06; 21:12; 258 likes; 356 retweets; 22 comments) (Trudeau 2015j)

Figure 0-38: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: On the environment, Stephen Harper trusts his ideology. Liberals will trust science. #elxn42 (2015-08-06; 20:55; 359 likes; 339 retweets; 28 comments) (Trudeau 2015h)

Figure 0-39: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: Trudeau to Harper: // Image Text: "Canadians know that you've let them down because you've chosen to give benefits and tax breaks to the wealthiest Canadians." – Justin Trudeau (2015-08-06; 22:01; 362 likes; 330 retweets; 26 comments) (Trudeau 2015k)

Figure 0-40: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: My number is 9. // Mon chiffre c'est 9. #elxn42 (2015-08-06; 21:08; 233 likes; 308 retweets; 18 comments) (Trudeau 2015p)

Figure 0-41: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: Trudeau to Mulcair: #elxn42 #macdebate // Image Text: "My number is nine. Nine supreme court justices said one vote is not enough to break up this country and yet that is Mr. Mulcair's position" – Justin Trudeau (2015-08-06; 21:25; 203 likes; 264 retweets; 20 comments) (Trudeau 2015s)

Figure 0-42: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: Mr. Harper has failed our veterans by not giving them the service and the help they need. #elxn42 #cdnpoli // Video: Trudeau states, "If we are going to send our troops overseas, we need to make sure we are properly taking care of them when they come home. And Mr. Harper has failed our veterans by nickel-and-diming them, by not giving them the service, the help that they need. And it's something that we should all be ashamed of, that this government, that likes to wrap itself in the flag, is actually not caring for those people who have fought, injured themselves, and – in many cases, died – under that flag." (2015-08-06; 21:50; 263 likes; 263 retweets; 19 comments) (Trudeau 2015o)

Figure 0-43: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: First round of the day. #elxn42 (2015-08-06; 14:40; 369 likes; 259 retweets; 74 comments) (Trudeau 2015d)

Figure 0-44: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: FACT CHECK – The Bank of Canada says Canada is again in a recession #elxn42 #macdebate // Image Text: "We don't believe we will be in a recession." – Joe Oliver, July 3, 2015. (2015-08-06; 20:28; 176 likes; 249 retweets; 18 comments) (Trudeau 2015n)

Figure 0-45: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: FACT CHECK – Stephen Harper has the worst economic growth record of any PM since the Depression. lpc.ca/am3f. #elxn42 // Web Link Text: Harper's growth record is the worst since R. B. Bennett (2015-08-06; 20:07; 152 likes; 235 retweets; 17 comments) (Trudeau 2015m)

Figure 0-46: Twitter's Trudeau: Web Link Content from Figure 0-45: Harper's Growth Record Is the Worst Since R.B. Bennett (Goodale 2013)

Figure 0-47: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: Trudeau to Harper: // Image Text: "You haven't been able to get it done on the environment, Mr. Harper" – Justin Trudeau (2015-08-06; 20:56; 196 likes; 227 retweets; 22 comments) (Trudeau 2015r)

Figure 0-48: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: Okay Twitterverse, I'm turning over my account to @liberal_party's campaign team for the #macdebate. Watch this account all night. #elxn42 (2015-08-06; 16:49; 182 likes; 102 shares; 34 comment) (Trudeau 2015g)

Figure 0-49: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: Back on Twitter post-debate after calling my top advisor. Thanks Sophie. (2015-08-06; 23:11; 576 likes; 181 retweets; 61 comments) (Trudeau 2015a)

Figure 0-50: Twitter's NDP: Post Text: Honestly, Mr Harper, we really can't afford another 4 years of you." #Ready4Change #NDP #elxn42 #macdebate // Video: Mulcair states, "What Mr. Harper fails to mention is that he's run up eight deficits in a row. He's added \$150 billion to Canada's debt in the last 10 years, and frankly, last week, as we headed into this campaign, in just one day he spent over a billion dollars. Honestly, Mr. Harper, we really can't afford another four years of you." (2015-08-06; 20:29; 90 likes; 182 retweets; 4 comments) (NDP 2015b)

Figure 0-51: Twitter's NDP: Post Text: .@ThomasMulcair challenges Stephen Harper on his failed plan for Canada's economy. #Ready4Change #macdebate // Image Text: "You are the only Prime Minister who when asked about recessions on his watch, has to ask: which one?" (2015-08-06; 20:30; 63 likes; 129 retweets; 2 comments) (NDP 2015c)

Figure 0-52: Twitter's NDP: Post Text: Governing is about setting priorities. RT if you agree w/ @ThomasMulcair's focus on affordable childcare. #macdebate // Image Text: "Taxpayers have spent \$1 billion on the corrupt Senate under Mr. Harper. Think of the child care spaces that could have been created instead. Tom Mulcair NDP. (2015-08-06; 21:22; 51 likes; 97 retweets; 2 comments) (NDP 2015a)

Figure 0-53: Twitter's Mulcair: Post Text: Canadians are #Ready4Change. We are too. #NDP #macdebate #elxn42 // Video: Mulcair states, "It is time for a change – change that's built on hard work, living within your means, and accountability. These are the values that have guided by 35 years of public service, and these are the values that will continue to guide me. My number one priority is to kickstart the economy and get Canadians working. We will invest in local infrastructure and help small businesses to create jobs. And we understand that good jobs and a clean environment go hand-in-hand. I have fought for Canada my whole life. I know that Canada is the greatest country in the world. But a lot has been lost under the Conservatives. I have the experience to replace Mr. Harper, and the plan to repair the damage that he has done. Canadians are ready for change. We're ready too. I invite you to join us. Thank you. (2015-08-06; 22:14; 224 likes; 217 retweets; 28 comments) (Mulcair 2015b)

Figure 0-54: Twitter's Mulcair: Post Text: The reviews are in – Tom was 'strong', 'prime ministerial', and the 'victor' in last night's debate. #NDP #macdebate" // Image Text: Tom Mulcair wins first leaders debate. "Mulcair was strong" – Laura Payton, CBC News. "prime ministerial" – Michael Den Tandt, National Post. "The strategic victor is Tum Mulcair's NDP" – Nicky Woolf, The Guardian. #Ready4Change. NDP. (2015-08-07; 15:18; 135 likes; 151 retweets; 59 comments) (Mulcair 2015g)

Figure 0-55: Twitter's Mulcair: Post Text: This election is a choice—between four more years of Stephen Harper or this extraordinary team." #Ready4Change #NDP // Video: Mulcair states: "Well, you know this is my first debate, and I am looking forward to it. I think that it is going to be an opportunity for Canadians to realize that this election is about choice. A choice between four more years of Stephen Harper or an extraordinary team of women and men dedicated to

bringing positive change to Ottawa. We want to replace the politics of fear and division with the politics of hope and optimism. Mr. Harper has given us eight deficits in a row, \$150 billion in new debt added for the future generations to bear, and he's got one of the worst job creation records in Canadian history, in fact he has the worst job creation record since the second world war, and one the worst economic records in a hundred years, you have to go all the way back to the crisis of the 1920s to find someone who's got a worse economic record. So, we know we can do better. We can kickstart the economy, with investments in infrastructure, we can become a champion for manufacturing, we can lower the business tax rates for small and medium sized businesses and help create new jobs. They create 80 per cent of the new jobs. We have a clear plan, to help kickstart the economy, to create jobs, and to replace Mr. Harper's politics of fear and division with our politics of hope." (2015-08-06; 13:23; 117 likes; 121 retweets; 19 comments) (Mulcair 2015d)

Figure 0-56: Twitter's Green Party: Post Text: Impressed by @ElizabethMay in the #macdebate? Join the movement today green.ca/volTW #elxn42 // Image Text: I'm In. Join the movement. Green.ca/volunteer. (2015-08-06; 21:50; 73 likes; 101 retweets; 2 comments) (Green Party Canada 2015a)

Figure 0-57: Twitter's Green Party: Post Text: We need to put power back where it belongs - in the hands of Canadians #macdebate #elxn42 #gpc green.ca/ov // Image Text: "We need to reduce the power of political parties and amplify the role of individual members of Parliament. Members of Parliament have to get back to actually representing their constituents." – Elizabeth May #elxn42. Green. (2015-08-06; 21:00; 51 likes; 89 retweets; 5 comments) (Green Party Canada 2015b)

Figure 0-58: Twitter's Green Party: Post Text: Our policy on #C51 is simple. Repeat it. #macdebate @ElizabethMay // Video: May states, "C-51 creates a secret police under CSIS with no reporting requirements to the RCMP. None. And it will create separate security espionage groups not knowing what the other is doing. This legislation must be repealed. <edit> This is a disaster." Video Text: On October 19 vote for a Canada that works. Together. Green. Greenparty.ca (2015-08-10; 19:23; 81 likes; 80 retweets; 7 comments) (Green Party Canada 2015c)

Figure 0-59: Twitter's May: Post Text: Q of the day: In the #Macdebate Harper said C51 includes oversight by judges. Does it really? #QPGPC #elxn42 #cdnpoli // Image Text: Elizabeth May's question of the day. #QPGPC (2015-08-29; 19:09; 18 likes; 41 retweets; 12 comments) (May 2015g)

Figure 0-60: Twitter's May: Post Text: @Tintie4 @christellar His excuse was absurd. #GPC is national party w elected MP. That has always been the requirement for debates. (2015-08-11; 18:45; 12 likes; 13 retweets; 2 comments) (May 2015f)

Figure 0-61: Twitter's May: Post Text: @betheoteca @UniforTheUnion I tried in the debate. We must address crushing student debt! (2015-08-11; 11:57; 7 likes; 9 retweets) (May 2015e)

Figure 0-62: Instagram's Trudeau: Post Text: Called my top advisor. Thank you Sophie. // Un appel avec ma conseillère la plus importante. Merci Sophie. #macdebate #cdnpoli #polcan #elxn42 (2015-08-06; 3,706 likes, 276 comments) (Trudeau 2015b)

Figure 0-63: Instagram's Trudeau: Post Text: Morning boxing session in Toronto. // Entraînement de boxe à Toronto ce matin. #elxn42 (2015-08-06; 2,033 likes; 161 comments) (Trudeau 2015e)

Figure 0-64: Instagram's Mulcair: Post Text: Canadians are #Ready4Change. We are too. #NDP #macdebate #elxn42 (2015-08-06; 232 likes; 7 comments) (Mulcair 2015c)

Figure 0-65: 2015 Leaders' Debate Crowd (M. Kennedy 2015)

Figure 0-66: Instagram's Mulcair: Post Text: "This election is about a choice - a choice between four more years of Stephen Harper or this extraordinary team of women and men dedicated to bringing positive change to Ottawa."- Tom Mulcair in Toronto #Ready4Change #NDP #Toronto #elxn42 (2015-08-06; 146 likes; 2 comments) (Mulcair 2015e)

Figure 0-67: Facebook's Conservatives: Post Text: Tonight's debate made one thing clear: Andrew Scheer is the only leader that can be trusted to help you and your family get ahead. // Image Text: Andrew Scheer Wins Debate (2019-10-07; 21:00; 11,915 reactions; 10,517 likes; 3,451 shares; 2,017 comments) (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2019a)

Figure 0-68: Facebook's Conservatives: Post Text: Canadians are tired of Justin Trudeau's weak leadership. It's time to elect a strong Conservative government that will help you get ahead. // Image Text: "Mr. Trudeau, you're a phoney and you're a fraud and you do not deserve to govern this country" – Andrew Scheer (2019-10-09; 08:47; 6,234 reactions; 5,537 likes; 2,622 shares; 1,225 comments) (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2019b)

Figure 0-69: Facebook's Conservatives: Post Text: Justin Trudeau has no record to run on and has no plan for Canada's future. The debate on Monday made one thing very clear: Andrew Scheer is the best choice for Canada. // Image Text: "As Monday's debate unfolded, only Andrew Scheer emerged as the candidate worthy of the support of Canadians who value sensible general economic policies free of radicalism and extremism – Financial Post, October 9" (2019-10-10; 08:01; 5,479 reactions; 4,958 likes; 1,529 shares 1,191 comments) (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2019c)

Figure 0-70: Facebook's Scheer: Post Text: Another week in the books! Momentum is building as more and more Canadians show their support for our plan to help you get ahead. Join me, and let's make life more affordable for everyone! // Video Text: "Another week in the books. I'm just about to take off from Toronto, going to spend a few hours with my kids tonight, and then tomorrow, and then back at it on Monday. We start off the week in Whitby, Ontario. Nous avons commence à Whitby, Ontario. We had our first French-language debate, the only one so far that Justin Trudeau showed up at. That's where we found out that the Liberals have a second plane, and that Justin Trudeau is a high carbon hypocrite. Justin Trudeau est un faux-écologiste. The

momentum is really building. More and more Canadians are realizing that Justin Trudeau is making life more expensive, that after the election, taxes are going to go up, especially his carbon tax, and their looking forward to a Conservative government that will live within its means, leave more money in your pocket, because it's time for you to get ahead. Plus. Pour vous. Dès maintenant. Video Text: It's time for you to get ahead. Conservative. (2019-10-06; 21:35; 66,000 views; 5,167 reactions; 4,462 likes; 1,061 shares; 1,095 comments) (Scheer 2019a)

Figure 0-71: Facebook's Scheer: Post Text: Let's do this. It's time for you to get ahead! #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 (2019-10-07; 18:46; 10,484 reactions; 9,400 likes; 809 shares; 1,159 comments) (Scheer 2019d)

Figure 0-72: Facebook's Scheer: Post Text: As Prime Minister, I will work to make your commute shorter and more affordable. Under Justin Trudeau, critical projects that will reduce your commute times aren't getting built. It's time for you to get ahead. // Video: Scheer states, "In 2015 Justin Trudeau made a lot of promises to get elected. He said he would balance the budget. He said he would help the middle class. He even said he would be accountable and ethical. Now here we are just four years later, and he has broken almost every promise he has made to Canadians. Including his promises to build infrastructure. In 2015, he made billions in promises, claiming he'd make your commute easier. But critical projects that will reduce your commute times aren't getting built. A new Conservative government will work with provincial and territorial governments to build those projects that make a difference in people's lives. By reducing commute times and congestion and getting people home faster after a long day. Projects like the Ontario Line and the Yonge Subway Extension here in the GTA. And the Massey Tunnel Replacement in Vancouver. And the Third Link in Québec City. As Prime Minister, I will help make your commute shorter and more affordable. Because it's time for you to get ahead." Video Text: It's time for you to get ahead. Conservative. (2019-10-09; 08:45; 43,000 views; 3,396 reactions; 3,343 likes; 748 shares; 774 comments) (Scheer 2019h)

Figure 0-73: Facebook's Liberals: Post Text: Are we really surprised that the Conservatives have been caught lying to Canadians - again? // Web Link Text: Truth Tracker: Conservatives falsely claim Trudeau lowered taxes for millionaires (2019-10-09; 19:32; 1209 reactions; 896 likes; 584 shares; 922 comments) (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2019c)

Figure 0-74: Facebook's Liberals: Web Link Content: Truth Tracker: Conservatives falsely claim Trudeau lowered taxes for millionaires (see Figure 0-73 and Figure 0-115) (Slaughter 2019)

Figure 0-75: Facebook's Liberals: Post Text: Cuts to education, healthcare, and environmental protection - for our kids' sake, we can't afford for Andrew Scheer to do to Canada what Doug Ford has done to Ontario. // Image Text: Conservative cuts hurt kids. (2019-10-07; 11:42; 1,356 reactions; 1,058 likes; 370 shares; 997 comments) (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2019a)



Figure 0-76: Facebook's Liberals: Post Text: Who has the positive plan? Their words from the debate last night speak for themselves. // Image Text: women's rights; climate change; billion trees; middle class; housing; succeed; climate change. Phoney; abuse; demo; mishandles; failing;

threatening; doing nothing; fraud (2019-10-08; 22:22; 1,371 reactions; 1,055 likes; 286 shares; 722 comments) (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2019b)

Figure 0-77: Facebook's Trudeau: Post Text: The best kind of debate prep: walking these two to school this morning! (2019-10-07; 16:02; 130,994 reactions; 111,376 likes; 2,422 shares; 7,600 comments) (Trudeau 2019g)

Figure 0-78: Facebook's Trudeau: Post Text: To be clear: We will NOT put a 50% tax on the sale of your home. // Video Text: Andrew Scheer is sending a letter to millions of Canadians with his latest lies about our platform. To. Be. Clear. We will not put a 50% tax on the sale of your home. Here's what we will do: Lower the price of your first home by 10%. Give more money to people in places where houses cost more. Tax vacant homes owned by people who don't live in Canada. Give Canadians an interest-free loan of up to \$40,000 to adapt their homes for climate change. Whatever mistruths you hear from Conservatives, know that we're for moving forward – for everyone. Choose forward. Liberal. (2019-10-07; 14:37; 146,000 views; 4,818 reactions; 4,011 likes; 1,294 shares; 1,623 comments) (Trudeau 2019i)

Figure 0-79: Facebook's Trudeau: Post Text: Do we go back to the Harper years when the Conservatives did nothing about climate change? Or fight for a better future? I'm for moving forward, for everyone. #ChooseForward // Video: Trudeau states, "Years from now, I want to look my kids in the eyes and say, we stepped up in the fight against climate change. That's why we worked long and hard to build our plan. Of course, it's not perfect, and we need to do more, but it's a serious plan that will reduce pollution, and create jobs. In October, you get to choose, do we go back to the Harper years, when the Conservatives did nothing about climate change, or fight for a better future? I'm for moving forward, for everyone. Video Text: investing in renewables; ban single-use plastics; world class oceans protection plan; reduce pollution; create jobs. Liberal Choose Forward.ca (2019-10-07; 20:08; 302,188 views; 15,710 reactions; 12,873 likes; 1,095 shares; 2,220 comments) (Trudeau 2019d)

Figure 0-80: Facebook's NDP: Post Text: Last night, Jagmeet stood up for everyday people and showed how he'll make life better for families – and the response has been incredible. Here's what they're saying about Jagmeet's performance at last night's debate.   // Video Text: What's they're saying ... "In the winner category, you can put a check mark next to NDP leader Jagmeet Singh's name... He's risen to the occasion many times over the course of this campaign and I think that he did so again tonight." – Vassy Kapelos, CBC News. "Jagmeet had some of the best lines of the night. He had the lines that are going to play with the average Canadians. They were short, they were snappy, they speak to Canadians." – Mercedes Stephenson, Global News. "The most interesting person tonight was Mr. Singh. Of the leaders tonight he was the most comfortable on stage. If Twitter traffic matters, he dominated the night. Both in volume and positive coverage it was about Jagmeet Singh." – Darrell Bricker, IPSOS. "Jagmeet Singh was pretty strong, hopeful, positive." – Michel Boyer, CTV News. "Jagmeet Singh was the big winner, acting the most Prime Ministerial." – André Picard, Globe and Mail. "Singh is strong tonight. He's picking up steam on the hustings. Natural campaigner. Tonight's zinger: Canadians don't have to choose between Mr. Delay (Trudeau) and Mr. Deny (Scheer) on climate change action." – Mercedes Stephenson, Global News. "Singh lands a blow with the government's challenge to a compensation order for First Nations kids in care. He's heads and tails above the

others on this file.” – Robyn Urback, CBC News. “So far, Singh doing best tonight, I think. Exceeding expectations, seems at ease, repeatedly suggesting Trudeau too soft on rich and powerful.” – Stephen Maher, Maclean’s. “Singh’s pretty darn good at this.” – David Akin, Global News. “This is my first extended exposure to Jagmeet Singh. He is the only one on this stage I can relate to at all. I’m impressed.” – Damien Cox, Toronto Star. “Jagmeet Singh is crushing this debate.” – Lauren O’Neil, BlogTO. “Singh jumps in and points out that Trudeau and Scheer are fighting about ‘who is worse for Canada.’ Singh uses this to pivot to his platforms and how universal pharmacare and dental care will save families money.” – Annie Bergeron Oliver, CTV News. “I think that the people feeling the best tonight are the New Democrats. They feel that Jagmeet Singh has had his best week this week, since becoming leader.” – David Cochrane, CBC News. (2019-10-08; 13:57; 12,000 views; 453 reactions; 464 likes; 242 shares; 78 comments) (Canada’s NDP / Le NPD du Canada 2019c)

Figure 0-81: Facebook’s NDP: Post Text: This weekend, Jagmeet visited Grassy Narrows, where the devastating impacts of mercury contamination have impacted 3 generations. // Video: Various voices of Grassy Narrows. “There is nothing more important than clean water. My name is Judy Da Silva. My name is Darwin Fobister. Sharice Bruce. I am from Grassy Narrows. I live in a community that is very destroyed by the effects of mercury poisoning in the water. This water can kill us eventually. It’s already killing us slowly. As you get older you begin to face more health issues because of the mercury that’s in our bodies. I’m poisoned by mercury and I’m a mother of five. In the 1960s and ’70s, industrial pollution contaminated the water in Grassy Narrows with mercury, making it one of Canada’s worst environmental disasters. The contamination in this community of about 1,000 residents has affected three generations. When we found out the mercury was in the water it had a really devastating effect in our community economically, socially, and all that. It’s like a genocide of our people. A lot of our people have died from the mercury poisoning and still today they are. Ninety per cent of people tested in Grassy Narrows experience symptoms of mercury poisoning. Industry is given too much free rein on our lands to put their pollutants out there and their chemicals – and they need to put water first. No one should be without safe, clean water. For too long, Grassy Narrows First Nation, like many Indigenous communities, has been left behind by governments. We have a responsibility to make sure the services of the community are improved, to care for mercury survivors, and to help Grassy Narrows children and youth get the support they need to thrive.” Video: Singh states, “Why is it that we ask the question whether or not Indigenous people should have clean drinking water? We’ve got to take a minute and think, why is that even a question? Yes, they deserve clean drinking water, yes, we can make it happen, it’s a matter of priority.” Video Text: Jagmeet Singh, NDP. In it for you. On se bat pour vous. (2019-10-07; 09:45; 7,100 views; 226 reactions; 159 likes; 169 shares; 54 comments) (Canada’s NDP / Le NPD du Canada 2019b)

Figure 0-82: Facebook’s NDP: Post Text: There are just two weeks to go until election day – and our team is out connecting with people in communities across Canada. Be a part of the campaign – volunteer today! → ndp.ca/volunteer. // Image Text: Volunteer! NDP. (2019-10-07; 15:05; 56 reactions; 48 likes; 35 shares; 34 comments) (Canada’s NDP / Le NPD du Canada 2019a)

Figure 0-83: Facebook’s Singh: Post Text: You know it’s been a long day when the ears are out 🗣️ #elxn43 (2019-10-06; 17:54; 14,819 reactions; 11,412 likes; 450 shares; 883 comments) (Singh 2019a)

Figure 0-84: Facebook's Singh: Post Text: Debate night is a wrap! I love every opportunity I get to share the stories of the people I've met across Canada – and offer our plan to make life easier for people, not the rich & powerful. CA C'est fini pour le débat de ce soir! C'est très important pour moi de saisir chaque occasion pour partager les histoires des gens que je rencontre à travers le Canada et présenter notre plan pour rendre votre vie plus facile, pas celle des plus riches. (2019-10-07; 21:59; 8,295 reactions; 7,070 likes; 374 shares; 700 comments) (Singh 2019e)

Figure 0-85: Facebook's Singh: Post Text: We're here & ready to go 🇨🇦 Arrivé et prêt à passer à l'action. (2019-10-07; 16:41; 5,818 reactions; 5,033 likes; 213 shares; 367 comments) (Singh 2019f)

Figure 0-86: Facebook's Green: Post Text: At the debate tonight, Elizabeth explained why Scheer's brand of selfish policies are stopping us from lifting everyone out of poverty. // Image Text: "Mr. Scheer, that may be the worst idea in your whole non-platform" is Elizabeth May's best line, perhaps the best line in the history of Canadian politics. (2019-10-07; 21:23; 3,987 reactions; 3,073 likes; 1,159 shares; 458 comments) (Green Party of Canada 2019b)

Figure 0-87: Facebook's Green: Post Text: Andrew Scheer will never be Prime Minister. He's proven he's not trustworthy. His climate non-plan ignores science. And he's been dog whistling to the far right. People in Canada are so much better than that. Vote for what you believe in. // Image Text: Andrew Scheer won't win. Pass it on. (2019-10-08; 14:01; 2,690 reactions; 2,206 likes; 993 shares; 646 comments) (Green Party of Canada 2019e)

Figure 0-88: Facebook's Green: Post Text: It's debate night! The only female leader, Elizabeth has been head of the Greens for 13 years, an MP for 8, and she's devoted her whole life to defending people + 🌍. To the other leaders: buckle up, boys! Pass this on to wish her luck! (2019-10-07; 14:44; 3,077 reactions; 2,406 likes; 682 shares; 257 comments) (Green Party of Canada 2019d)

Figure 0-89: Facebook's May: Post Text: I was unfairly excluded from tonight's French language debate, which means I didn't get to offer French Canadians my plan or my perspective. But don't worry, the Green momentum won't be stopped - and I'll be there to hold them to account in the next one. Tune in Monday. // Image Text: When 4 men talk about women's rights... If only there was a woman there to weigh in. #facefaceTVA (2019-10-02; 22:34; 3,454 reactions; 2,370 likes; 1,200 shares; 494 comments) (May 2019a)

Figure 0-90: Facebook's May: Post Text: The debate tonight made one thing blatantly clear: we need proportional representation. We can't solve the problems of our time without working together. // Image Text: Tired of the divisive politics you've seen this election? Blame first past the post. @ElizabethMay: "It makes each party a rival of the other." We need solutions, not bickering. Greens fight for proportional representation. #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli (2019-10-07; 21:42; 4,088 reactions; 3,518 likes; 847 shares; 441 comments) (May 2019f)

Figure 0-91: Facebook's May: Post Text: 40 days of Green Party Leader Elizabeth May's campaign in 40 seconds. #CanadaElection2019 #CanadaVotes #elxn43. // Video: May states, "This election is about telling the truth to Canadians about how serious the climate emergency

really is. We need to move away from fossil fuels as quickly as possible. We're certainly not a one issue party. Bring in real pharmacare. Cancelling tuition. We want to ensure that no one is left homeless and bring in a guaranteed livable income. I'm not a woman who would ever, ever, ever, retreat from the right of a woman to a safe and legal abortion and that's our party policy. He's not a separatist. We will not have a candidate who thinks they can work to break-up our country. That's not on. Vote Green, it feels good. To avoid catastrophic levels of global warming, we must not build the Trans Mountain pipeline. It's so heartbreaking for me to look at you today and know you could have done so much more in the last four years. Please God you don't get a majority." Video Text: Canada Votes 2019. CBCNews. (2019-10-21; 16:15; 98 reactions; 68 likes; 61 shares; 21 comments) (May 2019j)

Figure 0-92: Facebook's Bloc: Post Text: À la veille du débat en anglais, tenons-nous debout pour le Québec, pour les Franco-Canadiens et pour les Acadiens. (Translated) On the eve of the English debate, let's stand up for Québec, for French-speaking Canadians and for Acadians. // Image Text: "Je souhaite juste que les francophones du Canada et les Acadiens aient le même traitement que les anglophones du Québec" (Translated) "I want French-speaking people in English Canada and Acadians to get the same treatment as English-speaking people in Québec." (2019-10-06; 15:51; 2,772 reactions; 2,254 likes; 1,431 shares; 260 comments) (Bloc Québécois 2019a)

Figure 0-93: Facebook's Bloc: Post Text: À jeudi! (Translated) See you Thursday! // "J'ai hate d'entendre ces messieurs nous dire la même chose qu'ils nous ont dit ce soir lors du débat en français jeudi." (Translated) "I can't wait to hear these gentlemen tell us the same thing they told us tonight in the French debate on Thursday." (2019-10-07; 21:19; 1,631 reactions; 1,337 likes; 586 shares; 279 comments) (Bloc Québécois 2019b)

Figure 0-94: Facebook's Bloc: Post Text: Petit rappel 🙏 (Translated) Little reminder 🙏 // Image Text: Québec knows what's right for Québec. Thank you. (2019-10-07; 19:23; 1,172 reactions; 929 likes; 387 shares; 166 comments) (Bloc Québécois 2019f)

Figure 0-95: Facebook's Blanchet: "PUBLICITÉ LE QUÉBEC C'EST NOUS - UNE CAMPAGNE POSITIVE - Le Bloc Québécois mène une campagne positive et nous devons continuer ainsi à présenter des propositions fortes. Dignes, verts et généreux. Ne prêtez pas l'oreille aux campagne négatives. Elles démontrent que notre écoute de ce qu'est et veut une large part du Québec inquiète les partis qui le voient comme une minorité dont on tolère difficilement la différence. Vous le croyez aussi? Je vous invite à partager ce sommaire de notre vision, et à invitez vos gens à en faire autant. Nous avons moins d'argent que les adversaires? Nous avons le nombre et la passion pour le Québec. Juste pour le Québec! Parce que le Québec, c'est nous. Merci! (Translated) A POSITIVE CAMPAIGN The Bloc Québécois is running a positive campaign and we must continue to present strong proposals. Dignified, green and generous. Do not listen to the negative campaigns. They show that listening to what a large part of Québec is and wants worries the parties who see it as a minority whose difference is difficult to tolerate. Do you believe it too? I invite you to share this summary of our vision, and to invite your people to do the same. We have less money than the opponents? We have the number and passion for Québec. Just for Québec! Because Québec is us. Thank you for your support!" // Video Text: L'énergie propre c'est nous. La vitalité des régions c'est nous. La langue, notre culture, la laïcité,

c'est nous. Le Québec c'est nous. Bloc Québécois. Bloc.org. (2019-10-07; 13:54; 554 reactions; 419 likes; 447 shares; 54 comments) (Yves-François Blanchet 2019d)

Figure 0-96: Facebook's Blanchet: Post Text: À deux jours du débat en anglais, je me demande pourquoi je suis le seul à revendiquer ce qui devrait être un hymne pour les fédéralistes et un début d'indication que leur fédération fonctionne. Nous sommes de la nation québécoise en quête d'un pays mais aussi frères et sœurs de tous les Français d'Amérique. Partagez... au Canada! 🌸 🌻 😊 (Translated) With two days to go before the debate in English, I wonder why I am the only one claiming what should be an anthem for the federalists and a beginning of indication that their federation is working. We are from the nation of Québec in search of a country but also brothers and sisters of all the French people in America. Share ... in Canada! // Image Text: "Je souhaite juste que les francophones du Canada et les Acadiens aient le même traitement que les anglophones du Québec" (Translated) "I want French-speaking people in English Canada and Acadians to get the same treatment as English-speaking people in Québec." (2019-10-05; 22:03; 634 reactions; 472 likes; 323 shares; 71 comments) (Yves-François Blanchet 2019b)

Figure 0-97: Facebook's Blanchet: Post Text: En nous attaquant et traitant de tous les noms, en se la jouant paternalistes qui au mieux tolèrent notre nation, nos langue, valeurs et intérêts, les adversaires ont provoqué un ressac qui invite les Québécois à se demander ce qu'ils veulent. Ou pas. 🌸 (Translated) By attacking us and calling us names, playing paternalistic who at best tolerate our nation, language, values and interests, opponents have caused a backlash that invites Quebecers to ask themselves what they want. Or not. 🌸 // Web Link Text: Mon vote (2019-10-07; 09:34; 439 reactions; 148 shares; 67 comments) (Yves-François Blanchet 2019c)

Figure 0-98: Facebook's Blanchet: Web Link Content from Figure 0-97: Mon vote (Martineau 2019)

Figure 0-99: Facebook's PPC: Post Text: Maxime Bernier WILL be in the Leaders' Debates Commission debates! #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI #elxn43 // Image Text: Today, democracy won! (2019-09-16; 19:00; 1,633 reactions; 1,384 likes; 322 shares; 271 comments) (People's Party of Canada 2019a)

Figure 0-100: Facebook's PPC: Post Text: "Aside from curbing immigration, the party wants to eliminate the deficit in 2 years, end subsidies to corporations, cut funding to multiculturalism programs, make it easier to build pipelines, scrap the carbon tax and phase out supply management for agricultural products. agricultural products." // Web Link Text: Bernier paints himself as genuine crusading conservative in leaders debate. (2019-10-08; 11:30; 894 reactions; 792 likes; 274 shares; 128 comments) (People's Party of Canada 2019f)

Figure 0-101: Facebook's PPC: Web Link Content from Figure 0-100: "Bernier Paints Himself as Genuine Crusading Conservative in Leaders Debate" (Bronskill 2019)

Figure 0-102: Facebook's PPC: Post Text: Received the good news from the Leaders' Debates Commission as I'm about to board my plane for Saint John! // Video: Bernier states, "Hello everyone. I am very pleased with Mr. Johnston's decision to invite me to the leaders' debate.

That was the right decision. Half of Canadians wanted to hear from us. And Canadians will be able to look at all the options. And I can tell you that the People's Party is a real national party with serious reforms that need to be done for a freer and a more prosperous country. See you soon. Thank you. (2019-09-16; 14:31; 869 reactions; 719 likes; 225 shares; 157 comments) (People's Party of Canada 2019c)

Figure 0-103: Facebook's Bernier: Post Text: Seems like Canadians were interested in what I had to say at the leaders' debate last night. ----- On dirait que les Canadiens étaient intéressés par ce que j'avais à dire au débat des chefs hier soir. // Image Text: Google Trends. Compare. Interest over time. (2019-10-08; 11:30; 2,336 reactions; 1,964 likes; 543 shares; 676 comments) (Bernier 2019j)

Figure 0-104: Facebook's Bernier: Post Text: Aside from curbing immigration, the party wants to eliminate the deficit in 2 years, end subsidies to corporations, cut funding to multiculturalism programs, make it easier to build pipelines, scrap the carbon tax and phase out supply management for agricultural products. // Web Link Text from Figure 0-101: Bernier paints himself as genuine crusading conservative in leaders debate (2019-10-08; 13:00; 1,478 reactions; 1,281 likes; 318 shares; 506 comments) (Bernier 2019h)

Figure 0-105: Facebook's Bernier: Post Text: The PPC is the only major party with policies different than the others on: -immigration -multiculturalism -equalization -tax cuts -balancing the budget -climate alarmism -corporate welfare -foreign aid -UN globalism -defunding CBC -supply management -health care -veterans pension -interprovincial barriers -free speech -respecting the Constitution -etc. If the Leaders' Debates Commission announces tomorrow that I am not invited to the Leaders' Debates, IT WILL DENY THE DEMOCRATIC RIGHT OF CANADIANS TO HEAR ALL THE OPTIONS. (2019-09-15; 14:33; 1,264 reactions; 1,119 likes; 304 shares; 338 comments) (Bernier 2019a)

Figure 0-106: Twitter's Conservatives: Post Text: Tonight's debate made one thing clear: Andrew Scheer is the only leader that can be trusted to help you and your family get ahead. #cdnpoli #elxn43. // Image Text: Andrew Scheer wins debate. (2019-10-07; 21:00; 4,686 likes; 1,283 retweets; 2,791 comments) (Conservative Party 2019c)

Figure 0-107: Twitter's Conservatives: Post Text: .@JustinTrudeau and @TOAdamVaughan have a secret plan to tax the sale of your home at 50%. This is Trudeau's hidden agenda: tax hikes to pay for his massive deficits. You work hard, you increase the value of your home, and Liberals take 50%. How is that fair? #NotAsAdvertised. // Image Text: Policy Proposal 2: Housing Affordability. Topic: Housing Affordability. Prepared by: Adam Vaughan. Campaign platform 2019. "A 50% tax after one year of ownership" (2019-09-12; 15:31; 1,137 likes; 1,037 retweets; 535 comments) (Conservative Party 2019a)

Figure 0-108: Twitter's Conservatives: Post Text: SHARE this video if you think Justin Trudeau belongs in provincial politics. #cdnpoli #elxn43 // Video Text: Share this video and make Justin Trudeau the next Kathleen Wynne. // Video: Barton states, "Mr. Scheer you have one minute to respond. Mr. Scheer." Scheer states, "First of all Mr. Trudeau, you seem to be oddly obsessed with provincial politics. There is a vacancy for the Ontario Liberal Leadership if you're so

focused on provincial politics, go and run for the leadership of that party, Mr. Trudeau. (2019-10-08; 15:00; 48,600 views; 1,865 likes; 988 retweets; 424 comments) (Conservative Party 2019d)

Figure 0-109: Twitter's Conservatives: Post Text: Justin Trudeau is a compulsive liar. #NotAsAdvertised #Elxn43 #cdnpoli #LeadersDebate2019 // Image Text: Trudeau is a compulsive liar" (2019-10-10; 20:38; 1,406 likes; 552 retweets; 657 comments) (Conservative Party 2019e)

Figure 0-110: Twitter's Scheer: Post Text: Another week in the books! Momentum is building as more and more Canadians show their support for our plan to help you get ahead. Join me, and let's make life more affordable for everyone! // Video: Scheer states, "Another week in the books. I'm just about to take off from Toronto, going to spend a few hours with my kids tonight, and then tomorrow, and then back at it on Monday. We start off the week in Whitby, Ontario. Nous avons commencé à Whitby, Ontario. We had our first French-language debate, the only one so far that Justin Trudeau showed up at. That's where we found out that the Liberals have a second plane, and that Justin Trudeau is a high carbon hypocrite. Justin Trudeau est un faux-écologiste. The momentum is really building. More and more Canadians are realizing that Justin Trudeau is making life more expensive, that after the election, taxes are going to go up, especially his carbon tax, and their looking forward to a Conservative government that will live within its means, leave more money in your pocket, because it's time for you to get ahead. Plus. Pour vous. Dès maintenant. Video Text: It's time for you to get ahead. Conservative. (2019-10-06; 21:37; 36,100 views; 2,109 likes; 636 retweets; 394 comments) (Scheer 2019b)

Figure 0-111: Twitter's Scheer: Post Text: As Prime Minister, I will work to make your commute shorter and more affordable. Under Justin Trudeau, critical projects that will reduce your commute times aren't getting built. It's time for you to get ahead. // Video: Scheer states, "In 2015 Justin Trudeau made a lot of promises to get elected. He said he would balance the budget. He said he would help the middle class. He even said he would be accountable and ethical. Now here we are just four years later, and he has broken almost every promise he has made to Canadians. Including his promises to build infrastructure. In 2015, he made billions in promises, claiming he'd make your commute easier. But critical projects that will reduce your commute times aren't getting built. A new Conservative government will work with provincial and territorial governments to build those projects that make a difference in people's lives. By reducing commute times and congestion and getting people home faster after a long day. Projects like the Ontario Line and the Yonge Subway Extension here in the GTA. And the Massey Tunnel Replacement in Vancouver. And the Third Link in Québec City. As Prime Minister, I will help make your commute shorter and more affordable. Because it's time for you to get ahead." Video Text: It's time for you to get ahead. Conservative. (2019-10-09; 08:44; 29,800 views; 1,586 likes; 453 retweets; 423 comments) (Scheer 2019i)

Figure 0-112: Twitter's Scheer: Post Text: Let's do this. It's time for you to get ahead! #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 (2019-10-07; 18:51; 1,533 likes; 321 retweets; 220 comments) (Scheer 2019e)

Figure 0-113: Twitter's Liberals: Post Text: "A Québecer is a Canadian and will remain a Canadian under my watch." - @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli" // Image Text: "By definition, a Québecer can do anything a Canadian can do, because a Québecer is a Canadian and will remain a Canadian under my watch. – Justin Trudeau (2019-10-07; 20:54; 3,151 likes; 611 retweets; 626 comments) (Liberal Party 2019a)

Figure 0-114: Twitter's Liberals: Post Text: We've invested \$2.7 billion since 2016 to strengthen First Nations water and wastewater systems. Since then, 87 long-term drinking water advisories have been lifted, and we will end the rest by 2021. @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli // Image Text: We will eliminate all long-term drinking water advisories on reserve by 2021. (2019-10-07; 20:04; 1,187 likes; 436 retweets; 277 comments) (Liberal Party 2019b)

Figure 0-115: Twitter's Liberals: Post Text: Are we really surprised that the Conservatives have been caught lying to Canadians - again? // Web Link Text from Figure 0-74: Truth Tracker: Conservatives falsely claim Trudeau lowered taxes for millionaires (2019-10-09; 19:32; 1,118 likes; 435 retweets; 275 comments) (Liberal Party 2019c)

Figure 0-116: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: To be clear: We will NOT put a 50% tax on the sale of your home." // Video Text: Andrew Scheer is sending a letter to millions of Canadians with his latest lies about our platform. To be clear, we will not put a 50% tax on the sale of your home. Here's what we will do: Lower the price of your first home by 10%. Give more money to people in places where houses cost more. Tax vacant homes owned by people who don't live in Canada. Give Canadians an interest-free loan up to \$40,000 to adapt their homes for climate change. Whatever mistruths you hear from the Conservatives, know that we're for moving forward—for everyone. Choose Forward. Liberal (2019-10-07; 14:36; 300,400 views; 5,522 likes; 1,816 retweets; 1,862 comments) (Response to Conservative's Post in Figure 0-107) (Trudeau 2019j).

Figure 0-117: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: Andrew Scheer is against gay marriage, against a woman's right to choose, against stronger gun control, and against fighting climate change. @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli // Video Text: Andrew Scheer: X Same-sex marriage, X Woman's right to choose, X Gun control, X A price on pollution. Choose forward. Liberal (2019-10-07; 19:40; 479,400 views; 5,393 likes; 1,542 retweets; 1,319 comments) (Trudeau 2019c)

Figure 0-118: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: I asked you during the debate, @AndrewScheer and you still haven't answered: why are you offering millionaires a \$50,000 tax break and 17 billion dollars in cuts for everybody else? #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli (2019-10-07; 21:11; 5,771 likes; 1,279 retweets; 1,175 comments) (Trudeau 2019e)

Figure 0-119: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: .@JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli // Image Text: "Mr. Bernier, your role on this stage right now seems to be to say publicly what Mr. Scheer believes privately. - Justin Trudeau (2019-10-07; 19:21; 3,960 likes; 898 retweets; 607 comments) (Trudeau 2019f)

Figure 0-120: Twitter's Trudeau: Post Text: Andrew Scheer confirmed on Quebec TV he would allow his MPs to reopen the abortion debate. A real leader would stop them. But the truth is he agrees with them. @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli" (2019-10-07; 20:37; 2,562 likes; 889 retweets; 686 comments) (Trudeau 2019b)

Figure 0-121: Twitter's NDP: Post Text: Don't want Mr. Delay OR Mr. Deny? You don't have to settle for either guy. If you want someone who will do something to fight climate change, just pick Jagmeet Singh! #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn43 // Image Text: Mr. Delay Mr. Deny (2019-10-07; 21:54; 1,757 likes; 437 retweets; 76 comments) (NDP 2019a)

Figure 0-122: Twitter's NDP: Post Text: This weekend, Jagmeet visited Grassy Narrows, where the devastating impacts of mercury contamination have impacted 3 generations. We can make sure every community has access to clean water. We just have to make it a priority. #InItForYou #elxn43 #cdnpoli // Video: Various voices of Grassy Narrows. "There is nothing more important than clean water. My name is Judy Da Silva. My name is Darwin Fobister. Sharice Bruce. I am from Grassy Narrows. I live in a community that is very destroyed by the effects of mercury poisoning in the water. This water can kill us eventually. It's already killing us slowly. As you get older you begin to face more health issues because of the mercury that's in our bodies. I'm poisoned by mercury and I'm a mother of five. In the 1960s and '70s, industrial pollution contaminated the water in Grassy Narrows with mercury, making it one of Canada's worst environmental disasters. The contamination in this community of about 1,000 residents has affected three generations. When we found out the mercury was in the water it had a really devastating effect in our community economically, socially, and all that. It's like a genocide of our people. A lot of our people have died from the mercury poisoning and still today they are. Ninety per cent of people tested in Grassy Narrows experience symptoms of mercury poisoning. Industry is given too much free rein on our lands to put their pollutants out there and their chemicals – and they need to put water first. No one should be without safe, clean water. For too long, Grassy Narrows First Nation, like many Indigenous communities, has been left behind by governments. We have a responsibility to make sure the services of the community are improved, to care for mercury survivors, and to help Grassy Narrows children and youth get the support they need to thrive." Video: Singh states, "Why is it that we ask the question whether or not Indigenous people should have clean drinking water? We've got to take a minute and think, why is that even a question? Yes, they deserve clean drinking water, yes, we can make it happen, it's a matter of priority." Video Text: Jagmeet Singh, NDP. In it for you. On se bat pour vous. (2019-10-07; 21:34; 21,400 views; 609 likes; 220 retweets; 19 comments) (NDP 2019c)

Figure 0-123: Twitter's NDP: Post Text: Justin Trudeau did everything he could to keep SNC-Lavalin out of court – but he spent nearly a million dollars fighting Indigenous kids. What kind of leader chooses to fight kids in court instead of help them? #CanadaDebates2019 // Video Text: What kind of leader fights indigenous kids in court? Justin Trudeau: Not in it for you. (2019-10-07; 19:58; 24,300 views; 625 likes; 214 retweets; 26 comments) (NDP 2019b)

Figure 0-124: Twitter's Singh: Post Text: A man has no place in a discussion of a woman's right to choose. #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn43 (2019-10-07; 20:41; 22,720 likes; 4,206 retweets; 561 comments) (Singh 2019c)

Figure 0-125: Twitter's Singh: You don't have to choose between Mr. Delay (@JustinTrudeau) & Mr. Deny (@AndrewScheer). It's time to start fighting the climate crisis like we want to win by taking on the largest polluters & creating 300,000 new jobs in the clean energy economy of the future. #CanadaDebates2019 (2019-10-07; 20:12; 5,076 likes; 1,141 retweets; 160 comments) (Singh 2019h)

Figure 0-126: Twitter's Singh: Post Text: What we're seeing tonight is Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Scheer arguing over what is worse for Canada. I believe we need to be fighting for what will be best for Canada. We need to demand more – not be scared into settling for less. #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn43 (2019-10-07; 19:52; 5,439 likes; 1,016 retweets; 150 comments) (Singh 2019g)


Figure 0-127: Twitter's Green: Post Text: Pipelines Won't Solve Climate Change  ♀
#LeadersDebate #elxn43 #cdnpoli (2019-10-07; 20:47; 951 likes; 226 retweets; 83 comments) (Green Party Canada 2019a)

Figure 0-128: Twitter's Green: Post Text: Tired of the divisive politics you've seen this election? Blame first past the post. @ElizabethMay: "It makes each party a rival of the other." We need solutions, not bickering. Greens fight for proportional representation. #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli" (2019-10-07; 19:46; 506 likes; 165 retweets; 49 comments) (Green Party Canada 2019b)

Figure 0-129: Twitter's Green: Post Text: "You bought a pipeline. You can't be a climate leader and buy a pipeline." - @ElizabethMay Trudeau's targets are a commitment to failure. #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli (2019-10-07; 20:10; 402 likes; 161 retweets; 17 comments) (Green Party Canada 2019c)

Figure 0-130: Twitter's May: Post Text: So - after all the debates are over - the Conservatives will release their platform. This is a new low in respect for voters. #GPC #respect (2019-10-10; 14:02; 3,419 likes; 854 retweets; 309 comments) (May 2019h)

Figure 0-131: Twitter's May: Post Text: In Canada, all parties represented in Parliament should be included in debates. By excluding a Green voice, TVA fails to offer the full picture that voters are facing at the polls this election. <https://www.macleans.ca/opinion/the-green-party-wont-be-silenced-by-tva/> (2019-10-02; 17:51; 635 likes; 202 retweets; 68 comments) (see Figure 0-132) (May 2019b)

Figure 0-132: Twitter's May: Web Link Content from Figure 0-131: May - The Green Party won't be silenced by TVA (May 2019c)

Figure 0-133: Twitter's May: Post Text: Green Party exclusive middle seat in economy fully loaded! My husband @kidderjohn and I are off to Ottawa for my preparations for #leadersdebate2019. Watch as I try to add peace and loving kindness to 5 angry men. :) #GPC (2019-10-06; 15:00; 1,575 likes; 162 retweets; 352 comments) (May 2019d)

Figure 0-134: Twitter's May: Post Text: If I become PM, I will encourage global philanthropy to support Canadian NGOs pushing for a clean energy economy and healthy biodiversity. We will protect the rights of civil society org's to comment on settled science under Canada's election and charitable laws. #GPC #climate (2019-10-07; 12:17; 762 likes; 145 retweets; 172 replies) (May 2019e)

Figure 0-135: Twitter's Bloc: Post Text: Justin Trudeau va plus loin en anglais qu'en français. Il laisse entendre qu'il va contester la #Loi21 adoptée par l'Assemblée nationale et appuyée par 70% des Québécois et Québécoises. #polcan #débatdeschefs #elxn43 #leadersdebate2019” (Translated) Justin Trudeau goes further in English than in French. He hints that he will challenge Bill 21 adopted by the National Assembly and supported by 70% of Quebecers. #polcan#débatdeschefs#elxn43#leadersdebate2019 (2019-10-07; 19:38; 215 likes; 172 retweets; 34 comments) (Bloc Québécois 2019d)

Figure 0-136: Twitter's Bloc: Post Text: “Les premières nations sont des nations. Le Canada est une nation. Le Québec est une nation. Et une nation ne laisse pas sa culture entre les mains d'une autre nation.” #ÉgalÀÉgal #polcan #débatdeschefs #elxn43 #leadersdebate2019 (Translated) “First nations are nations. Canada is a nation. Quebec is a nation. And one nation does not leave its culture in the hands of another nation.” #ÉgalÀÉgal #polcan #débatdeschefs #elxn43 #leadersdebate2019” (2019-10-07; 20:03; 227 likes; 86 retweets; 19 comments) (Bloc Québécois 2019e)

Figure 0-137: Twitter's Bloc: Post Text: #Débatdeschefs en anglais: “J'ai hâte d'entendre ces messieurs nous dire la même chose qu'ils nous ont dit ce soir lors du débat en français jeudi.” - @yfblanchet #polcan #elx43 #LeadersDebate2019 (Translated) #Débatdeschefs in English: “I look forward to hearing these gentlemen tell us the same thing they told us tonight during the debate in French Thursday.” - @yfblanchet #polcan#elx43#LeadersDebate2019 (2019-10-07; 21:04; 227 likes; 81 retweets; 16 comments) (Bloc Québécois 2019c)



Figure 0-138: Twitter's Blanchet: Post Text: À 2 jours du débat anglais, pourquoi suis-je le seul à revendiquer ce qui devrait être un hymne des fédéralistes et une indication que leur fédération marche? La nation québécoise envisage un pays mais est aussi sœur de tous les Français d'Amérique. Partagez... au Canada!   (Translated) With two days to go before the English debate, why am I the only one claiming what should be a federalists anthem and an indication that their federation works? The Quebec nation envisions a country but is also the sister of all the French people in America. Share ... in Canada! // Image Text: “Je souhaite juste que les francophones du Canada et les Acadiens aient le même traitement que les anglophones du Québec” (Translated) “I want French-speaking people in English Canada and Acadians to get the same treatment as English-speaking people in Québec.” (2019-10-05; 21:48; 467 likes; 189 retweets; 33 comments) (Yves-F. Blanchet 2019a)

Figure 0-139: Twitter's Blanchet: Post Text: Troublant. Sa question était indigne, comme son tweet mercredi dernier. (Translated) Disturbing. His question was outrageous, as was his tweet last Wednesday. // Web Link: “Rappelons que la modératrice @althiaraj soupait en tête-à-tête avec @gmbutts il y a quelques jours. Ça, c'est assez particulier mettons. Certains pourraient dire que ceci explique cela... #elxn43 (Translated) Remember that the moderator @althiaraj was

having dinner with @gmbutts a few days ago. That's pretty special, let's say. Some might say this explains it... #elxn43 (2019-10-07; 22:39; 332 likes; 170 retweets; 37 comments) (Yves-F. Blanchet 2019b)

Figure 0-140: Twitter's Blanchet: Post Text: Est-il étrange que le thème central de la campagne fédérale soit une loi déjà adoptée par une législature 'provinciale'? Ou juste révélateur de la coexistence forcée de deux nations, l'une conquérante, l'autre conquise. Trudeau se range avec le Canada. (Translated) Is it strange that the central theme of the federal campaign is a law already passed by a 'provincial' legislature? Or is it just indicative of the forced coexistence of two nations, one conquering, the other conquered. Trudeau stands with Canada. (2019-10-08; 09:25; 343 likes; 127 retweets; 42 comments) (Yves-F. Blanchet 2019c)

Figure 0-141: Twitter's Blanchet: Web Link Content from Figure 0-140: Trudeau, Capitaine Canada contre la loi 21 (Robitaille 2019)

Figure 0-142: Twitter's People's: Post Text: It's happening! (2019-09-16; 13:32; 696 likes; 233 retweets; 59 comments) (PPC HQ - People's Party of Canada 2019a)

Figure 0-143: Twitter's PPC: Post Text: @mmccdenier @TVAreseau @munkdebate @MaximeBernier We need to hear all voices. That's what democracy is about. #PutMaximeBernierIn (2019-09-16; 21:06; 27 likes; 34 retweets; 0 comments) (PPC HQ - People's Party of Canada 2019b)

Figure 0-144: Twitter's PPC: Post Image; Oh yeah. It's all coming together. (2019-09-16; 14:01; 113 likes; 25 retweets; 7 comments) (PPC HQ - People's Party of Canada 2019c)

Figure 0-145: Twitter's Bernier: Post Text: Here's the People's Party of Canada ad that will air in the coming days on the CTV Network. Watch and SHARE! // Video: Bernier states, "Are you tired of the same thing over, and over again from the Liberals and Conservatives? They say anything to get elected. So how can you as a voter keep doing the same thing and expect a different result? I'm Maxime Bernier. The People's Party of Canada will reduce immigration, lower your taxes, and fight political correctness. It's time for a change. On election day, try something new. Find out more at PeoplesPartyofCanada.ca (2019-10-07; 12:18; 59,000 views; 2,764 likes; 1,440 retweets; 228 comments) (Bernier 2019f)

Figure 0-146: Twitter's Bernier: Post Text: Received the good news from the @debates_can as I'm about to board my plane for Saint John! // Video: Bernier states, "Hello everyone. I am very pleased with Mr. Johnston's decision to invite me to the leaders' debate. That was the right decision. Half of Canadians wanted to hear from us. And Canadians will be able to look at all the options. And I can tell you that the People's Party is a real national party with serious reforms that need to be done for a freer and a more prosperous country. See you soon. Thank you." (2019-09-16; 14:08; 70,400 views; 3,421 likes; 1,114 retweets; 530 comments) (Bernier 2019b)

Figure 0-147: Twitter's Bernier: Post Text: It's sad to see @theJagmeetSingh repeat the lies and slanders of the far Left antifa crowd and call for censorship. I don't hate anyone. I love my country. And millions of Canadians agrees with PPC policies. Is he that afraid many more will

find out during the debates? // Link Text from Figure 0-148: CBC News @ CBCNews – Sep 17. NDP Leader Jagmeet Singh says Maxime Bernier, the leader of the People’s Party of Canada, promotes “an ideology of hate that spreads prejudice and disinformation.” [cbc.ca/1.5287227](https://www.cbc.ca/1.5287227) @peterzimonjic #cdnpoli (2019-09-18; 09:03; 2,320 likes; 879 retweets; 257 comments) (Bernier 2019c)

Figure 0-148: Twitter’s Bernier: Web Link Content from Figure 0-147: Singh asks commissioner to rethink decision to allow Bernier to join election debates (Zimonjic 2019)

Figure 0-149: Twitter’s Bernier: Post Text: Scheer at the debate: PPC supporters come from “the darkest parts of Twitter.” He said this after paying his hired mudslinger Kinsella to fabricate this story and manipulate the media. Scheer and Trudeau practice the same kind of DIRTY POLITICS. #LibConCorruption (2019-10-19; 09:23; 1,752 likes; 811 retweets; 137 comments) (Bernier 2019k)

Figure 0-150: Twitter’s #CanadaDebates2019: “A man has no place in a discussion of a woman’s right to choose. #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn43” (2019-10-07; 20:41; 22,720 likes; 4,206 retweets; 561 comments) (Singh 2019c)

Figure 0-151: Twitter’s #CanadaDebates2019: “You know what would be better than all the white leaders congratulating @theJagmeetSingh on dealing w/ racism in the campaign? Actually coming up w/ a plan to deal with racism/white supremacy in their platforms. #elxn43 #CanadaDebates2019 #cdnpoli #leadersdebate2019” (2019-10-07; 19:34; 5,088 likes; 1,272 retweets; 62 comments) (Hudson 2019)

Figure 0-152: Twitter’s #CanadaDebates2019: “You don’t have to choose between Mr. Delay (@JustinTrudeau) & Mr. Deny (@AndrewScheer). It’s time to start fighting the climate crisis like we want to win by taking on the largest polluters & creating 300,000 new jobs in the clean energy economy of the future. #CanadaDebates2019” (2019-10-07; 20:12; 5,077 likes; 1,141 retweets; 160 comments) (Singh 2019h)

Figure 0-153: Twitter’s #LeadersDebate2019: “.@theJagmeetSingh on his climate plan: ‘You do not need to choose between Mr. Delay and Mr. Deny. There is another option.’ #elxn43 #leadersdebate2019” (2019-10-07; 20:10; 302,500 views; 5,790 likes; 1,656 retweets; 187 comments) (Maclean’s Magazine 2019)

Figure 0-154: Twitter’s #LeadersDebate2019: “Andrew Scheer is against gay marriage, against a woman’s right to choose, against stronger gun control, and against fighting climate change. @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli” (2019-10-07; 19:40; 483,000 views; 5,364 likes; 1,524 retweets; 1,287 comments) (Trudeau 2019c)

Figure 0-155: Twitter’s #LeadersDebate2019: “You know what would be better than all the white leaders congratulating @theJagmeetSingh on dealing w/ racism in the campaign? Actually coming up w/ a plan to deal with racism/white supremacy in their platforms. #elxn43 #CanadaDebates2019 #cdnpoli #leadersdebate2019” (2019-10-07; 19:34; 5,088 likes; 1,272 retweets; 62 comments) (Hudson 2019)

Figure 0-156: Instagram's Conservatives: Post Text: Tonight's debate made one thing clear: @andrewjscheer is the only leader that can be trusted to help you and your family get ahead. // Image Text: Andrew Scheer wins debate (2019-10-07; 4,570 likes; 432 comments) (Conservative Party of Canada 2019b)

Figure 0-157: Instagram's Conservatives: Post Text: Repost @andrewjscheer . . . Let's do this. It's time for you to get ahead! #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 CA Allons-y! Plus. Pour vous. Dès maintenant! #DébatDesChefs2019 #elxn43 (2019-10-07; 1,669 likes; 37 comments) (Conservative Party of Canada 2019a)

Figure 0-158: Instagram's Scheer: Post Text: Let's do this. It's time for you to get ahead! #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 CA Allons-y! Plus. Pour vous. Dès maintenant! #DébatDesChefs2019 #elxn43" (2019-10-07; 5,754 likes; 477 comments) (Scheer 2019f)

Figure 0-159: Instagram's Scheer: Post Text: Heading into the debate with my better half on Thursday. CA En arrivant au débat jeudi avec ma douce moitié. #Latergram #Canada #bestwife #family #cdnpoli #polcan #elxn43 #meilleureépouse #famille (2019-10-13; 5,268 likes; 142 comments) (Scheer 2019j)

Figure 0-160: Instagram's Scheer: Post Text: I kicked off National Newspaper Week with copies of the Fort Times, from my local community in Saskatchewan, and the @OttawaCitizen, where my dad worked as a librarian. Local papers are our communities' lifelines for keeping up with the news. #NewspapersMatter. CA J'ai donné le coup d'envoi de la Semaine nationale de la presse avec des exemplaires du Fort Times, de chez moi en Saskatchewan, et du @OttawaCitizen, où travaillait mon père comme bibliothécaire. Les journaux locaux sont vitaux pour que nous restions à l'affût de l'actualité. #LesJournauxComptent . . . #Canada #polcan #cdnpoli #elxn43" (2019-10-07; 2,877 likes; 155 comments) (Scheer 2019c)

Figure 0-161: Instagram's Liberals: Post Text: In the past week, Liberal volunteers across the country made over 2 MILLION knocks & calls - a new record! Congrats to @lockhartalaina, @genevievehinse, @marcomendicino, @amarjeet_sohi, @sukhdhaliwal_mp, @richard.hebertlsj, and their awesome teams for being the top teams across the country this week. To all Liberal teams working hard to reach more Canadians than ever before - keep up the great work! — Au cours de la dernière semaine, les bénévoles libéraux d'un bout à l'autre du pays ont fait plus de 2 MILLIONS d'appels et de visites - un nouveau record! Cette semaine, @lockhartalaina, @genevievehinse, @marcomendicino, @amarjeet_sohi, @sukhdhaliwal_mp, @richard.hebertlsj et leurs fabuleuses équipes se sont les plus démarqués parmi toutes les équipes de partout à travers le pays. Félicitations! Et à toutes les autres équipes qui travaillent sans relâche pour interagir avec plus de Canadiens que jamais auparavant - continuez votre superbe travail, vous êtes indispensables! (2019-10-08; 1,267 likes; 57 comments) (Liberal Party of Canada 2019)

Figure 0-162: Instagram's Trudeau: Post Text: The best kind of debate prep: walking these two to school this morning! CA La meilleure préparation pour un débat : aller les reconduire à l'école ce matin! (2019-10-07; 181,464 likes; 2,647 comments) (Trudeau 2019h)

Figure 0-163: Instagram's Trudeau: Post Text: Préparation pour le débat. Debate prep. (2019-10-02; 176,691 likes; 5,315 comments) (Trudeau 2019a)

Figure 0-164: Instagram's NDP: Post Text: Canvassing blitz with our candidates and their local teams! . Melissa Jean-Baptiste Vajda, NDP candidate for University– Rosedale Mark Cherrington, NDP candidate for Edmonton Griesbach Allison Brown, NDP candidate for Dufferin-Caledon Barrington Walker, NDP candidate for Kington and the islands Audrey Redman, NDP candidate for Edmonton Riverbend . Sign up now to give a few hours of your time and be part of the campaign team! Link in bio. #InItForYou #elxn43#cdnpoli (2019-10-07; 751 likes; 17 comments) (Canada's NDP // NDP du Canada 2019b)

Figure 0-165: Instagram's NDP: Post Text: Flashback to the #firstdebate where Jagmeet went toe-to-toe with Justin Trudeau on the climate crisis and called him out for always siding with his mega rich friends over everyday people. #InItForYou #elxn43 #cdnpoli #fbf (2019-09-20; 742 likes; 42 comments) (Canada's NDP // NDP du Canada 2019a)

Figure 0-166: Instagram's Singh: Post Text: You know it's been a long day when the ears are out 🤔 #elxn43 CA Tu sais que c'est une longue journée quand les oreilles finissent par sortir 🤔 #elxn43 (2019-10-06; 68,811 likes; 775 comments) (Singh 2019b)

Figure 0-167: Instagram's Singh: Post Text: Debate night is a wrap! I love every opportunity I get to share the stories of the people I've met across Canada – and offer our plan to make life easier for people, instead of protecting the interests of the rich & powerful. #elxn43 #CanadaDebates2019 CA C'est fini pour le débat de ce soir! C'est très important pour moi de saisir chaque occasion pour partager les histoires des gens que je rencontre à travers le Canada et présenter notre plan pour rendre votre vie plus facile, pas celle des plus riches. (2019-10-07; 68,211 likes; 802 comments) (Singh 2019d)

Figure 0-168: Instagram's Greens: Post Text: Debate night! The only female leader, Elizabeth has been an MP for 8 years and devoted her life to defending the 🌍. She's ¹⁰⁰ sure to make a splash, laying down some hard facts and honest, ethical, caring leadership. 🇨🇦 Buckle up, boys! Watch at cbcnews.ca (2019-10-07; 3,175 likes; 132 comments) (Green Party of Canada 2019c)

Figure 0-169: Instagram's Greens: Post Text: 🇨🇦🇨🇦🇨🇦 // Image Text: Tired of the divisive politics you've seen this election? Blame first past the post. @ElizabethMay: "It makes each party a rival of the other." We need solutions, not bickering. Greens fight for proportional representation #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli (2019-10-07; 1,668 likes; 46 comments) (Green Party of Canada 2019a)

Figure 0-170: Instagram's May: Post Text: Happy Thanksgiving! From our happy family to yours! counting my blessings. #love (2019-10-14; 335 likes; 26 comments) (May 2019i)

Figure 0-171: Instagram's Bloc: Post Text: 🇫🇷 #BlocQC #polcan #polqc // Image Text: "J'ai hâte d'entendre ces messieurs nous dire la même chose qu'ils nous on dit ce soir lors du débat en français jeudi." (Translated) "I cannot wait to hear these gentlemen tell us the same thing they

told us tonight during the debate in French on Thursday.” (2019-10-08; 279 likes; 14 comments) (Bloc Québécois 2019g)

Figure 0-172: Instagram’s Blanchet: Post Text: À deux jours du débat en anglais, je me demande pourquoi je suis le seul à revendiquer ce qui devrait être un hymne pour les fédéralistes et un début d’indication que leur fédération fonctionne. Nous sommes de la nation québécoise en quête d’un pays mais aussi frères et sœurs de tous les Français d’Amérique. Partagez... au Canada! 🌸🌻 (Translated) With two days to go before the English debate, why am I the only one claiming what should be a federalist’s anthem and an indication that their federation works? The Québec nation envisions a country but is also the sister of all the French people in America. Share ... in Canada!” // Image Text: “Je souhaite juste que les francophones du Canada et les Acadiens aient le même traitement que les anglophones du Québec” (Translated) “I want French-speaking people in English Canada and Acadians to get the same treatment as English-speaking people in Québec.” (2019-10-05; 285 likes; 21 comments) (Yves-François Blanchet 2019a)

Figure 0-173: Instagram’s Blanchet: Post Text: À la veille du débat final, avec une brise au parfum de nation et d’espoirs, je veux remercier les gens qui multiplient les messages de confiance. Je ne sais pas si je serai à la hauteur de vos vœux, mais ce petit homme, fils de ma fille, sera mon inspiration. Merci! ❤️🌻🌸 (Translated) On the eve of the final debate, with a nation-breeze and hopes, I want to thank the people who multiply the messages of trust. I do not know if I will live up to your wishes, but this little man, son of my daughter, will be my inspiration. (2019-10-09; 264 likes; 21 comments) (Yves-François Blanchet 2019f)

Figure 0-174: Instagram’s PPC: Post Text: Maxime Bernier WILL be in the Leaders’ Debates Commission debates! #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI #elxn43 // Image Text: Today, democracy won! (2019-09-16; 1,397 likes; 144 comments) (People’s Party of Canada 2019b)

Figure 0-175: Instagram’s PPC: Post Text: The HQ team is watching the debates from the government funded trailers outside the debate venue. How do you think Max is doing? #elxn43 #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI // Image Text: Maxime Bernier (2019-10-07; 1,233 likes; 243 comments) (People’s Party of Canada 2019d)

Figure 0-176: Instagram’s PPC: Post Text: We’re less than 90 minutes away from a landmark moment in Canadian history. #elxn43 #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI #canadadebates2019 // Image Text: PPC dressing room (2019-10-07; 940 likes; 42 comments) (People’s Party of Canada 2019e)

Figure 0-177: Instagram’s Bernier: Post Text: I needed to make one last stop before turning in for tonight. We need more people like Dorothy in Canada. Je devais faire un dernier arrêt avant de me coucher ce soir. Nous avons besoin plus de gens comme Dorothy au Canada. (2019-10-07; 2,977 likes; 183 comments) (Bernier 2019g)

Figure 0-178: Instagram’s Bernier: Post Text: Final bit of pre-debate preparation. How do you guys think Max is doing this far? #elxn43 #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI (2019-10-07; 2,425 likes; 422 comments) (Bernier 2019e)

Figure 0-179: Instagram's Bernier: Post Text: Catherine et Johanne ont détourné mon Instagram. Voyons quoi d'autre qu'elles afficheront ce soir. Catherine and Johanne have hijacked my Instagram. Let's see what else they post tonight. #elxn43 #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI (2019-10-07; 774 likes; 29 comments) (Bernier 2019d)

List of Tables

Appendices can be found as a separate but connected document within the UWSpace submission.

Table 1: Facebook Page Likes and Followers of Canada's Political Parties and Leaders: October 2015 and October 2019

Table 2: Twitter Page Followers of Canada's Political Parties and Leaders: October 2015 and October 2019

Table 3: Instagram Page Followers of Canada's Political Parties and Leaders: October 2015 and October 2019

Table 4: Top 10 Shared Debate-Related Facebook Posts for Leaders and Parties in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate

Table 5: Top 10 Retweeted Debate-Related Twitter Posts for Leaders and Parties in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate

Table 6: Top 4 Liked Debate-Related Instagram Posts for Leaders and Parties in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate

Table 7: Top 10 Shared Debate-Related Facebook Posts for Leaders and Parties in Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

Table 8: Top 10 Retweeted Debate-Related Twitter Posts for Leaders and Parties in Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

Table 9: Top 10 Liked Debate-Related Instagram Posts for Leaders and Parties in Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

List of Abbreviations

@	At, addressing someone on social media, used to tag a specific user in a post
#	Hashtag, used to mark a keyword or topic for search on social media
BQ	Bloc Québécois Party
Conservatives	Conservative Party of Canada
Conservative Party	Conservative Party of Canada
CPC	Conservative Party of Canada
CPP	Canada Pension Plan
CSIS	Canadian Security Intelligence Service
EI	Employment Insurance
FP	Financial Post news media
G-7	A geopolitical consortium comprised of seven nations: Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the European Union
G20	A geopolitical consortium comprised of 19 countries and the European Union. The 19 countries are Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Korea, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States
Green Party	Green Party of Canada
GIS	Guaranteed Income Supplement
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
GPC	Green Party of Canada
HoC	House of Commons
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISIL	Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (synonymous with ISIS)
ISIS	Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (synonymous with ISIL)
Liberals	Liberal Party of Canada
Liberal Party	Liberal Party of Canada
LGBTQ2+	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and/or Questioning, and Two-Spirited
LPC	Liberal Party of Canada
MP	Member of Parliament
NDP	Canada's New Democratic Party
OAS	Old Age Security
People's Party	People's Party of Canada
PPC	People's Party of Canada
RCMP	Royal Canadian Mounted Police
RESP	Registered Education Saving Plans
RRIF	Registered Retirement Income Fund
RT	Retweet/Share function on Twitter
TVO	TV Ontario, a publicly funded English-language educational television network and media organization serving the Canadian province of Ontario
UN	United Nations

U.S.

United States (of America)

If you can influence the leaders, either with or without their conscious cooperation, you automatically influence the group which they sway. But men do not need to be actually gathered together in a public meeting or in a street riot, to be subject to the influences of mass psychology. Because man is by nature gregarious, he feels himself to be member of a herd, even when he is alone in his room with the curtains drawn. His mind retains the patterns which have been stamped on it by the group influences.

Edward Bernays (1928, 73)

1. Shaping Political Leaders' Debates: Social Media and the Fostering of *Prosopopoeia* and *Ethopoeia*

“This election is about who has the proven experience
to keep Canada safe and our economy strong.”
- Conservative Leader and Prime Minister, Stephen Harper
Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate

1.1. Introduction

Historically, leadership debates have been the centrepiece of election campaigns, traditionally exerting a lot of influence during elections, as they present the leaders to the viewing audience and inform voters about the political stance of each party and leader. Debates are typically the only nationally televised event related to the election where voters can watch party leaders together on stage discussing important political, economic, and social issues, a kind of one-stop-shopping election event. They are one of the most direct ways to compare and contrast leaders' *ethoi* and learn more about the leaders' policy platforms.

Mass media has been shaping political debate since its emergence in the gazettes of the eighteenth century,¹ with political operatives courting editors and columnists, and debate results moving afterwards out into the media, in various reports and opinion pieces. With the advent of radio, and then television, the media began literally staging the debates—microphones, cameras, lighting, backdrops—and setting the rules of engagement: who spoke when, and for how long. The political candidates responded with make-up and clothing, with gestures and voicing that suited the camera more than the rostrum, and media-shaped ethotic projections. Much has been

¹ In 1774, after an unsuccessful attempt for the U.K. House of Commons in 1771 to prosecute reporters for intrusion of privacy, journalists obtained the freedom to report parliamentary speeches. In 1783 reporters were allowed to start taking notes. And in 1839, with the court case *Hansard v Stockdale*, the courts sanctioned the publication of official verbatim accounts of parliamentary proceedings. Following the extension of the franchise by the U.K. Second Reform Act of 1867, politicians began to take the public platform as a way of winning support from voters (Coleman 2000, 3).

discussed about the intimacy of radio in the mid-twentieth century, when political figures like Franklin Delano Roosevelt could ‘enter the homes’ of listeners via his fireside chats, and the glamour of television, when John F. Kennedy could bond with viewers through the intimacy of close-ups and his seemingly direct eye contact. By the 1980s, commentators were expressing alarm that television was exerting too much control over—and trivializing—political debates. Neil Postman, for instance, complained that television had distorted these events so much that he could not use the word *debate* without irony-quotes. The candidates “confronted each other on television in what were called ‘debates’ ... events [that] were not in the least like the Lincoln-Douglas debates or anything else that goes by the name” (Postman 1985, 97). For Postman, the series of seven U.S. debates between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas in 1858 represents a golden age.² Today, however, one might think that the three U.S. debates between Ronald Reagan and Walter F. Mondale in 1984 that Postman was complaining about represent a golden age. The trajectory he identified and termed the “trivialization” of public information has continued (Postman 1985, 111). Increasingly, and dramatically so with the emergence of participatory digital media, the media are shaping and constraining leadership debates. Media do not passively respond to what happens on the debate stage. The debates are structured and performed overwhelmingly to serve those media. The influence of social media has accelerated the distortions Postman worried about to extremes, with the U.S. 2020 Presidential debates between incumbent President and Republican Party Leader Donald Trump and Democratic Party Leader Joe Biden the zenith, or the nadir, of this trajectory. But even in Canada’s comparatively tame 2015 and 2019 federal elections, the effect of social media on leadership debates is

² Stephen A. Douglas, the incumbent democratic senator of Illinois, and Abraham Lincoln, a former congressman and current attorney, participated in seven debates for the right to represent Illinois in the U.S. Senate. They debated on issues of the day before outdoor crowds, with Senator Douglas accusing Lincoln of being an abolitionist and Lincoln accusing Douglas of being for the nationalization of slavery (“Lincoln-Douglas Debates” 1994).

unmistakeable in terms of structure and performance. The structure and performance of democracy is being (re)shaped by social media.

Since democracies hinge on representation by individuals, one of the principal currencies affected by this reshaping is *ethos*, the rhetorical term for the symbolically projected character of the rhetor. Two ancient and enduring rhetorical strategies—*prosopopoeia* (the ‘putting on,’ mask-like, of someone else’s *ethos*) and *ethopoeia* (the characterization of someone else’s *ethos*)—are fundamental in the ethotic ecology of political campaigns and debates, and their particular deployments have shifted markedly under the pressures of participatory media.

This dissertation examines these two ethotic strategies in a comparative analysis of the social media entanglements discernible in a central debate from each of two Canadian federal elections: the 2015 election featuring Stephen Harper, incumbent Prime Minister and Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada; Thomas Mulcair, Leader of Canada’s New Democratic Party (NDP); Gilles Duceppe, Leader of the Bloc Québécois (BQ); Justin Trudeau, Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada; and Elizabeth May, Leader of the Green Party of Canada with only a toehold of seats in Parliament; and the 2019 election, featuring Justin Trudeau, now incumbent Prime Minister and still Leader of the Liberal Party; Andrew Scheer, Leader of the Conservatives; Jagmeet Singh, Leader of the NDP; Yves-François Blanchet, Leader of the BQ; Elizabeth May, still leader of the Green Party, and Maxime Bernier, Leader of the People’s Party of Canada (PPC), a new reactionary party. Three social media platforms are the focus of this study: Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram.

My study shows that political leaders’ debates are changing because of social media. In 2015, it was more prominent for debate content to move out *onto* social media, whereas in 2019, debate content is being shaped *for* social media. In both cases, but more so in 2019, the forces of

social media fostered *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*. While appearing more transparent, political leaders are incorporating others' *ethos* into their performance (*prosopopoeia*) and depicting others' *ethos* through their performance (*ethopoeia*). By wearing various masks in the debate and in the social media posts related to the debate, leaders are disadvantaging voters by not providing sufficient knowledge about themselves and their platforms to make an informed decision come election day.

1.2. (Constructed) *Ethos* of Political Leaders

During Canada's federal leaders' debates, audience members are actively watching and listening to the political leaders' discourse to help decide which party to support, which leader to select, and ultimately which candidate to vote for as Member of Parliament (for the merits they may have as local representatives and also) as proxies for those debating leaders. Voters are deciding among people, among characters, so *ethos* is crucial.

Aristotle, discussing the political debates of ancient Greece, notes that during deliberative debates, audiences are comparing one political speaker to another, and "rhetoric exists to affect the giving of decisions" (2001, pt. 1377b). He recognizes that "the orator must not only try to make the argument of his speech demonstrative and worthy of belief; he must also make his own character look right" (Aristotle 2001, pt. 1377b). Aristotle proposes that there are three ethotic qualities that will inspire confidence in the orator's own character and will induce the audience to believe a thing apart from any specific evidence for it. These three dimensions are:

1. *Phronesis*, good sense or practical wisdom, associated with rational judgement and domain competence;
2. *Arete*, good moral character or virtue, associated with ethical conduct; and

3. *Eunoia*, goodwill, associated with clearly valuing the audience's desires and needs, sometimes at the expense of the rhetor's own desires or needs (Aristotle 2001, pt. 1378a6).

Aristotle observes that “any one who is thought to have all three of these good qualities will inspire trust in his audience” (2001, pt. 1378a).

Aristotle believes that the personal character of the speaker “may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion” (2001, pt. 1356a13), and *ethos* is particularly important during debate when it is on full display in a situation “where exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided” (2001, pt. 1356a8). All proofs (*ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*) have both *entechnic* (‘artistic’) and *atechnic* (‘inartistic,’ or outside the art) realizations, but Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* focuses overwhelmingly on the *entechnic* realizations, on *ethos* as manifest in the speech, not as a function of reputation, prior knowledge, or belief. However, his discussion of *ethos* blurs an important distinction between the orator’s ‘real’ character and an artistically produced character. George E. Yoos worries that “Aristotle’s emphasis on portrayal, not just on the display of qualities possessed by the speaker, lays a foundation for dissimulation,” seemingly encouraging rhetors to distort the truth about their character, a feigned *ethos*, which compromises the ‘ethical’ dimension of *ethos* (Yoos 1979, 42, 45). Yoos states:

The danger ... is that the speaker may say what he says simply to enhance his own image. If he does this and succeeds, he misleads his audience into thinking that he really has something to say. There is then double deception, deception about the speaker’s *ethos* and deception about the aim of the appeal. (Yoos 1979, 45–46)

This distinction reveals one of the most fundamental ways that all media—which are instruments of incorporation (fostering *prosopopoeia*) and depiction (fostering *ethopoeia*)—affect political debate. On the one hand, the *ethoi* of political leaders are constructed through the use of media,

with scripted talking points in leaders' debates, and subsequent scripted and ghostwritten messages promoted through images, video, and text, for publication on their social media platforms. The media images of political leaders are curated by political parties to have a credible and appealing *ethos* through the features of *phronesis*, *arete*, and *eunoia*, while the authentic character of the politician can often be concealed. Ironically, the appearance of authenticity is one of the most coveted ethotic projections in contemporary politics. On the other hand, the pressure from media produces a kind of curation for the debate as well, affecting the format (staging, timing, moderation, sequence, interaction, and so on), which in turn affects the kind of ethotic performance the leaders are afforded, notably including the incorporation of others' *ethos* into a performance (*prosopopoeia*), and the depiction of others' *ethos* through the performance (*ethopoeia*).

1.3. Social Media and its Effect on Debates

The reach of social media in Canada, as everywhere, has grown exponentially over the past decade, which has increased the pressure for political parties and their leaders to have a social presence online, prominently featuring debate content. In 2015, Canada's population was 35.7 million, with approximately 17.7 million Canadians on Facebook (Statista Research Department 2015a), approximately 7.3 million on Twitter (Tankovska 2021c), and approximately 5.7 million on Instagram (Statista Research Department 2015b; Statistics Canada - Government of Canada 2015). In 2019, Canada's population was 37.59 million, and the number of Canadians on social media rose significantly; approximately 24.8 million on Facebook (Tankovska 2021a), approximately 7.8 million on Twitter (Degenhard 2021), and approximately 11.8 million on Instagram (Tankovska 2021b).

If we take the 1984 Reagan-Mondale debate as our benchmark, in deference to Postman, or the not dissimilar Turner-Broadbent-Mulroney Canadian Leaders' Debate of the same year, things now look very different. In contrast to an organized debate, an individuated spectacle, broadcasted on a single day at a prescribed time, with a few days of constrained media coverage in 'frozen' newspaper accounts, or specifically timed electronic coverage, social media provides political parties and leaders with a direct avenue to communicate *with* constituents, but also *at* constituents, while concurrently gaining information *from* constituents through the platforms' requested responses of likes, shares, and comments. But, by virtue of those likes, shares, and comments, those constituents also exercise much greater control over the media as well as the political parties and political leaders. There is an instantaneous feedback loop in today's media instruments, as well as a much greater propensity for echo-chambering than with traditional media.

1.3.1. Facebook

Each social media platform functions in similar and distinctive ways. Facebook, for example, encourages users to connect with people they already know, bringing together large and diverse friend networks "on one social platform" that were once "maintained independently of one another in different contexts of daily social life" (Lomborg 2014, 149), though it can grow into friend-of-a-friend and mutual-interest networks through shares, likes, and the affiliated algorithms. This connected presence (Licoppe 2004) on the platform demonstrates affection "by signaling mutuality and ambient accessibility" without the demands of "here-and-now" attention of friends (Lomborg 2014, 153). Facebook activates all the *pisteis*—the three Aristotelian 'proofs,' including *ethos* (the projected character of the rhetor), *pathos* (the emotional state of the audience), and *logos* (drawing the argument from the matter or subject itself). But it strongly

favours *ethos* and *pathos* over *logos* in its social networking form, in that it connects users with friends and family, provides users a space to establish their identities, and encourages users to reach out to others through affective alliances. Facebook largely offers an airbrushed image of the users' life (a performance of *ethos*), designed for self-promotion (Galloway 2017, 99, 177), generating lines of loyalty and affection (*pathos*). Users of Facebook are curators of their lives and their attitudes, where it is customary to post about peak experiences, moments to remember, and moments to be remembered by (Galloway 2017, 100). A personal Facebook page is in many ways a museum of the self. That situation creates a doubleness. The self is both the content and the content-provider. Life events are experienced, recorded, and shared. But they are also planned, staged, and exhibited.

1.3.2. Twitter

Twitter is not a communally curated newsletter but a stream of interwoven microblogs. It is a communicative genre “characterized by networked connections and conversations, a fast-paced, continuous flow of utterances united in a stream, in bursts of immediacy, denoting the pressure towards ‘here and now’ participation” where individuals can tweet short statements, and other people read them (Lomborg 2014, 142). To engage in conversation on Twitter, users establish connections with other users, by following and being followed by them (Lomborg 2014, 100). But as Stine Lomborg states: “The connections are not necessarily bidirectional, but merely reflect an individual’s attention to specific others, who may or may not reciprocate the attention. Twitter profiles thus display a list of people that the user follows, and a list of ‘followers’ of the Twitter user” (2014, 100). One does not need to follow another user to see or reply to their tweets, which can be a political strategy, in replying to unfollowed ‘enemies,’ or retweeting them with a scolding frame. Deen Freelon and David Karpf suggest that researchers

need to pay attention to Twitter's "second-screen's role in political spectacles" as "new media technologies promote different elements of the debate performance, empowering different publics and constructing different media narratives" (2015, 391).

1.3.3. Instagram

Instagram is visual in format. It is predominantly a photo-sharing application (mobile in 2015), which invites users to take a picture, apply a filter, add a caption to the image, and make it public. But it has the same producer/consumer asymmetry as Twitter. Whereas Facebook's connections are typically rooted in sets of individuals that users already know in the 'outside world,' Instagram and Twitter followers can be "like minded strangers with whom the user has no prior relationship" (Lomborg 2014, 100). *Eunoia* is the prime ethotic feature for fostering communities based on like-mindedness, communities of mutual goodwill based on shared values.

1.4. The Networking of Social Media

Herein is the asymmetry. Tweeters and Instagrammers build networks of followers largely through the performance of *eunoia* (though aspects of *phronesis* and *arete* are notable as well), but following, unlike 'friendship,' is not inherently mutual. Person X and Person Y only connect on Facebook if they 'accept' each other as 'friends,' though posts can radiate out into related concentric circles (friends, friends of friends, and public). On Twitter and Instagram, Person X can 'follow' Person Y; Person Y need not 'follow' Person X. It is common, for instance, to refer to Tweeters and Instagrammers as 'influencers' when they have a high number of followers, a term that does not have much traction in the world of Facebook even for users with vast numbers of friends, though it corresponds loosely to the term 'pundit' in legacy media. For expository reasons, I will identify these primary differences between Facebook and

Twitter/Instagram by referring to the former as *friendship circles*, the latter as *following networks*.³ These differences flatten out somewhat with public pages, such as those maintained for political parties and leaders, which must be ‘joined’ in Facebook, in a process much like following. In any case, these differences have parallel implications for *ethos* and *pathos*. Users perform attitudes and understandings, putting their *phronesis*, *arete*, and especially *eunoia* on display to recruit and persuade others.

Generating currency on these social media platforms is accomplished by accumulating a combination of friends, followers, shares/retweets, likes, views, and comments. Friends and followers, “pay,” as Richard Lanham puts it, with their eyeballs in an economy of attention (2006, 7–8; Losh 2009, 69). Lanham states, “by the law of supply and demand, virtual property for which you can ‘count eyeballs’ has become the real currency standard, and the culture’s commerce has come to depend on accumulation of this form of capital” (2006, 7–8; Losh 2009, 69). It is this economy of attention, correlated with economies of acquisition (material or ideological), that has fostered the organizational penetration of Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram pages, such as the ones maintained by political parties. Public pages for corporate entities (companies or political parties) are crafted and curated along similar lines to personal ones and pursue the same immediate currency, but they have greater interest in the attention economy. They seek to trade those eyeballs for specific actions; in the political domain, for support, for volunteers and donations, and ultimately, for votes. Debates play a crucial role in this economy, providing content to be curated and crafted to attract the eyeballs and initiate the transactions leading to votes. But the curating and the crafting are not exclusive to the initial content-

³ The landscape is always changing, so I will not attempt to chart out the complications to this division caused by ‘follow back’ protocols or the various cross-platform favouring and blocking and muting affordances or the constantly evolving friendship and follower algorithms that promote specific posts for specific users.

providers. The consumers re-curate with their likes and reframe with their shares, and those actions push the crafting of the parties and the performances of the leaders in specific directions, largely as a function of the size of friendship circles or following networks. They can also be turned back upon the content-providers through a reframing that represents them as smug, out of touch, hypocritical, and so on. We can refer to this entire constituency, the initial content-providers, the simple propagators, who boost the posts without commentary, and the reframers, who add their own spins, positive or negative, as ‘content-rhetors.’ We might also see this discursive ecology much the way Mikhail Bakhtin characterizes the circulation of language more broadly:

The fact is that when the listener perceives and understands the meaning (the language meaning) of speech, he simultaneously takes an active, responsive attitude toward it. He either agrees or disagrees with it (completely or partially), augments it, applies it, prepares for its execution, and so on. And the listener adopts this responsive attitude for the entire duration of the process of listening and understanding, from the very beginning-sometimes literally from the speaker’s first word. Any understanding of live speech, a live utterance, is inherently responsive, although the degree of this activity varies extremely. Any understanding is imbued with response and necessarily elicits it in one form or another: the listener becomes the speaker. (Bakhtin 1986, 68)

There are differences, of course, such as the presence of images, videos, links, and so on, but there are only two differences which are distinctly qualitative: the affordance of exact replication and the presence of algorithms in the propagation network.

A primary constraint with the form of social media is that in order to organically see the posts by a political party or politician, the social media user needs to connect with that party or politician by becoming friends with them, following them, or liking their account page, but there are loopholes. The party/politician might penetrate their circle of friends or their following network. Once in, those penetrating posts can reach users who are not directly connected to the party or politician, through various concurrent linkages. These webs of linkages also allow for

the harvesting of user affinities and associations, which can be used to target individuals through promotional advertising. When a social media user shares others' posts, the message gains attention and propagates, which is why it is imperative for political parties and politicians to generate followers to share, retweet, or like their posts, as it expands their social reach exponentially.

The connection between social media and political leaders' debates is this: political leaders' debates are no longer limited to a stage (Lincoln/Douglas), or a television screen (Reagan/Mondale) viewed on one evening at a certain time, and to limited, static media coverage thereafter, but rather debate content is now parsed and curated, sent out to multiple audiences who may or may not have seen the debate in its original form. Through these new curated forms, debate content attracts new eyeballs. Because of the reach of social media then, the form of debate is changing, and changing rapidly. As Elizabeth Losh observes with respect to digital environments, "rhetoricians of digital culture [...] rarely address how fundamental paradigms of the public sphere have been reshaped by new ideas from the discourses of codes and algorithms [...] and how pre-scripted possibilities and constraints always play a role in shaping the available rhetorical choices" (2009, 6). Once viewed as the main event of an election to provide comprehensive answers to pointed questions and give voters clarity on which leader will influence their vote choice, leaders' debates have developed into a series of time-constrained undeveloped responses, fractured statements, cross-talking, and scripted sound bites. Political parties and leaders are aware of how the content during the live televised debate is digitally recorded, transmediated, and presented to online audiences through the social media platforms. Statements from the debate are fractured and curated, visuals are produced, and audience responses are elicited, so parties and leaders ensure that specific phrases are included in their

responses during the debate, even if these statements are not presented well in the moment of the debate, or are even relevant to the debate context. There have always been scripted and rehearsed talking points and zingers, not just in the 1984 context Postman decries, where Reagan, responding to a question about whether, at 73, he might be too old to serve a second term as President, quips (in reference to Mondale, who was 56), “I will not make age an issue of this campaign. I am not going to exploit, for political purposes, my opponent’s youth, and inexperience” (“CPD: October 21, 1984 Debate Transcript” 1984). Even in Postman’s gold-standard for reasoned exchange, the 1858 U.S. Lincoln-Douglas debates, it is unlikely that the admonition had just popped into his head when Lincoln said, “I have never had the least apprehension that I or my friends would marry negroes if there was no law to keep them from it, but ... Judge Douglas and his friends seem to be in great apprehension that they might, if there were no law to keep them from it” (Lincoln and Douglas 1895, 459). But the trajectory that worried Postman with the advent of electronic media, “when serious public conversation becomes a form of baby-talk” (1985, 155), is that debate had descended to *nothing but* talking points and zingers, where “complexity, documentation and logic can play no role,” and “post-debate commentary largely avoided any evaluation of the candidates’ ideas, since there were none to evaluate” (1985, 97), a situation that has accelerated dramatically with the digital displacement of electronic media.

1.5. The Methodologies for Studying the Influence of Social Media on Political Debates

Studying the rhetorical influence of social media on political leaders’ debates matters because in democracies the knowledge and beliefs of voters determine the outcomes of elections, which are substantially shaped by media. Without a critical investigation into the effect of social

media on political leaders' debates, we cannot judge its influence on debates, and subsequently, its influence on political decisions that are made by political parties, by political leaders, and most importantly, by voters. This research addresses this gap in existing knowledge by rhetorically evaluating parties' and leaders' social media accounts and their debate-related content during Canada's 2015 and 2019 federal election campaigns. The method of analysis for this study centres on *ethos* as represented and depicted in the debates as a function of social media pressures. It reveals the effect of social media on political debates through the lens of two rhetorical figures, *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, which are so interconnected they have sometimes been treated as synonymous.

With rhetorical figures, the terminology is quite entangled, so the various treatments these two figures have received in the rhetorical tradition are surveyed, out of which we have distilled the sharpest, most precise analytic tools. The idea is not to 'cherry pick' features, choosing them opportunistically as they suit one argument or another, but to establish a coherent framework, "drawn from the cumulative wisdom of the rhetorical tradition, while filtering off the unproductive treatments which don't fit a coherent overall system" (Harris 2019, 22), and bring precision to the rhetorical figures, as figures of argumentation, distinct from a genre or a style of writing.

The term *prosopopoeia* or *προσωποποιΐα* comes from the Greek term *prosopon*, 'face,' 'person,' and *poiein*, 'to make,' and literally means to 'make a face' or to 'put on a mask.' Rhetorically, it means adopting a voice or a stance originating with others, sometimes to borrow an endorsement, transfer some ethotic force, or even to mock someone else. Sometimes it can be highly deliberate, as in Donald Trump's notorious exaggerated physical mimicry of a disabled reporter in 2017, exemplifying *prosopopoeic* mockery ("Donald Trump Mocks Disabled

Reporter” 2017). Sometimes it can take the form of an allusion, as in Justin Trudeau’s 2015 ‘Sunny ways’ speech, echoing Wilfrid Laurier (Global News 2015). Sometimes it can be almost invisible, even to the speaker/writer, in the way Bakhtin sees the compounding and enfolding of meanings and attitudes in the circulation of language. For instance, Aristotle said that “the object of rhetoric is judgement” (350BCa, pt. 1377b). In that last sentence, I have briefly put on the mask of Aristotle, representing him through the conventions of quotation, ‘speaking’ his words. But in a more diffuse, Bakhtinian sense, since Aristotle adapted the word *phronesis* to rhetoric, every time we use it, we use a word he has stamped, bringing along some quotient of his *ethos*. *Prosopopoeia* is one of the ways we can represent another’s *ethos* (by quoting, paraphrasing, or alluding), or channelling it in some way (by absorbing it into our language and other symbolic actions).

Ethopoeia or ἠθοποιία is the depiction of the character of an orator or another person (Quintilian 2001a, vol. 4, pt. 9.2.58). It is derived from the ancient Greek term *ethos*, ‘character,’ the same major component of *prosopopoeia*, *poiein*, ‘to make,’ so it literally means ‘character making.’

In a very real way *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* are the same phenomenon approached from opposite ends, the penetration of one’s language and action by the language and action of others. *Prosopopoeia* is the *incorporation* of such language and action. *Ethopoeia* is the *depiction* of such language and action. They are both, therefore, fundamentally ethotic. *Prosopopoeia* is the performance of another’s *ethos* (even if the ‘other’ is an object or an abstraction). *Ethopoeia* is the construction of another’s *ethos*. In both cases, this can be individual or collective, concrete or abstract. One can speak for an individual, seen most directly through quotation, or speak for a group, seen most directly through public statements by

officials. Similarly, one can depict an individual, characterizing them as wise or foolish, experienced or naive, and one can depict a political party, a class of people, or a family down the street in the same terms. One can also fictively speak for a god, an animal, or a concept, like greed, and one can depict a thing or a concept as if it had personal characteristics. Here, we overlap with anthropomorphism and personification.

1.6. Masks and *Prosopopoeia*: The Performance of Another's *Ethos*

We can observe the effects of social media on political leaders' debates through the increased pressure for political parties to brand their leader by having their political leader adopt a mask, through *prosopopoeia*, while also caricaturing, or otherwise rendering another party or leader, through *ethopoeia*. Like most rhetorical figures, *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* have had an inconsistent history; as such, they have a range of overlapping but not entirely consistent definitions. We can start with a clear and representative definition of *prosopopoeia*, from the best general source in English, the *Oxford English Dictionary*: "A rhetorical device by which an imaginary, absent, or dead person is represented as speaking or acting" ("*Prosopopoeia*, n." 2022). *Prosopopoeia* is often conflated with the trope, personification, and it has a variety of synonyms and plesionyms (*prosopoeia*, *conformatio*; *personae confictio*; *the counterfait in personation*; *allocutio*; *deformatio*; *effiguratio*; *fictio personae*; notably, this list also includes; *ethopoeia*). The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, identifies *conformatio* as "representing an absent person as present, or in making a mute thing or one lacking form articulate, and attributing to it a definite form and language or a certain behaviour appropriate to its character" (Cicero 2014, pt. 4.66), which is methodologically vague. Demetrius cites a classic instance of the figure *prosopopoeia* from Plato's *Menexenus* in his *On Style*, where Socrates speaks directly for the fallen soldiers of the Peloponnesian war, addressing their families. "We might have lived

dishonourably,” Socrates says under his rhetorical mask, “but have preferred to die honourably rather than bring you and your children into disgrace” (246d; Demetrius 1902, pts. 265–266).

Many rhetoricians extend *prosopopoeia* from the dead, imagined, or absent, to abstract concepts, physical objects, and the like—“to cities, beasts, birds, trees, stones, weapons, fire, water, lights of the firmament” (Ruffin 1920, 393). In these extensions, one can see how *prosopopoeia* can get mixed up with personification, the attribution of human characteristics to abstract concepts, as well as with anthropomorphism, the attribution of human characteristics to animals and non-animate objects. And, of course, speech is a human characteristic.

Quintilian, who explored these techniques more fully, viewed *prosopopoeia* as “impersonation,” which adds variety and animation to speech (2001a, vol. 4, pt. 9.2.29). To him, *prosopopoeia* can be used to “display the inner thoughts of our opponents ... introduce conversations ... and provide appropriate characters for words of advice, reproach, complaint, praise, or pity” (Quintilian 2001a, vol. 4, pt. 9.2.29). With *prosopopoeia*,

we display the inner thoughts of our adversaries as though they were talking with themselves (but we shall only carry conviction if we represent them as uttering what they may reasonably be supposed to have had in their minds); or without sacrifice of credibility, we may introduce conversations between ourselves and others, or of others among themselves, and put words of advice, reproach, complaint, praise or pity into the mouths of appropriate persons. Nay, we are even allowed in this form of speech to bring down the gods from heaven and raise the dead, while cities also and peoples may find a voice. (2001a, vol. 4, pt. 9.2.29)

One notable addition to the scope of *prosopopoeia* in Quintilian is the collective “peoples,” so that this figure can represent a group, an ethnicity, or a nation. He adds that

it is not only that there are just as many varieties of *Prosopopoeia* as there are of Causes: there are more, because in *Prosopopoeia* we simulate the emotions of children, women, nations, and even things which cannot speak, and they are all entitled to their appropriate character. (2001b, vol. 5, pt. 11.1.41)⁴

⁴ In this connection, James J. Paxson notes that Quintilian “assimilates women, children, and ‘voiceless things’ into one ontic category—a category apart from that of adult males who can be represented in a fictional text according to

In the writings of Emporius the Orator we find *prosopopoeia* “giving words to the dumb and creating a person who does not really exist,” as when Cicero “attributes words to the province of Sicily or represents the republic as speaking” (1973, 35). Henry Peachum defines *prosopopoeia* as “the fayning of a person, that is, when to a thing sencelesse and dumbe wee fayne a fit person, or attribute a person to a commonwealth or multitude [...] the Orator by this figure maketh the common welth to speake” (1577, [113]). The notion of speaking for a multitude, of speaking in a role, representing some commonwealth, is one of the central ways *prosopopoeia* functions. If we look back at Demetrius’s example from Plato, for instance, we notice that Socrates is not giving voice to a single fallen warrior, but speaking on behalf of all the fallen soldiers of Athens from that conflict (1902, pts. 265–266).

John Smith suggests that *prosopopoeia* is “the feigning of a person to speak, or the attributing of a person to the inanimate creatures; as, when we bring in persons that are dead, or the inanimate creatures speaking or hearing” (1657, 153). He suggests that *prosopopoeia* happens “when the properties of man are for similitude and agreeableness sake attributed unto other things” (J. Smith 1657, 153). *Prosopopoeia* for him is two-fold: imperfect or perfect (J. Smith 1657, 156). Smith states,

An Imperfect *Prosopopoeia* is when the speech of another is set down lightly and indirectly; as in [Psalms 2.1]. David brings in the wicked, as saying unto his soul; Flee as a bird unto your Mountain. A Perfect *Prosopopoeia* is when the whole feigning of the person is set down in our speech, with a sit entring [*sic*] into and leaving off of the same. (1657, 156)

other means of characterization (*ethopeia* or *adlocutio*)” (1994, 49). It is important to remember that Roman law “designated any being—corporate or individual—that was not a ‘sane, adult, and natural person,’ as part of a category that required ‘curatorial’ representation” to manage their affairs (Kantorowicz 1957, 374). It is therefore understood that “children, mad persons, and cities required figurational processing in order to enjoy legal voice or social presence” (Paxson 1994, 49).

Pierre Fontanier describes *prosopopoeia* as “staging, as it were, absent, dead, supernatural or even inanimate beings” who “are made to act, speak, answer as is our wont” (1968, 404; quoted in Riffaterre 1985, 107); the concept of staging is especially valuable in this definition, as it makes clear that all aspects of delivery, not verbal style on its own, are relevant for *prosopopoeia*. Paul de Man continues this theme, defining *prosopopoeia* as “the fiction of [...] an absent, deceased, or voiceless entity, which [...] confers upon it the power of speech” (1984, 75–76), evoking the performative dimensions in saying that it “makes the unknown accessible to the mind and to the senses” (de Man 1984, 80; Davis 2010, 38).⁵ We observe *prosopopoeia* in action, then, when a rhetor mimics some character, speaks as another, or adopts a character-type, speaking for a class of characters. In my article “Democratic Prosopopoeia: The Rhetorical Influence of the I-Will-Vote Image Filter on Social Media Profile Pictures During the 2015 Canadian Federal Election,” I extend the performance of character-type directly to social media, arguing that image filters on Twitter profiles, a kind of ‘digital mask,’ make every post from users who have adopted such mask as coming from a composite *ethos* that includes the relevant character type (Kampher 2019, 70). The I-Will-Vote image filter in the 2015 Canadian federal election campaign, for instance, ensured that every post from users who adopted it came from—whatever other features were foregrounded in a given post (female, mother, PhD candidate)—a voter, a certain kind of Canadian citizen with specific intentions. Indeed, in a very real way, every post, even without filters, comes through at least a few shallow layers of masking—a Facebook user, for instance, and a friend, on that platform, a Twitter user, and often a type identified by the handle (I am @MoniquePhD, wearing a PhD candidate character-type ‘mask’ and Randy Allen Harris is @profraha, a professor, though neither handle is without ambiguity).

⁵ De Man does restrict the performance of *prosopopoeia* to verbal style, however, saying that it brings forth “voice or face [of another] by means of language” (de Man 1984, 80–81).

De Man is especially preoccupied with *prosopopoeia* as representing the face (1984, 81). Cynthia Chase explains that de Man does not merely read *prosopopoeia* as the giving of face, but he reads face as given by *prosopopoeia* (1986, 84; Davis 2010, 43). “What is given by this act is figure,” she says, “figure is no less than our very face” (Chase 1986, 84; Davis 2010, 43). Diane Davis elaborates that, in this view, “*prosopopoeia* defaces and effaces precisely to the extent that it enfaces” (2010, 43), meaning that the figure defaces the idea of essential selfhood. The thinking that there is a pre-existing and substantial self that the face would (mis)represent (2010, 43) is a kind of ethotic fractionation that is highly prevalent in social media, and again recalls Bakhtin.

Megan Foley discusses the importance of *prosopopoeia* in the democratic *aporia* between sovereignty and biopower, when a living body is not a speaking subject, as in the legal case of Terri Schiavo. Schiavo was a U.S. woman in an irreversible persistent vegetative state who occupied a place between life and death. Her husband and legal guardian argued in a series of court cases that Schiavo would not have wanted prolonged artificial life support without the prospect of recovery. Schiavo’s parents disputed her husband’s assertions, arguing in favour of artificial nutrition and hydration. This case involved U.S. state and federal politicians including President George W. Bush (1998 to 2005). *Prosopopoeia* rhetorically reconstituted her capacity for self-representation (2010, 381), and her feeding tube was ultimately removed. Bryan Blankfield shows how the act of speaking in another’s voice, human or nonhuman, gives rhetors significant persuasive advantages, which can “build authority, ground emotional appeals, and allow for a speaker to identify with their audience or appear as a disinterested party in matters that they are very concerned with” (2022).

The most important aspect of *prosopopoeia* is this: the rhetor does not just *attribute* human characteristics to absent people, objects, or abstractions; in prototype, the rhetor *embodies* the absent person, object, or abstraction, giving it a voice, a face, a character, and even in more subtle variations there is always some quotient of embodiment. In a sense, then, *prosopopoeia* enacts pure identification, where the rhetor is nothing but the associations conjured by the mask (Kampherm 2019, 63). As Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia demonstrates (1981, 311–12), *prosopopoeia* is in many ways a fundamental principle of language, and as Judith Butler’s notion of performativity demonstrates (2010, 147–48), *prosopopoeia* is in many ways fundamental to social and personal presentation. All of our words, as well as our gestures and our expressions, carry with them in some degree the presence of others, incorporate those others, and all of our interactions rely in some degree on the masks we have built for ourselves (of gender, social role, political allegiance, and so on). Social media, with its various avatar-creating affordances, brings much of this masking to the fore. Randy Allen Harris was perhaps unwittingly speaking of this ancient lineage when he adopted Bakhtin’s concept to suggest that in our scholarly work “we take identity for granted” (1988, 168). When we report or cite what “Plato” or “Socrates” or “Aristotle” has said or believes, Harris argues, those labels do “not designate autonomous, univocal entities,” as if Plato was not using words and phrases and dispositions and values he absorbed from others, as if they were not, in a sense, masks of those others put on briefly so that they were speaking through Plato. Labels like “Plato” and “Harper” and “Singh,” from this position, that is, “designate composites—collections of voices, some in harmony, some in conflict” (Harris 1988, 168). *Prosopopoeia*, performance, and incorporation go all the way down.

But the notion of rhetorical figures has always implicated the concepts of salience and deviation or departure as well, of standing out. However far down a figurative disposition might go socially or neurocognitively, rhetoricians focus on the way that disposition manifests in moments of stylistic promotion, a figure standing out from some ground. This study, therefore, concerns the *tactical* deployment of *prosopopoeia*. For the purposes of investigating how social media has influenced political debate, illustrated in the 2015 and 2019 Canadian federal election debates, *prosopopoeia* is defined as “the incorporation of rhetorical features (style, delivery, invention, arrangement) associated with another person (i.e., someone other than the presenting rhetor), stereotype, object, or abstraction.” Since rhetorical features are adapted from one another and from stereotypes, and even in principle from some objects or abstractions, *prosopopoeia* is a deep, universal factor of language use and human conduct. But this study will primarily attend to its tactical use, when *prosopopoeia* stands out in some way.

1.7. Caricatures and *Ethopoeia*: The Depiction of Another’s *Ethos*

As rhetoricians, philosophers, and linguists have long recognized, ordinary language teems with rhetorical figures. The rhetorical figure *ethopoeia* is no exception. For the term *ethopoeia*, the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines it as: “Delineation of character; representation of a person’s manners or morals” (“*Ethopoeia*, n.” 2022). Historically, it has numerous synonyms and plesionyms, including *adlocutio*, *sermocinatio*, *notatio*, *aetopeia*, *mimesis*, *ethopoiia*, and, of course, *prosopopoeia*. One of the earliest appearances of *ethopoeia* in ancient rhetorical theory is when Greek critic Dionysius of Halicarnassus, praised Athenian speechwriter, Lysias, for his skill at representing others:

I also ascribe to Lysias that most pleasing quality, which is generally called characterization [*ethopoeia*]. I am quite unable to find a single person in this orator’s speeches who is devoid of character or vitality. There are three departments or aspects in which this quality manifests itself: thought, language,

and composition; and I declare him to be successful in all three. For not only are the thoughts he ascribes to his clients worthy, reasonable and fair, so that their words seem to reflect their good moral character, but he also makes them speak in a style which is appropriate to these qualities, and which by its nature displays them in their best light—clear, standard, ordinary speech which is thoroughly familiar to everyone. (100AD, pt. 8)

Lysias, in short, was highly regarded for his ability to grasp his client’s circumstances, encapsulating the feeling, manner, and language of his client in his written speeches which seemed to come from the mouth of his client (Katula and Murphy 2003, 49). Presumably other speech writers wrote in their own particular style, or in a generic one-size-fits-all style. But when Lysias wrote for a client, he wrote in a way that captured their thought, their language, and their compositional patterns. *Ethopoeia* in this vein captures the ideas, words, and style of delivery suited to the person the address is written for, adapting the speech to the conditions under which it is to be spoken, and discovering the exact lines of argument that will turn the case against the opponent (Katula and Murphy 2003, 49).

Quintilian also theorized *ethopoeia* in his work, defining it as “the representation of the characters of others”⁶ and associating it with “the gentler emotions” (2001a, vol. 4, pt. 9.2.58). Quintilian drew on the writings of Rutilius Lupus, who defined *ethopoeia* as a “description of thoughts and feelings” (1.21 in 2001a, vol. 4, pt. 9.3.99) and Marcus Tullius Cicero, who highlighted the importance of character depiction, where *notatio* (a plesionym of *ethopoeia*) places one’s character “before the eyes”⁷ (2014, pt. 4.63, 65). *Ethopoeia*, in this sense of

⁶ *Ethopoeia* is defined by Hermogenes (20.7 Rabe) as “representation of the character of a person who is the subject.” Lausberg section 820: 9.1.31 (Quintilian 2001a, vol. 4, pt. 9.3.99).

⁷ Character delineation for Cicero consists of “describing a person’s character by the definite signs which, like distinctive marks, are attributes of that character” (2014, pt. 4.63). Cicero explains the concept by providing an example of how he would describe a boastful man who is not actually rich but parades as a moneyed man: “That person there, men of the jury, who thinks it admirable that he is called rich, see now first with what an air he surveys us. Does he not seem to you to be saying, ‘I’d gladly give you clients’ doles, if you didn’t try my patience!’ Yes, once he has propped his chin on his left hand, he thinks that he dazzles the eyes of all with the gleam of his jewelry and the glitter of his gold ...” (2014, pt. 4.63). Cicero explains how Character Delineations set before our eyes a person’s whole character, “the envious or pompous man, the

particularizing a speech to the character of the client, came to be so highly valued that it was a mainstay of the *progymnasmata*, the writing and declamation exercises that were central to rhetorical training. Exercises in *ethopoeia* involved imagining words for a real person.

Prosopopoeia, also among the *progymnasmata*, involved the imagining of a non-existing person (G. A. Kennedy 2003, 84). Both realized *enargia*, the general figure of vivid evocation. In its formal realization, *ethopoeia* is “the fabrication – serving to characterize natural (historical or invented) persons – of statements, conversations and soliloquies or unexpressed mental reflections of the persons concerned” (Lausberg 1998, pt. 820 under the synonym, *sermocinatio*). It is suggested that “as far as content is concerned *sermocinatio* need not be historically true. It should only be ‘probable,’ i.e., it should, in particular be in agreement with the character of the person speaking.

The handbooks “distinguish between moral *ethopoeia*, when the character predominates; emotive *ethopoeia*, when an emotion predominates; and mixed *ethopoeia*, when a mixture of both components occur” (Mayoral 2001, 263). Richard Sherry defined *ethopoeia* as:

an expression of maners or mylde affeccions, and halth thre kyndes: of the which the first is a significacion or expression of of maners somewhat longer, as of wittes, artes, vertues, vices. Thus we expresse Thraso a boaster, and Demea a sowre felowe. (Sherry 1550, 67)

In Sherry’s version of *ethopoeia*, it is a description of manners, often in specified types: Thaso as a boaster, and Demea as a sour fellow. Richard Lanham explains that *ethopoeia* drew forth a “description of natural propensities, manners, affections, virtues and vices [of a character] in

miser, the climber, the lover, the voluptuary, the thief, the public informer—in short, by such delineation any one’s ruling passion can be brought into the open” (2014, pt. 4.65).

order to flatter or reproach; character portrayal generally” (1991, 71), something we will see a lot of in this dissertation.

Isidore of Seville observes:

1. We call that figure *ethopoeia*, in which we achieve the expression of a man’s character, age, interests, rank, pleasures, sex, habits, courage. When the character of a pirate is portrayed, the speech will be bold, abrupt, and daring; when the speech is likened to a woman, the oration should be consistent with the sex. A different character must be assumed for the youth, for the old man, for the soldier, for the emperor, for the parasite, for the farmer, for the philosopher. (1973, 95)
2. Sometimes the speaker appears to be transported with joy; again, he seems to cut to the heart. In this type of speaking these points must always be borne in mind: Who is speaking? In whose presence? About what? Where? When? What will he lose; what will he be required to do; what will he suffer, if he should disregard this advice? (1973, 95)

In Isidore of Seville’s account we see why *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* have been so closely associated as to be treated as synonyms. Isidore is effectively cataloguing a range of generic ‘masks’ that can be adopted—the pirate, the woman, the parasite, the philosopher.

From rhetorical treatises, Koen De Temmerman concludes that there are four different meanings for the term *ethopoeia*:

1. “In its broadest sense, [*ethopoeia*] refers to the construction of *ethos* in general (direct or indirect characterization through action or speech)” (De Temmerman 2010, 34).
2. *Ethopoeia* also “refers to a rhetorical figure of thought [*figura sententiae*] in which the orator/author represents the words of another person/character in direct speech. As an emotive figure, *ethopoeia* is one of the techniques adopted to express fictitious emotions. In this sense, it is defined as one of the six types of *metathesis (transmutatio)* by Phoebammon, who thus emphasizes its ability of transposing an utterance to the level of another speaker” (De Temmerman 2010, 35).

3. As a special case of the second meaning, *ethopoeia* also “refers to an orator’s ability to depict *himself* in his speech as good and trustworthy” (De Temmerman 2010, 35).
4. As well, *ethopoeia* refers to “the *progymnasma* that trains students to speak ‘in character’ of a (possibly fictitious) person. The term appears in this sense in the *progymnasmata* handbooks and in various other rhetorical treatises. Elsewhere, the term *prosopopeia* refers to this exercise” (De Temmerman 2010, 35–36).

De Temmerman concludes the “most self-evident function of *ethopoeia* is, by definition, characterization. The *progymnasmata* authors explicitly mention this function in their definitions of this school exercise. This function is also highlighted at other places, and some (Latin) authors specifically focus on the importance of *ethopoeia* for *moral* characterization”⁸ (De Temmerman 2010, 36–37).

One non-human entity that *ethopoeia* has more recently been associated with are computers as social actors, where it can be demonstrated that “users can be induced to behave as if computers were human, even though users know that the machines do not actually possess ‘selves’ or human motivations” (Nass et al. 1993, 111). This assignment of ‘selves’ and human attitudes, intentions, or motives to non-human entities is *ethopoeia* (Nass et al. 1993; 1994, 543). It can invoke a social response in humans, even if the non-human agent only offers a subtle or implicit representation of socialness (Nass et al. 1994, 556). Clifford Nass, Jonathan Steuer, Lisa Henriksen and Christopher D. Dryer suggest “individuals may assign the computer a separate and unique social identity, especially when the technology is perceived to change initial information or to provide additional information (e.g., generalized decision-support systems).

⁸ “Aquila Romanus S4 Halm, for example, highlights a character’s words as indications of either badness or dignity” (De Temmerman 2010, 37).

That is, the computer may be viewed as a messenger rather than a medium” (Nass et al. 1994, 556).

Ethopoeia, then, like most of the linguistic patterns that have been studied as rhetorical figures, occurs in everyday language and ordinary conduct. We incessantly talk about one another’s character. *Ethopoeia* might manifest as calling someone an endearment, or a slur, or it might be an elaborate depiction of someone else in order to justify some action, or explain their own emotions, or just in telling a story. But, like *prosopopoeia*, *ethopoeia* can also characterize an abstraction or an object, in expressions such as “karma is a bitch” and “COVID is terrorizing the world.” There needs to be *some* term to refer to the pervasive rhetorical move of characterizing the *ethos* of others, a need felt perhaps more acutely in the analysis of social media than anywhere else. While classical purists may resist using *ethopoeia* for that phenomenon because of its association with persona construction and the *progymnasmata*, there are ample precedents in the rhetorical tradition for this usage. For this purpose, as I explore it in this dissertation, *ethopoeia* is defined as “the depiction of rhetorical features (style, delivery, invention, arrangement) associated with a person (other than the presenting rhetor) or the personification of a stereotype, object, or abstraction.” Since others are depicted all the time and are personified widely in ordinary language, *ethopoeia* is a deep, universal factor of language use and human conduct. But as with *prosopopoeia*, this study will attend primarily to its *tactical* use, when *ethopoeia* stands out in some way.

In summary, there are two distinct rhetorical strategies implicating *ethos*, and this dissertation examines both in the social media influenced federal debates: the *incorporation* of *ethos* associated with others (including types, abstractions, and various other non-human or non-present others), and the *depiction* of *ethos* (with the same variations). The former we designate

by *prosopopoeia*, the latter by *ethopoeia*. *Prosopopoeia* is performing another's *ethos*. *Ethopoeia* is representing another's *ethos*. As we have seen, there are certainly boundary cases, but *incorporation* and *depiction* are our prototypical realizations of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*.

1.8. Social Media Fosters *Prosopopoeia* and *Ethopoeia*

Social media platforms are ethotically saturated. They foster *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* by encouraging users to populate their accounts with content about their lives and opinions, generating curated ethotic records, which remain online perpetually for friends and followers to view in their absence, unless deleted by the creator. Social media platforms act as proxies for the actual person, which we can call, after Wayne Booth, the *flesh-and-blood person* (1983, 415ff). This museum of the self selects (and deflects) various masks—typological ethotic features those users provide as ‘figures’ against the ground of the platform—such as mother, doctoral candidate, voter.

In using incorporation (*prosopopoeia*) and depiction (*ethopoeia*) in a political arena, the political party or leader may suggest information during the debate and subsequently in their social media post about the other leaders' character or their parties' policy plans, that would not otherwise present itself to the public without their statement. A comment put forward on social media about the other leader may be true, but it also may be false, or somewhere in a grey middle zone. The very fact that the comment is made, however, has the effect of evoking thoughts in the minds of the viewers about another leader's *ethos* and authenticity. Viewers may not realize that the content presented, and the text associated with the images in the leader's post may not portray a wholly accurate scene about their adversary, but rather be skillfully crafted to design a possibly feigned reality to evoke doubt in voters' minds, which could affect *if* the Canadian viewer votes, and if they do vote, *who* they vote for. One such example is Trudeau's

2015 post *ethopoically* depicting Harper as someone who cannot be trusted to keep his promises, taking Harper to task for appointing 59 Senators during his almost ten years as Prime Minister (2015j) (Figure 0-37). What Trudeau (and Mulcair, who made a similar point) failed to mention, however, was Harper’s lack of appointments to the Senate for the two years leading up to the 2015 election, leaving 22 Senate seats vacant. His appointing of 59 senators was true, but strategically, it was also not the whole story, depicting Harper as a hypocrite, or rather, as more hypocritical than the facts warrant.

Prosopopoeia and *ethopoeia* are used by both adversaries and advocates in the incorporation and depiction of someone’s *ethos*. During political debates, we see *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* in action when party messaging and taglines are stated by leaders, such as when Scheer in the 2019 Debate interjected the Conservative slogan, “Trudeau: not as advertised,” which was a Conservative Party hashtag (2019e) (Figure 0-109); he was speaking as Scheer, but he was also speaking the corporate slogan of the entire party. Incorporation and depiction moves can get quite ramified. Touting his party’s plan for an increase in the minimum wage, Thomas Mulcair in 2015 tried to depict Trudeau as indifferent to minimum-wage workers by noting that “Under Mr. Trudeau’s plan, not a single Canadian will get a raise” (2015f). Trudeau, who spoke next, then paraphrased Mulcair, depicted himself in the third person, and changed the topic entirely, while hinging the depiction on compassion for impoverished children. “Actually,” Trudeau said, “under Mr. Trudeau’s plan, 315,000 kids will be lifted out of poverty” (2015q)—an ethotic daily double, *prosopopoeically* incorporating the mask of an other (who ironically evokes Mulcair) while *ethopoically* depicting himself in a highly positive light.

Political leaders’ social media accounts are populated by text, images, and videos, often ghostwritten by staff of the political party or leader to appear as if the leader was speaking, in a

way that recalls Lysias the logographer. The public would not know if it was actually Trudeau, Harper, Scheer, Mulcair, Singh, May, Bernier, or Blanchet populating their Facebook or Twitter content, or their hired social media staff. But in 2015, Trudeau implied that he was the one populating his own social media feed, with the announcement, “Okay Facebook, I’m turning over my account to the Liberal Party’s campaign team for the #macdebate. Watch this page all night. #elxn42” (2015f) (Figure 0-12), with a similar message stated on Twitter (Figure 0-48) (2015g), and another message when the debate had concluded, saying that he was “back on” Facebook and Twitter, after calling his “top advisor” wife, Sophie (2015c; 2015a) (Figure 0-13; Figure 0-49). Evidence of different positioning by Mulcair attended the image post, “Tom Mulcair wins first leaders’ debate,” posted from Mulcair’s Facebook and Twitter accounts. This was clearly not a leader talking about himself in the third person, as in Trudeau’s “Mr. Trudeau” remark, but a gaffe. What the social media staff should have posted to the NDP accounts (2015h; 2015g) (Figure 0-17; Figure 0-54), instead went on the leader’s ‘personal’ page. The ghostwritten comment about “Tom,” written in third-person language, from a personal account came across as disingenuous, as it did not conform to the custom of the platforms, painting the leader as egotistical and boastful, promoting his “win” on his own social media feeds.

We learn about the leader, and make assumptions about the leader, through the presented collection of artifacts in snippets, but also as a whole. In a classic 1946 study by social psychologist Solomon Asch, it was discovered that when given a brief personality description, people make quick inferences about the full personality of the individual (Wallace 1999, 15; Miller 2003, 70). Adding to these findings, Joseph B. Walther noted that humans who interact with each other through computer mediated communication methods tend to have an idealized perception and an “inflated” impression of their partners in the absence of face-to-face cues and

prior personal knowledge. Martin Lea and Russell Spears have discovered that when these sorts of subtle social context and personality cues appear online, these cues take on great value (Walther 1996, 17–18; Miller 2003, 70; Spears and Lea 1992, 2, 53–54). The receiver of the online message places an “overreliance on minimal cues” to build an impression of the partner, engaging in an “over attribution” process, which is more pronounced when participants have no physical exposure to one another (Walther 1996, 17–18; Miller 2003, 70; Spears and Lea 1992, 38)—when, as John Whitman’s explanation of *prosopopoeia* suggests, there is a “separation between the literary pretense of a personality, and the actual state of affairs” (Whitman 1987, 271). Whitman’s account is especially apt for how social media functions in promoting *prosopopoeia* because social media provides only snippets of an individual’s reality to viewers through brief textual statements, short videos, or select images. It is even more impactful when there is no physical association or connection to the individual. Collectively, these posts accumulate over time and appear to represent a broad spectrum of an individual’s life, but it is through a curation of exhibits which incorporate degrees of masking. On public pages, such as those of a political leader, this curation, its maskings and its separation between actual states of affairs and literary or rhetorical pretense, are more strategically utilized in the economy of attention for attracting volunteer labour, funds, and votes. The communication of these aspects is curated to promote the strengths of the leader, respond to current events, and foreground ethotic features to represent the person as a certain ‘type’ of leader, but also as an authentic and likeable person. Often, they are intended to mimic what the leader would say or do. For citizens during elections, the consequence of using the rhetorical figures *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, then, is that the elector may be persuaded to vote based on these fictional constructs, alter their vote, or be persuaded to abstain from casting a ballot altogether, if doubt has surfaced in their minds. But

while *prosopopoeia* affects the viewer of the curated communication, it is also important to note that *prosopopoeia* affects the rhetor of the curated communication too, because as Kenneth Burke tells us, when we put on a role, the role puts on us (1941b, 267–68). Burke is not invoking *prosopopoeia* explicitly here, but the ethotic situation he describes is of a piece with *prosopopoeia*. Putting on a rhetorical mask in order to present oneself as a particular sort of person, while affecting the observer of the message, also affects the mask-wearer’s consciousness (Kampher 2019, 70).

1.9. Sorting Out the Rhetorical Figures

Rhetorical figures often are found working in layers, and we have seen how *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* are often interconnected. A more mundane example than Trudeau’s daily double is the Liberal Party’s Facebook and Twitter post, “Are we really surprised that the Conservatives have been caught lying to Canadians – again?” with a link to a CTV news article (2019c; 2019c) (Figure 0-73; Figure 0-115). Here the Liberal Party is speaking *as* CTV using *prosopopoeia*, incorporating its voice and *ethos*, to project *ethopoeia*, where CTV speaks *about* the Conservatives. As with other figures, one of them is often more prominent than the other in these combinations, a prominence I capture with the adjectival-nominal compounds, ‘*prosopopoeic ethopoeia*’ and ‘*ethopoeic prosopopoeia*.’

‘*Prosopopoeic ethopoeia*’ is the adopting of others’ voices, mannerisms, words, etc., to frame others. An example of ‘*prosopopoeic ethopoeia*’ is the Liberal Party’s Facebook post linking to a CTV News ‘Truth Tracker’ article about the Conservatives, and stating in their tagline, “Are we really surprised that the Conservatives have been caught lying to Canadians - again?” (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2019c) (Figure 0-73). ‘*Ethopoeic prosopopoeia*’ is the framing of others in terms of their masks (most commonly, accusations of

hypocrisy). An example of ‘*ethopoeic prosopopoeia*’ is Scheer, in the debate and on social media, characterizing Trudeau as a habitual mask-wearer. Scheer ethotically accuses Trudeau of *prosopopoeia*, putting “on a reconciliation mask, and then firing the attorney General, the first of Indigenous background. He puts on a feminist mask, and then fires two strong female MPs for not going along with his corruption. He puts on a middle class mask and then raises taxes on middle class Canadians” (2019g). Scheer ends his proclamation by stating, “Mr. Trudeau, you are a phoney and a fraud, and you do not deserve to govern this country” (2019g). Essentially, debaters address one another always in *apostrophe*, the rhetorical move of directing speech at someone or something (a god, a corpse, an abstraction) that cannot answer back; what the speaker says, therefore, is meant to be *overheard* by some audience, far more than to be heard by the person or thing being addressed. Scheer wanted to be heard accusing Trudeau, of course, more than he wanted Trudeau to hear anything. In this case, however, both the format and LaFlamme’s moderation ensured that no answer could be provided by Trudeau, leaving the combative statement hanging in isolation—not unlike the isolated posts on social media, which can also have *apostrophic* qualities (replies and @ddressed comments on Twitter, for instance).

One of the most complex methodological problems when working with rhetorical figures is disentangling them for analysis. This problem is made more difficult, rather than easier, by the handbook tradition, which very frequently exemplifies figures by passages that contain more than the single figure they are meant to illustrate, and is further complicated by the tendency of figures, like words and syntactic constructions, to collocate preferentially, to pattern in clusters or bundles, not in isolation.

Katherine Tu’s “Collocation in Rhetorical Figures” (2019), for instance, is a computational case study of parison (syntactic parallelism), *epanaphora* (phrase-initial lexical

repetition) and *homoioptoton* (morphological repetition), which finds them to collocate with high degrees of mutual preference. As she argues, the famous expression of John F. Kennedy, “Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country,” is routinely given as an example of *chiasmus*, or its plesionym, *antimetabole*, because of the prominent reverse repetition of “your country” and “you,” but it would not be as memorable or as argumentatively effective without the parison, the two *epanaphora* of “ask” and “what,” the *mesodiplosis* (medial lexical repetition) of “can do for,” or the *antithesis* (contradictory predication) of “ask” and “ask not” (Tu 2019, 4; Harris 2019, 19–20). There are other figures in the expression as well, such as the *hyperbaton* (unconventional syntactic ordering) of “ask not,” which gives it a biblical tone (Tu 2019, 4; Harris 2019, 19–20). Tu argues that this kind of figural collocation is the norm, not the exception, and Randy Allen Harris (2022) argues that at least some preferential collocations are responsible for the rhetorical effects ascribed to a single figure. *Antimetabole*, for instance, is often credited for the “corrective or refutative” function we see in the Kennedy expression (Fahnestock 1999, 150), but it would not have that effect without both parison and *mesodiplosis*, since the patterns AxB and BxA are crucial for the ‘opposing’ semantic and grammatical relationships between A and B that fuel Kennedy’s ‘correction’ of “what your country can do for you” by “what you can do for your country.” “The *mesodiplosis*,” Harris says, “mediates the semantic relationship between” words like *you* and *your country* here, and the parison ensures the “exchange of grammatical [and semantic] roles” (2022).

This situation of preferential collocation is exactly what is found with *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*. This can be clearly observed in Ruffin’s *Proverbs* example:

Doth not wisdom cry? and understanding put forth her voice? She standeth in the top of high places, by the way in the places of the paths. She crieth at the gates, at the entry of the city, at the coming in at the doors. Unto you, O men, I call; and my voice is to the sons of man. O ye simple, understand wisdom: and, ye fools, be

ye of an understanding heart. Hear; for I will speak of excellent things; and the opening of my lips shall be right things. (1920, pt. 8.1-6)

This is a typical example of personification, often identified as *prosopopoeia* or as *ethopoeia*, somewhat indiscriminately, in the way that these three terms are treated as if they are fully interchangeable, as if precision is irrelevant. In fact, if we take a precise approach to figuration, one in which we match one stylistic pattern with one specific term, so that we can isolate their contributions to the rhetorical effects of a passage like this, it is all three. It is personification because it characterizes an abstract concept analogically as if it were a human being. It is *ethopoeia* because it depicts features of that characterization: female, emotional, concerned, overlooking human relations (standing in high place), seeking out people wherever they go (in their paths, at the gates, at the doors). It is *prosopopoeia* because the rhetor incorporates ‘her’ words (“Unto you, O men, I call ...”). There are other figures in this passage as well, of course, such as the opening *erotema* (‘rhetorical question,’ assertion in the form of a question) and the *epanaphora* in the third line, but it is only the relations between *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* that concern us here.

They each have a range of effects that overlap. Incorporation might be used for mockery, especially if accompanied by exaggerated gestures or expressions, or, as it is here, it might be used for endorsement, so that the rhetor is seen to be aligned with the good sense and concern of Wisdom. Depiction too might be mocking or endorsing the *ethos* it targets. But there are important differences of ethotic distancing between a first-person incorporation of another’s words and a third-person depiction (or sometimes, second-person depiction, as in Scheer’s “you are a phoney and you are a fraud” (2019g) directed at Trudeau in the 2019 Debate). Incorporation involves parodic mimicry in cases of mocking, assimilation in cases of supporting. *Prosopopoeia* involves an ethotic penetration. It always comes from inside. Depiction is a step

removed. *Ethopoeia* involves an ethotic externality. The *ethopoeic* rhetorical stance always entails a separation, a judgement, praising or blaming, from an outside position.

1.10. Texts and Sampling Procedures

There is a great deal of debate-related, social-media data from the two Canadian federal elections, so a practical sampling procedure is developed to isolate the data for this analysis. The sampling procedure begins with gathering all debate related social media posts from the official Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts of Canada's federal political leaders and their respective parties who participated in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate during the 2015 and 2019 election campaign timeframes. From this data, traffic statistics are used to separate out the top three debate-related *shared* Facebook posts, *retweeted* Twitter posts, and *liked* Instagram posts for each party and leader, which are assembled into a top 10 list of shared Facebook posts, a top 10 list of retweeted Twitter posts, and a top 10 list of liked Instagram posts. If a party or leader had more than three top-performing shared, retweeted, or liked posts, these posts were also captured in the data set. With the data, the intention is not to 'cherry pick' particular posts, particular leaders, or particular parties but rather to select the most propagated posts related to the debate on social media to analyze. The social-media consumers (ignoring the possibility of bots, account farms, and other artificial boosting methods) have made the selections, not me. Impressions are driving the amplification of these posts, by social-media users.

1.10.1. Study Data for Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate

Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate held on 6 August 2015 from 20:00 to 22:00 ET was selected as the single 2015 debate to be studied during the 2015 Canadian federal

election.⁹ It was the first of five leaders' debates occurring during the campaign, the most viewed of the five leaders' debates covering general topics, and the debate hosting four of Canada's five party leaders:¹⁰

- Incumbent Prime Minister and Conservative Party of Canada Leader Stephen Harper
- Liberal Party of Canada Leader Justin Trudeau
- Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP) Leader Thomas Mulcair
- Green Party of Canada Leader Elizabeth May

For the 2015 study, I rely on five data sources:

- Live accounts of the full video replay of the two-hour 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders Debate ("Replay: *Maclean's* National Leaders' Debate" 2015)
- Live accounts of the transcribed 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate (2015)
- Live accounts and web archives of the 2015 political parties' and political leaders' Facebook accounts
- Live accounts and web archives of the 2015 political parties' and political leaders' Twitter accounts
- Live accounts and web archives of the 2015 political parties' and political leaders' Instagram accounts

⁹ Traditionally, party leaders participate in at least two debates, one in English and one in French, organized by the consortium of Canada's major television networks. In 2015, the Conservative government announced that they would not participate in the English consortium debate. Instead, there were five debates in 2015, two in English, one bilingual, and two in French. The first English debate was on general topics hosted on 6 August 2015 by *Maclean's* magazine, moderated by political columnist Paul Wells. The second English debate was on the Canadian economy hosted on 17 September 2015 by the *Globe and Mail*, moderated by editor-in-chief David Walmsley. The third debate was in French on general topics hosted on 24 September 2015 organized by the consortium of broadcasters, moderated by ICI RDI journalist Anne-Marie Dussault [*RDI* for Réseau de l'information; *ICI* is just a stylized version of the word *ici*]. The fourth debate was bilingual on Canada's foreign policy and was held on 28 September 2015 as part of the Munk Debates, moderated by senior fellow Rudyard Griffiths. The fifth debate was on general topics in French on 2 October 2015 and organized by private broadcaster TVA, moderated by TVA *Nouvelles* anchor Pierre Bruneau.

¹⁰ Bloc Québécois Leader Gilles Duceppe did not participate in the 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate, as the BQ had only four seats, did not have Official Party status, and it was an English-Language Leaders' Debate.

The 2015 data was manually scraped and captured in April 2019 and May 2019 through detailed post, photo, and video searches on leaders' and parties' Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts. The eight accounts captured on each of the three platforms for 2015 included:

- Conservative Party of Canada; Facebook @cpcpcc; Twitter @CPC_HQ
- Conservative Party of Canada Debate: Twitter @cpcdebate (2015)
- Conservative Party Leader of Canada and Prime Minister Stephen Harper; Facebook @RtHonStephenHarper; Twitter @PMHarper; Instagram @stephenharper
- Liberal Party of Canada; Facebook @LiberalCA; Twitter @liberal_party
- Liberal Party Leader Justin Trudeau; Facebook @JustinPJTrudeau; Twitter @JustinTrudeau; Instagram @justinpjtrudeau
- Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP); Facebook @NDP.NPD; Twitter @NDP_HQ (2015); Instagram @ndpcanada
- Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP) Leader Tom Mulcair; Facebook @TomMulcair; Twitter @ThomasMulcair; Instagram @tommulcair
- Green Party of Canada; Facebook @GreenPartyofCanada; Twitter @CanadianGreens; Instagram @greenpartyofcanadaofficial (2015)
- Green Party of Canada Leader Elizabeth May; Facebook @ElizabethMayGreenLeader; Twitter @ElizabethMay

The manually collected 2015 Twitter data was also electronically scraped using Python Twint in August 2019 and was cross-referenced with the archived *Macleans*' Leaders' Debate CPAC Twitter transcript from 6 August 2015 ("*Macleans*' Leaders' Debate" 2015). For deleted data, such as Twitter's Conservative Party of Canada's Debate account @cpcdebate, the Twitter transcript from CPAC.ca on 6 August 2015 ("*Macleans*' Leaders' Debate" 2015), the Twitter

feed capture from Internet Archive Wayback Machine on 29 August 2015 (“Internet Archive: Wayback Machine” 2015), and the Twitter feed from oldweb.today on 29 August 2015 at 15:51:06, (“Oldweb.Today” 2019) was used to populate this information.¹¹ Every effort was made to ensure precision and completeness of the data at the time of this study. However, there are limitations with the 2015 social-media data collection. One limitation with social media studies generally is the fluidity of user engagement, which was exacerbated in this case by the delay in data collection, meaning that the number of likes, shares, and comments from 2015 may have increased or decreased by the time of collection. Likes, shares, and comments may be absent from the posts, through deletion of posts, removal of likes, shares, comments by the users, or the termination of the users’ accounts. Engagement with posts may also have increased or decreased in the time following 2015 through new likes, shares, and comments on these older social media posts or removal of likes, shares, and comments, or deletion of accounts. Another limitation with the study is that once a social media user account is deleted, such as the Conservative Party’s 2015 Twitter debate account @cpcdebate, or when a post, video, or photo, is removed from the leaders’ or political parties’ account, it may not be possible to recover the content completely, or at all, meaning some of the images or videos may not display, or may not display correctly, and complete data on user engagement may not be wholly available. In addition, complex algorithms used on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram can sometimes determine what is seen on each platform, and user-enabled privacy restrictions may have influence on which posts are viewable for select audiences. For this study, all 2015 *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate related posts, photos, and videos, from Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, were

¹¹ Lane (Melanie) Lamb, Director, Knowledge Management and Preservation, Information and Document Resource Service at The Library of Parliament in Ottawa confirmed on 17 May 2019 by email that this was the most comprehensive information available on the deleted @cpcdebate Twitter account.

recorded from the live accounts of the political parties represented and the leaders who participated in the debate. For the Conservative Party's deleted Twitter debate account, @cpcdebate, archived data was recorded. Social reach and social performance are important indicators of success on social media platforms. From the data collected, each of the debating parties' and leaders' top three shared debate-related posts on Facebook and Twitter, and the top two liked debate-related posts on Instagram were assessed.¹² Capturing the political parties' and political leaders' top three posts on Facebook and Twitter, and top two liked posts on Instagram related to the 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and arranging the posts into a top 10 list of shared Facebook posts (Table 4), a top 10 list of retweeted Twitter posts (Table 5), and a top four list of liked Instagram posts (Table 6), was the main focus to control data for further analysis.¹³ In examining user engagement to determine the top shared posts on Facebook and Twitter and the top liked posts on Instagram, all posts, photos, and videos were considered on the day of the *Maclean's* debate, 6 August 2015, with *Maclean's* leaders' debate related posts, photos, and videos considered during the 78-day election campaign, from 2 August 2015 to 19 October 2015.

1.10.2. Study Data for Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate held on 7 October 2019 from 19:00 to 21:00 ET was selected as the single 2019 debate to be studied. This debate hosted six of Canada's party leaders:

- Conservative Party of Canada Leader Andrew Scheer
- Incumbent Prime Minister and Liberal Party of Canada Leader Justin Trudeau

¹² The Instagram platform does not have a share function.

¹³ In 2015, parties and leaders had few posts on Instagram, with only two debate-related Instagram posts available to study for Trudeau and Mulcair. Elizabeth May, the Conservative Party, and the Liberal Party did not have Instagram accounts, while Stephen Harper, the NDP, and the Green Party did not post debate-related material on their Instagram accounts.

- Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP) Leader Jagmeet Singh
- Green Party of Canada Leader Elizabeth May
- Bloc Québécois (BQ) Party Leader Yves-François Blanchet
- People's Party of Canada (PPC) Leader Maxime Bernier

For the 2019 study, I rely on five data sources:

- Live accounts of the full video replay of Canada's 2019 two-hour English-Language Leaders' Debate (*Maclean's* 2019a)
- Live accounts of the transcribed 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate (*Maclean's* 2019c)
- Live accounts of the 2019 political parties' and political leaders' Facebook accounts
- Live accounts of the 2019 political parties' and political leaders' Twitter accounts
- Live accounts of the 2019 political parties' and political leaders' Instagram accounts

For the 2019 study, all English-Language Leaders' Debate related posts, photos, and videos, from Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, were manually scraped, captured, and recorded from the accounts of the political parties and leaders in November 2019 and December 2019. The twelve accounts captured on each of the three platforms included:

- Conservative Party of Canada; Facebook @cpcpcc; Twitter @CPC_HQ; Instagram cpc_hq
- Conservative Party of Canada Leader Andrew Scheer; Facebook @AndrewScheerMP; Twitter @AndrewScheer; Instagram @andrewjscheer
- Liberal Party of Canada; Facebook @LiberalCA; Twitter @liberal_party; Instagram @liberalca

- Liberal Party of Canada Leader and Prime Minister Justin Trudeau; Facebook @JustinPJTrudeau; Twitter @JustinTrudeau; Instagram @justinpjtrudeau
- Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP); Facebook @NDP.NPD; Twitter @NDP (2019); Instagram @ndpcanada
- Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP) Leader Jagmeet Singh; Facebook @jagmeetndp; Twitter @thejagmeetsingh; Instagram @jagmeetsingh
- Green Party of Canada; Facebook @GreenPartyofCanada; Twitter @CanadianGreens; Instagram @thegreenparty_canada (2019)
- Green Party of Canada Leader Elizabeth May; Facebook @ElizabethMayGreenLeader; Twitter @ElizabethMay; Instagram @ElizabethMay
- Bloc Québécois (BQ) Party; Facebook @blocquebecois; Twitter @BlocQuebecois; Instagram @blocquebecois
- Bloc Québécois Party Leader Yves-François Blanchet; Facebook @Yves-François-Blanchet-Bloc-québécois-364797800592456; Twitter @yfblanchet; Instagram @yfblanchetbq
- People's Party of Canada (PPC); Facebook @peoplespca; Twitter @peoplespca; Instagram @peoplespca
- People's Party of Canada (PPC) Leader Maxime Bernier; Facebook @hon.maximebernier; Twitter @hon.maximebernier; Instagram @hon.maximebernier

In addition to posts being manually captured, the leaders' and parties' Twitter posts were electronically scraped and captured using Python Twint in November 2019 and December 2019 following the 21 October 2019 Canadian federal election. From the data collected, each of the debating parties' and leaders' top three shared posts from Facebook, top three retweeted posts

from Twitter, and the top three liked posts from Instagram were evaluated. A top 10 list of shared Facebook posts (Table 7), a top 10 list of retweeted Twitter posts (Table 8), and a top 10 list of liked Instagram posts (Table 9) was created. If a party or leader had more than three top performing shared, retweeted, or liked posts, these posts were also captured in the data set. Although Canada was on trial for removing likes on Instagram in December 2019,¹⁴ this did not affect collecting an accurate count of the engagement and likes for this study. At the time of collection, it was possible to view the number of likes and engagements on the political leaders' and political parties' Instagram images when clicking on and opening the image using a desktop computer. In assessing the top shared posts on Facebook and Twitter and the top liked posts on Instagram, all posts, photos, and videos were considered on the day of Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate, 7 October 2019, with English-Language Leaders' Debate related posts, photos, and videos considered during the 40-day election campaign from 11 September 2019 to 21 October 2019.

1.11. Overview

This dissertation is comprised of six chapters and three appendices. This chapter provides an overview of the importance of *ethos* when researching the effect of social media on leaders' debates. It briefly discusses the characteristics of the three social media platforms used in this study, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, and the methodologies used for studying the influence of social media on political debates. Two rhetorical figures used in this study, *prosopopoeia*, the incorporation of another's *ethos*, and *ethopoeia*, the depiction of another's *ethos*, are introduced, and a historical account of how the rhetorical figures have been presented over time is

¹⁴ Facebook Inc.'s Instagram first started hiding 'likes' visible on posts for some users in Canada in May 2019, so users could "focus on the photos and videos you share, not how many likes they get" (Instagram 2019). This came after reports found that Instagram was detrimental to mental health and was linked to depression and anxiety in younger people (Royal Society for Public Health Vision, Voice and Practice (RSPH) 2017).

considered. Chapter One also discusses the texts and sampling procedures used for the analysis of Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate.

Chapter Two provides a descriptive synopsis of Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and a descriptive synopsis of Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate. This chapter is intended for those who have not watched the leaders' debates or who cannot recall its content. The first part of the chapter identifies the 2015 Debate players, moderator, and four leaders of the main political parties. It provides a concise outline of the format of the 2015 Debate, followed by a short description characterizing the issues emphasized by each leader, the way the leaders identified their own *ethos*, and some of the *ethopoeic* strategies the leaders used in depicting the other leaders. It provides an explanatory summary detailing the four main themes of the 2015 Debate: The Economy; Energy and the Environment; The State of Canada's Democracy; and Foreign Policy and Security. The second part of Chapter Two identifies the 2019 Debate players, the five moderators and six leaders of the main political parties. It provides a brief description discussing the issues each leader emphasizes, how leaders identify their own *ethos*, and a few of the *ethopoeic* strategies the leaders use in depicting other leaders. It offers an explanatory summary of the 2019 Debate under five main themes: Leadership in Canada and the World; Polarization, Human Rights, and Immigration; Indigenous Issues; Affordability and Income Security; and Environment and Energy. The analysis of the two debates follows in Chapters Three, Four, and Five.

Chapter Three analyzes how social media influences Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate. It examines the instruments of incorporation and depiction, *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, in the social media posts related to the debate. It identifies and analyzes parties' and leaders' top

shared Facebook posts, top retweeted Twitter posts, and top liked Instagram posts related to six major debate-related themes. The first theme discussed on each platform focuses on posts related to *prosopopoeia* while the second theme focuses on posts related to *ethopoeia*.

2015 Facebook themes:

1. Recirculating edited versions of leaders' closing remarks
2. Asserting a party's leader "wins" the debate

2015 Twitter themes:

3. Requesting followers to "agree" with and share parties' and leaders' debate-related posts
4. Reinforcing leaders' debate-related talking points and zingers

2015 Instagram themes:

5. Providing followers with a behind-the-scenes intimate view of leaders
6. Curating information and visuals in favour of a particular leader

Through the examination of these posts related to the six main themes, one sees how *ethos* refracts in social media and how the rhetorical figures, *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* infiltrate the political parties' and leaders' social media accounts.

Chapter Four analyzes the effect of social media on Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate through examining the top shared debate-related Facebook posts, top retweeted debate-related Twitter posts, and top liked debate-related Instagram posts, under an additional set of six themes present within the social media posts. Posts related to *prosopopoeia* are discussed in the first theme, while posts related to *ethopoeia* are focused on in the second theme for each platform:

2019 Facebook Themes:

1. Constructing an ideological and rhetorical divide between parties and leaders

2. Curating favourable leader posts by ‘cherry-picking’ traditional media

2019 Twitter Themes:

3. Providing a debate ‘do-over’ for leaders
4. Affording parties and leaders with a platform to debate contentious issues

2019 Instagram Themes:

5. Associating leaders’ partners and families with the debate
6. Incorporating emotional appeals in leaders’ visual performances

Examining these themes reveals how *ethos* refracts and the how the rhetorical figures *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* incorporates into the parties’ and leaders’ social media accounts.

Chapter Five assesses the effect of social media on debates over time by comparing the 2015 Debate posts to the 2019 Debate posts, for each social media platform, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. It discusses the implications of the evolution on political leaders’ debates with a focus on the occurrences of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*. Whereas in 2015 it is more common to see debate content move out *onto* social media (with the exception the Trudeau Liberals), in 2019, debate content is being shaped *for* social media by political parties and leaders. Social media is coaxing a performative personae from leaders, fostering the use of the rhetorical figures, *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, in ways that are (re)shaping debate, and ultimately, democracy.

Chapter Six is the culmination of this research project. It provides a summary of each of the earlier five chapters, discusses the contributions that this research has for the study of rhetoric, examines the limitations of this study, and provides recommendations for future exploration and research on this topic.

The Appendices include tables comparing page likes and followers for each political leader and political party, comparing 2015 to 2019, for each social media platform, Facebook,

Twitter, and Instagram. It also provides tables showcasing Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate, and 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate, top ten shared debate-related Facebook posts, top ten retweeted debate-related Twitter posts, and top ten liked debate-related Instagram posts for each of the two debates.¹⁵ Also included is a comprehensive catalogue of the top three shared Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram posts for each political party and leader for each of the two debates.¹⁶ Each post has a hyperlink embedded within the image, and at the time of publication, the link can be clicked to bring the viewer to the post on the original social media platform. Also included in the appendices are the full transcripts of Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate.

¹⁵ In 2015, only four social media posts were debate-related on Instagram, two from Trudeau's account, and two from Mulcair's account.

¹⁶ For some political parties and leaders, there may not be three debate-related posts available. In these instances, the posts related to the debate are shown. Also, in some instances, there may be more than three debate-related posts displayed. This is because the number of shares/retweets/likes exceeds those attained by the other parties' top posts and were therefore included in the top ten list of most shared/retweeted/liked posts for that platform.

2. Descriptive Synopses: Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

“You know, he's very good at pretending things. He can't even remember how many times he put blackface on. Because the fact of the matter is he's always wearing a mask. He puts on a reconciliation mask and then fires the Attorney General, the first one of Indigenous background. He puts on a feminist mask and then fires two strong female MPs for not going along with his corruption. He puts on a middle-class mask and then raises taxes on middle class Canadians. Mr. Trudeau, you are a phoney and a fraud, and you do not deserve to govern this country.”

- Conservative Leader, Andrew Scheer

[directed at Liberal Leader and Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau]

Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

This chapter is intended to provide a descriptive account of Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate, particularly for those readers who did not watch the debate or cannot recall its content. It also offers a brief overview of the two Canadian federal elections serving in this comparative case study. The analysis of these debates follows in the subsequent chapters.

2.1. The Leaders in Canada's 2015 Federal Election

The leaders featured in the 2015 Canadian federal election were:

- Incumbent Prime Minister Stephen Harper, and Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada. Harper held the position of Prime Minister of Canada for three consecutive terms (2006 to 2015). Going into the 2015 election, the Harper Conservative Party was holding 166 of 308 seats in the House of Commons and had a majority government.
- Newcomer Justin Trudeau, elected Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada in 2013. Trudeau is the son of past Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau (1968-1979; 1980-1984). Trudeau was in a difficult position heading into the 2015 election with the

Liberals holding only 34 seats after a disastrous 2011 showing, in which the party lost 43 seats (reduced from 77 to 34 seats).

- Newcomer Thomas Mulcair, Leader of Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP) (2012-2017), and Leader of the Official Opposition before the dissolution of Parliament (2012-2015). Mulcair was in a strong position leading the Opposition after an impressive NDP performance in 2011 (under Jack Layton). Mulcair's NDP held 103 seats heading into the 2015 election.
- Elizabeth May, Leader of the Green Party of Canada (2006-2019). The Green Party had one seat heading into the 2015 election, May's own.
- Gilles Duceppe, Leader of the Bloc Québécois (BQ) (1997-2011; 2015). Duceppe held four seats heading into the 2015 election. Duceppe was not a participant in Canada's 2015 *Macleans*'s Leaders' Debate.

2.2. The Format of Canada's 2015 *Macleans*'s Leaders' Debate

Canada's 2015 *Macleans*'s Leaders' Debate had the following format:

- One moderator, Paul Wells, a political reporter, and Senior Editor of *Macleans* Magazine. Wells does not claim to be impartial or to not have opinions about the leaders, but rather asserts his first objective for political coverage is to "be interesting," even "if that means being annoying, or maddening, or provocative" (2015b), traits that play especially well on social media.
- The debate physically took place on the ground floor of the CityTV television building in Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

- A two-hour debate, broadcasted live on 6 August 2015 from 20:00 to 22:00 ET on Rogers TV networks, including City, OMNI 1, OMNI 2, and CPAC. It was also live-streamed on Rogers' radio and television station websites, Macleans.ca, Facebook, and YouTube.
- The debate was broadcasted in six languages, Italian, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Punjabi, on OMNI, and aired in English and French on CPAC.
- There were no opening statements, but each leader had two minutes for a closing statement.
- The debate focused on four topics:
 1. The Economy
 2. Energy and the Environment
 3. The State of Canada's Democracy, and
 4. Foreign Policy and Security
- Each topic was allotted 30-minutes, and the segments were broken down into two parts, with debate questions undisclosed to leaders in advance (2015)
- The debate consisted of a randomly assigned speaking order, predetermined before the debate began. Wells asked one question to one of the leaders, allowing another leader to respond to the first leader, and then an extended discussion followed among all leaders.

2.3. Leaders' *Ethos* in Canada's 2015 *Macleans*'s Leaders' Debate

2.3.1. Stephen Harper

Stephen Harper followed a strategy of defending his "prudent" leadership, attacking Justin Trudeau's inexperience in politics and Tom Mulcair's longstanding career as a politician. Harper forecasted his continued governance as Prime Minister by encouraging voters to view him as superior to his competition. Highlighting unprecedented economic instability globally,

Harper professed that under his leadership Canada had the strongest economic growth, strongest job creation record, and the strongest income growth for the middle class among major developed economies, and claimed that the other parties' plans of high taxes, high debt, and high deficits, which are failing everywhere else, would fail in Canada too (2015c). On social media, Harper's images were centred on himself. Through these images, Harper was indirectly asserting that there is no other choice—he is, and will remain, the Prime Minister of Canada. But in his communication with the debate viewers, Harper had difficulty incorporating succinct language, which negatively affected his media exposure in the days following the debate. Using jargon and acronyms to explain his policy plans to the public instead of using plain language, Harper spoke of “OAS” to refer to old age security, and “RRIFs” to indicate registered retired income funds. Harper failed to connect these acronyms to private or personal terms, instead using abbreviations which viewers may not have understood. As well, Harper used policy jargon, such as “Guaranteed Income Supplement,” “income-splitting,” and “poor income seniors,” flaunting his intellectual superiority rather than explaining these terms in “popular speech” (Fairclough 1992, 112)—that is, emphasizing *phronesis* at the expense of *eunoia*. Harper lost a critical opportunity during the debate to adequately explain to the public the rewards accrued from his ten-year reign as Prime Minister of Canada. This left the 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate open for Trudeau, Mulcair, and May, to capture audience attention with their communication of concepts and ideas.

2.3.2. Justin Trudeau

Justin Trudeau represented himself as a sharply progressive alternative to Harper's Conservatism. Trudeau looked and spoke well, and this was advantageous for the Liberal Party, as his attractive appearance along with projecting characteristics of a positive personality that was sincere, straightforward, and inspired, resonated with audiences. He also took the best parts

of Mulcair's policies and made them his own. Trudeau presented to viewers a plan to strengthen the middle class by getting the wealthiest to pay more tax and hammered home the idea that Harper's plan had failed for the past ten years by predominately providing benefits to wealthy Canadians. Rather than speaking about specific policy plans in detail, Trudeau used his debate time to directly address Harper and his shortcomings, accusing Harper of being disconnected from the reality people are facing across the country, taking money out of the pockets of seniors in raising the age at which seniors could access old age benefits, benefiting the wealthy with tax breaks, as well as failing on the environment and on the economy. Trudeau used the debate to present his *ethos* and governance capabilities, and the audience liked what they saw. He positioned himself with particular emphasis on *eunoia* and *arete*.

2.3.3. Thomas Mulcair

Thomas Mulcair, in attempting to adopt a Prime Ministerial air during the debate, greeted audiences with a forced smile and a soft and restrained demeanour, counter to his typically combative temperament in the House of Commons. With polls suggesting Mulcair was ahead of, or tied with, the Conservatives, and ahead of the Liberals at the time of the *Macleans*' Leaders' Debate, it was assumed that should mean Mulcair "will become Prime Minister" (Maher 2015). During the debate Mulcair harped on lost manufacturing jobs, skyrocketing household debt, and incomes that were flatlining. He promised he would invest in the middle class through the creation of new jobs as well as spending on infrastructure and a clean environment. Mulcair criticized Harper for losing manufacturing jobs, replacing them with mostly part-time precarious jobs, and suggested Harper is hiding the fact that Canada is currently in a recession. Mulcair said the right things, but his controlled and cranky debate performance left the door open for Trudeau and May to gain the limelight—and they welcomed the opportunity.

2.3.4. Elizabeth May

Elizabeth May promoted her willingness to work across party lines to deliver what Canadians want, stressing that the Green Party is not a one issue party, or a one-person party. May kept Harper on task during the debate, challenging his statements and asking him tough questions, such as questioning his policy plans for austerity measures rather than investment, pointing out Canada was in a recession under his governance for a second time, and declaring his record on climate is a legacy of broken promises, while advocating for the need to invest in a climate action plan. May promoted herself as an “intervener” (2015d), providing comprehensive policy plans and statements, divulging information that was distinct from branded campaign quips and quotes, and providing viewers additional content and facts that they may not have been aware of or had been privy to.

2.4. Descriptive Synopsis of Canada’s 2015 *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate

Full of zany zingers, crosstalk, and even a live rendition mimicking Jack Nicholson’s “you can’t handle the truth” scene from the 1992 film, *A Few Good Men*,¹⁷ Canada’s 2015 *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate was an action-packed event; or at least, that was what it appeared to be through the political leaders’ and political parties’ social media platforms. It was the first of five leaders’ debates occurring during the 2015 election campaign, the most viewed of the five leaders’ debates, and the debate hosting four of Canada’s top political leaders vying for the job of Prime Minister of Canada. Political leaders were positioned from left to right in the order of Justin Trudeau, Elizabeth May, Thomas Mulcair, and Stephen Harper. Paul Wells, the moderator, asked pointed questions on a broad range of topics. A total audience of 4.3 million

¹⁷ Trudeau’s response to Mulcair: “You want a number, Mr. Mulcair? I’ll give you a number. Nine. My number is nine. Nine Supreme Court Justices said, one vote is not enough to break up this country...” (Trudeau 2015q).

tuned into the debate (Hutchins 2015) with more than 3.8 million viewers watching at least some of it, and an average audience of 1.5 million viewers (Hutchins 2015). The debate was streamed over 278,000 times on Macleans.ca, YouTube, Facebook, and OMNI.ca websites, and gained continued audience viewing on Macleans.ca, with over 200,000 replays within one week (Hutchins 2015). On Twitter, the hashtag associated with the debate, #macdebate, became the number one trending topic across Canada with conversations about the debate exceeding 2,200 tweets per minute during its peak (Hutchins 2015). Wells promoted *Macleans*'s Facebook page during the debate, educating and reminding viewers “who are watching TV that if you want to engage on social media and have your say on tonight’s debate, you can do so on our Facebook page. So, you can talk to other voters about what’s going on here while you’re watching on TV” (2015a). The *Macleans*'s Facebook page drew more than 110,000 votes in live polls during the debate and tens of thousands of viewer comments (Hutchins 2015).

2.4.1. Segment One: Economy

Within the segment on the economy, the first question from Wells highlighted the anxiety Canadians feel around the shrinking economy, hurting manufacturing sector, and the low price of oil. He asked leaders if a tax break or a few changes in tax rates at the margin would have any effect. Leaders took this opportunity to discuss their party platforms in response, which focused primarily on middle class Canadians. Trudeau was first to respond, using scripted campaign language to highlight his plan of “lowering taxes for the middle class by asking the wealthiest to pay more tax” (2015q), language that would work well as a social media post. When Wells challenged Trudeau on his statement questioning him on the premise of his argument, saying, “economists have said that median incomes have actually been on the rise since about 1990” and that he has “a solution to a problem that isn’t really there” (2015a), Trudeau retorted, “not at all”

and commented on the choices middle class Canadians have to make, from paying for their kids' education to saving for retirement, asserting that "we have a generation of young people who aren't going to do better than the previous generation did" (2015q). Harper was first to respond to Trudeau, "correcting a few facts" (2015c). Harper, too, used campaign language, arguing that Canada has the "strongest economic growth, the strongest job creation record, and the strongest income growth for the middle class among any of the major developed countries" and urged Canadians to stick by his "prudent plan that is working" (2015c). Harper warned viewers against the other leaders' "plan[s] of high taxes and high debt and high deficits ... which is failing everywhere else" (2015c). Mulcair emphasized his plan is to "invest in the middle class and create new jobs" and infrastructure, as well as give a break to small and medium-size corporations (2015f). May was the last to speak, declaring that "we're in a recession now" and maintained that we "need to build up Canada's economy through investment" (2015d).

The discussion headed toward the topic of job creation. Mulcair raised concern about the loss of 400,000 manufacturing jobs under Harper and the creation of mostly part-time jobs as replacements. Harper disagreed with Mulcair's statement stating, "let me give you the facts" (2015c). Since the global financial crisis, Harper claims, "ninety percent of the 1.3 million net new jobs created are full-time. Eighty percent of them are [in] the private sector. Two-thirds of them are in high wage industries" (Harper 2015c). Harper warns viewers that the other parties want to "impose both on workers and on employers, big hikes to payroll taxes—CPP¹⁸ taxes, EI¹⁹ taxes" which he declares would "kill jobs, and they would hurt ordinary people" (2015c).

¹⁸ The Canada Pension Plan (CPP) provides contributors and their families with partial replacement of earnings in the case of retirement, disability, or death. Almost all individuals who work in Canada outside of Québec contribute to the CPP (Employment and Social Development Canada 2015a).

¹⁹ Employment Insurance Benefits (EI) assists those who are unemployed, but also plays an important role in supporting employees and self-employed individuals (including fishers) who are too sick to work, who stay at home with a newborn or newly adopted child, or who take a temporary leave from work to provide care or support to a gravely ill family member (Employment and Social Development Canada 2014).

Trudeau believes “the challenge that we’re facing right now in our economy is actually about creating growth” and deems that “we need more investment. We need to create more jobs” (2015q), but does not say how he will do this. In this segment, Trudeau oddly introduces Mulcair’s minimum wage plan, proclaiming that Mulcair’s \$15.00 an hour plan “will only help less than one percent of every Canadian that earns minimum wage” (2015q). Mulcair responds that “under Mr. Trudeau’s plan, not a single Canadian will get a raise” (2015f). Trudeau then inappropriately speaks in third-person saying, “actually, under Mr. Trudeau’s plan, 315,000 kids will be lifted out of poverty,” (2015q) which does not relate to the topic of discussion on minimum wage, but was likely a pre-planned talking point for this segment on the economy.

From the topic of job creation, Trudeau veered the topic towards a discussion on seniors. Harper highlighted that the Liberals and the NDP plan to increase CPP taxes. Trudeau responds by reminding viewers of Harper’s plan to raise the age of retirement from 65-years to 67-years, which “is taking tens of thousands of dollars out of the pockets of our most vulnerable seniors” (2015q). Trudeau then adds additional scripted statements unrelated to the topic of seniors addressing Harper stating, “Canadians know that you’ve let them down because you’ve chosen to continue to give benefits and tax breaks to the wealthiest Canadians” (2015q), followed by, “our plan is focused on strengthening the middle class with a more generous child benefit that’ll lift 315,000 kids out of poverty and stop sending government cheques to millionaires” (2015q). Ignoring Trudeau’s pivot from seniors to children, Harper retorts that retirement age will not increase for ten years, leading Trudeau to state, “Oh, so it’s for our grandchildren to worry about that one?” (2015q). Harper then lists the Conservative Party’s accomplishments, using acronyms to do so:

OAS²⁰ is increasing. We have brought in the largest increase to the Guaranteed Income Supplement²¹ for poor income seniors in 25 years. We brought in income-splitting for our pensioners²²—I know something the other parties oppose, but [the pensioners] appreciate it. We’ve made the rules for RRIFs²³ more generous (2015c).

This jargon-ridden statement during the debate illuminates Harper’s *ethos* and his implied audience of his Conservative Party base, which would not translate well into a social media post. The segment ends with Mulcair claiming Harper “added \$150 billion to Canada’s debt in the last 10 years” concluding his statement with an attempt at a scripted zinger, “Mr. Harper, we really can’t afford another four years of you” (2015f) to which Harper counters saying, “we have a budget that is balanced now when other countries don’t” (2015c).

In part two of the segment on the economy, there is a focus on infrastructure, taxes, and the recession. On the topic of infrastructure, May claims that the “infrastructure deficit is \$123 billion” and investment is needed “as our bridges and roads are crumbling” (2015d). Mulcair raises the issue that “municipal and local governments ... assume 60 percent of the cost for infrastructure with only eight percent of the tax base” (2015f). Mulcair states he will invest in infrastructure and “champion manufacturing and innovations, including green energy technologies” (2015f). Harper maintains that “investments in infrastructure, in innovation, and in

²⁰ The Old Age Security (OAS) program is the Government of Canada’s largest pension program. It is funded out of the general tax revenues of the Government of Canada. This means that Canadians do not pay into it directly. The OAS pension is a monthly payment available to seniors aged 65 and older who meet the Canadian legal status and residence requirements (Employment and Social Development Canada 2015c).

²¹ The Guaranteed Income Supplement (GIS) provides a monthly non-taxable benefit to Old Age Security (OAS) pension recipients who have a low income and are living in Canada (Employment and Social Development Canada 2015b).

²² Pension Income Splitting allows spouses or common-law partners to split eligible pension income if they meet all of the legislated requirements (Canada Revenue Agency 2007a).

²³ A registered retirement income fund (RRIF) is an arrangement between a Canadian and a carrier (an insurance company, a trust company, or a bank) that the government registers. A Canadian transfers property to the carrier from a RRSP, a PRPP, a RPP, a SPP, or from another RRIF, and the carrier makes payments to you. The minimum amount must be paid to you in the year following the year the RRIF is entered into. Earnings in a RRIF are tax-free and amounts paid out of a RRIF are taxable on receipt. You can have more than one RRIF and you can have self-directed RRIFs. The rules that apply to self-directed RRIFs are generally the same as those for RRSPs (Canada Revenue Agency 2007b).

immigration” are all part of his Conservative Economic Action Plan to help drive our economy (2015c).

On the topic of taxes, Trudeau reiterates that he “is asking the wealthiest one percent in this country to pay more tax, so we can give a big tax break to the middle class” (2015q) to which Harper responds that he has “done the same thing for people. We have cut taxes across the board with the vast bulk of those tax breaks for middle- and low-income Canadians” (Harper 2015c). Harper claims his “low-tax, prudent plan” has “created the lowest tax environment for business investment across the G-7”²⁴ and suggests that this lower tax environment is “one of the reasons we have the strongest employment growth in the G-7” as “tax cuts help create jobs” and in addition, the “tax revenues actually went up from the business sector” (2015c). Harper associates the other parties with “permanent higher tax rates and permanent deficits” (2015c). Mulcair guarantees to “reduce small business taxes because they are responsible for creating 80 percent of the new jobs” (2015f), to which Harper retorts that the Conservatives “cut taxes many times for small business, and the NDP voted against that every single time” (2015c). Mulcair also states he will increase Canada’s largest corporations’ “taxes slightly” (2015f), to which Trudeau responds that Mulcair’s corporate tax hike is “simply pandering to the people who like to hate corporations, but we need that growth. We need that job creation” (Trudeau 2015q). May states that these large corporation “job creators” have “sat on that money” and claims that “\$630 billion in cash, an astonishing 32 percent of Canada’s GDP” is sitting unused, which Mark Carney, the past Governor of the Bank of Canada (2008-2013) and current Governor of the Bank of England (2013-2020), has called “the dead money” (2015d).

²⁴ The G-7 is an informal grouping of seven of the world’s advanced economies consisting of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the European Union. Since joining the G-7 in 1976, Canada has further strengthened political and economic ties with the world’s most advanced economies and helped shape global progress on a broad range of issues (Foreign Affairs Trade and Development Canada 2019).

A focus for all other leaders was on questioning Harper about the likelihood of Canada being in a recession. Trudeau, Mulcair, and May suggested that Canada is in a recession. Harper responded that Canada has “the lowest debt levels in the G-7” (2015c). However, Mulcair pushes Harper stating that “the Canadian government have shown that for five months in a row the Canadian economy has shrunk. We are one month away from a technical definition of a recession, but according to a lot of observers, we’re already in a recession” (2015f). Harper gets rattled with Mulcair’s questioning and states, “I’m not denying that,” but the contraction is “almost exclusively in the energy sector,” and “the way to handle a fall in oil prices is not tens of billions of dollars of increased taxes, increased borrowing, and increased spending” (2015c). Harper asserts that “we have the best fiscal situation” in the G-7 “by a country mile” and “middle class incomes ... are rising in significant part because of the tax breaks we’ve given to middle- and low-income Canadians” (2015c). Mulcair concludes the segment with a scripted zinger, bouncing off his previous line of questioning towards Harper saying, “Well, you know, Stephen Harper is the only Prime Minister in Canadian history who, when asked about the recession during his mandate, gets to say, ‘Which one?’” (2015f).

2.4.2. Segment Two: Energy and Environment

The second segment of the debate focused on energy and the environment. Key areas of discussion in this segment included oil export through pipeline projects, climate change, and putting a price on pollution through a carbon tax. The discussion on oil exports focused on the stalled Keystone XL, Northern Gateway, and Energy East, oil pipelines. Harper explained that the Keystone pipeline is “a situation under control of the United States” and he is “very confident” the next President will approve that project (2015c). In response to the Northern Gateway pipeline, Harper discussed how “the project went through a rigorous environmental

assessment” with “some 200 conditions on the project” to which the proponent must fulfil (2015c), and chastises the other parties for not being responsible in opposing these oil pipeline projects before they have had their environmental assessments. Trudeau accuses Mulcair of being “inconsistent on pipelines” where “in English, he’ll say that he supports the Energy East pipeline; in French he said that it’s out of the question” (2015q). Trudeau suggests “that kind of inconsistency, quite frankly, isn’t the kind of leadership we need for Canada. You can’t say one thing in English and its opposite in French” (2015q). Trudeau then pivoted to a scripted statement, not fitting the *microkairos* of the moment,²⁵ promoting the environment, similar to his closing statement, stating,

This is about not just doing right by our environment; it’s also about doing right by future generations. I have three kids, and I know I want my kids to grow up in a country as fresh and pure and clean as Canada was when – as we remember it to be and as it used to be. And for that to be – take hold, we have to have a government that’s actually demonstrating leadership, that understands that you cannot make a choice between what’s good for the environment and what’s good for the economy (2015q).

Harper, ignoring Trudeau’s digression, suggests that Trudeau is being hypocritical, telling Trudeau, “You do exactly what you accuse Mr. Mulcair of doing. You go to one part of the country, Atlantic Canada, you’re for Energy East; you go to Québec, and you’re against it” (2015c). Mulcair later supports Harper’s statement on Trudeau’s pipeline inconsistency, when Mulcair states, “Mr. Trudeau, you said the exact opposite in an interview with Radio Canada in Rimouski last fall, and it’s easy to find that quote online” (2015f). May, focused on climate concerns, asks why Canada allows unprocessed oil to be exported to countries such as China,

²⁵ This dissertation treats *kairos* as the opportune moment of a rhetorical situation, like the Syrian refugee crisis of 2015, which gave Trudeau the opportunity to emphasize the inclusiveness of his party and the traditional safe-haven reputation of Canada, and the darkface scandal of 2019, which gave Scheer especially the opportunity to prosecute his charges of hypocrisy against Trudeau. In that light, I have adopted *microkairos* as the term for more transient matters of rhetorical timing, such as come up in a debate for the utterance of a zinger or knock-out blow.

through Enbridge and Kinder Morgan, which have poor environmental records. Mulcair agrees that he shares the same concerns as May with regard to the Kinder Morgan pipeline but states that “opposing these pipelines systematically in advance is just as wrong as supporting them” and wants “to look at them objectively with thorough, credible, environmental assessment processes” (2015f). Trudeau promotes his plan of “investing in clean tech, in jobs, investing in kids, pollution reduction, and emissions reduction” (2015q).

On the topic of climate change, May suggests that Canada needs to take action to “defend ourselves from the changing global climate” (2015d). May reminds Harper of his commitment in 2008 “to bring in a North America-wide cap-and-trade program working with partners” as well as oil and gas regulations, and that Canada needs to take action on reducing emissions (2015d). Harper responds that “our partners, both the United States and Mexico ... haven’t yet accepted that, but we are ready to go” (2015c). Trudeau suggests a similar platform to Harper’s, as Trudeau wants to “work again on a continental model, work with the United States and Mexico to address both energy and the environment” (2015q). Mulcair criticizes Harper on “gutting our environmental laws” stating that Canada now has “dirtier air and water ... carbon pollution, and [is] a laggard on the world stage” (2015f). Trudeau also criticizes Harper, insinuating that Harper favours the economy over the environment, stating, “you cannot make a choice between what’s good for the environment and what’s good for the economy” (2015q). Harper defends his policies stating, that “not only do we take both the economy and the environment seriously; we are the first government in history to reduce greenhouse gas emission while also growing our economy” (2015c) to which May states, “that’s not true” (2015d), and Trudeau follows with “Mr. Harper – nobody believes you” (2015q). Harper claims that the other parties have taken

positions “against every single one of these projects,” even opposing liquefied natural gas (2015c). Trudeau then brings in a zinger, stating:

Mr. Harper is continuing to invent attacks, and quite frankly, Canadians are tired of that kind of leadership. You haven’t been able to get it done on the environment, Mr. Harper. You haven’t been able to get it done on the economy. You haven’t built the kind of balance that Canadians expect. (2015q)

However, Trudeau, in chastising Harper on his failures, does not say how he will address the balance between the economy and the environment differently.

The second segment ends with a discussion on carbon tax. On the topic of a carbon tax, Trudeau, Mulcair, and May are all in favour of levying pollution. Harper is not in favour of a carbon tax. Trudeau is in synch with May but cannily avoids the word *tax*. He pledges to work with provinces and claims that “86 percent of our economy have committed to put a price on carbon” (2015q). May suggests that the only thing that has brought down Canada’s emissions is the shutting down of coal-fired power plants in Ontario and the carbon tax in British Columbia (2015d).

2.4.3. Segment Three: Democracy

In the third segment on democracy, the Clarity Act²⁶ associated with national unity was raised, as was electoral reform, and The Fair Elections Act.²⁷ May opened this segment responding to a question on her depicting the government as “an elected dictatorship” (Wells 2015). May responded to Wells by emphasizing the “unhealthy growth of power in the Prime Minister’s Office, which goes along with less of a role for individual members of parliament doing their fundamental job” (2015d). May asserts that the job description for a member of parliament is to “represent your constituencies” (2015d) and elections are not about electing a Prime Minister, but electing Members of Parliament (MPs).

Regarding the Clarity Act, Trudeau accuses Mulcair of pandering to his audience, saying “one thing in one part of the country and a different thing in another part of the country” (2015q). Trudeau accuses Mulcair of “talking in French about his desire to repeal the Clarity Act, to make it easier for those who want to break up this country to actually do so” (2015q).

²⁶ The Clarity Act, Bill C-20, “gives effect to the requirement for clarity set out by the Supreme Court of Canada in the Québec Secession Reference. It is the interpretation of the Court that the federal government give ‘political actors’ the responsibility of returning the right to determine, what, among other things, constitutes a question and a clear majority after a referendum that one province or territory initiates with a view to secession from Canada. Bill C-20 also defines in article 3, under what prior conditions the federal government is subject to political obligation to negotiate secession resulting from a referendum that has satisfied the requirements for clarity as defined in articles 1 and 2 of the Act. The bill was introduced in Parliament on 13 December 1999 by the Liberal government of Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. Despite criticism on both sides of the House of Commons, the bill eventually passed through Parliament, receiving royal assent on 29 June 2000. According to Bill C-20, only the House of Commons has the power to vote on the clarity of the question and the majority; yet the exclusion of the Senate’s power to hold a vote on these issues calls into question the principle of the two-chamber system entrenched in the Constitution. As to the government’s refusal to recognize the right of Aboriginal peoples to participate in negotiations on territorial division—this directly affects ancestral rights and treaty issues that were recognized in the Constitution. Legal opposition could conclude the Bill invalid. Concerned groups, including the Québec Cree, had already expressed their intentions of bringing the debate before the courts. Although the Québec government had expressed strong and clear opposition to Bill C-20, and had countered with Bill-99 to deny the legal and political impact of the federal bill, public opinion in Québec remained deaf to the rallying calls of the sovereigntist forces. Bill C-20 was rather favourably received across the country. Nevertheless, the federal government preferred to defend the country’s integrity by making the conditions of a province’s secession especially difficult, rather than affirming the unity and indivisibility of Canada through the constitutional route, like several Western democracies” (“The Clarity Act (Bill C-20)” 2013).

²⁷ The Fair Elections Act, Bill C-23, is an Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and other Acts and to make consequential amendments to certain Acts (Parliament of Canada 2014).

Mulcair spins the conversation back to Trudeau retorting, “Mr. Trudeau has an obligation, if he wants to talk about this subject, to come clean with Canadians. What’s his number? What is your number, Mr. Trudeau?” (2015f) regarding repealing the Clarity Act. A heated exchange ensues, where Mulcair uses a sing-song tone when addressing Trudeau, and discourteously uses his first name during the debate:

Justin Trudeau:	First of all, Mr. Mulcair —
Hon. Thomas Mulcair:	You’re not answering.
Justin Trudeau:	— I don’t question your patriotism.
Hon. Thomas Mulcair:	You haven’t answered.
Justin Trudeau:	The question is —
Hon. Thomas Mulcair:	What’s the number, Justin?
Justin Trudeau:	— why is your policy so reckless? You want a number, Mr. Mulcair?
Hon. Thomas Mulcair:	Yeah, give us a number.
Justin Trudeau:	I’ll give you a number. Nine. My number is nine. Nine Supreme Court justices said one vote is not enough to break up this country, and yet that is Mr. Mulcair’s position. He wants to be Prime Minister of this country, and he’s choosing to side with the separatist movement in Québec and not with the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mulcair then again asked Trudeau “to name a margin above 50 per cent that you think would be acceptable” and Trudeau responded that “the Supreme Court said very clearly that Mr. Mulcair’s number is not the right one” (2015q). The segment ended without an answer from Trudeau. It is questionable if Trudeau raising the issue of the Clarity Act during the debate was fitting, as Harper suggests that no one was discussing this issue. Lloyd’s F. Bitzer (1968, 11) would call this act by Trudeau “sophistic ... a contrived exigence,” as Trudeau was alerting Canada during

the debate to something that was not aligned to the *kairos* (current climate) of Canada's view on the topic. Some might suggest that the contentious topic of Québec separation was raised during the debate to garner social media attention. Contentious topics and contrived exigences often flourish on social media.

On the topic of Harper's Fair Elections Act, Mulcair calls it the "Unfair Elections Act" because it has "made it harder for whole classes of Canadians to vote" (2015f). Harper retorts that 90 per cent of Canadians support the requirement for voters to "show ID to demonstrate who they are" (2015c). Trudeau raises the notion that Harper creates a speculative fear of massive voter fraud, when changes to the Elections Act "actually make it more difficult for students, for Aboriginal and indigenous communities, [and] for many seniors to actually vote" (2015q), with May adding homeless people to the list as well (2015d). Harper, a bellwether for what would soon become a conservative *topos* internationally, most spectacularly in the 2020 U.S. federal election, asks "how would we be able to identify voter fraud if we can't even identify who voters are?" (2015c).

In the second part of the segment on democracy, the topic of the Senate was given full attention, although Harper protested that his "priorities are the economy and security" and that "opening up constitutional discussions is the wrong priority for the country" (2015c). In this segment, Mulcair and Trudeau both raise the subject of Harper naming 59 senators to the Senate after Harper previously stated he would never name an appointed senator. However, May reminded Harper and the other leaders, that refusing to appoint senators is unconstitutional, referring to Harper leaving 22 Senate seats vacant over the past two years of governing. In having vacant senator seats, the Provinces are being deprived their rightful representation and Parliament is not in its proper form (Wherry 2015). On another note, May also explains that it is

illegitimate “that the Prime Minister’s Office has the right to tell its Conservative senators how to vote” (2015d). May then refers to appointed senators rejecting Green MP Bruce Hyer’s Climate Accountability Act, a bill that was passed by a democratically elected House of Commons, which May states, has not happened in 75 years. Harper responded frankly, stating “we always ask senators [...] to support the party’s position. The party didn’t support that particular bill” (2015c). Trudeau agrees with May, confirming that in the Liberal Party, “we have released the senators, so they can be independent” although “some have chosen to continue to call themselves Liberals” but indicated that they are no longer directed to “vote along party lines” (2015q). Nearing the end of the third segment, Mulcair reminds voters that “one billion dollars has been spent on the Senate on Mr. Harper’s watch. He’s done nothing about abolition. He’s done nothing about reform. Can you imagine how many childcare spaces we could have created with \$1 billion, Mr. Wells?” (2015f).

2.4.4. Segment Four: Foreign Policy and Security

The final segment of the debate focused on foreign policy and security. Key areas covered in this segment were on combat missions, Canada’s position against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), veterans, and Canada’s position with respect to Russian aggression against the Ukraine. On the topic of sending troops or jet fighters into combat, Mulcair professes that he is “always going to evaluate it based on whether or not it is a United Nations mission” to ensure that it has “a clearly defined mission and a clear exit strategy” (2015f). Mulcair suggests, in a contrastive *ethopoeic* move that combines *antithesis* and *epiphora*, that May is “opposed to every single possible use of our military” while “Harper is in favour of every single possible use of our military” (2015f). Trudeau agrees that a United Nations mandate is “a clear indicator that we should be involved” but also supports Canada’s role against ISIS. In terms of military missions,

Trudeau is in favour of “training, not combat missions” (2015q). Trudeau adds an aside stating, “if we are going to send our troops overseas, we need to make sure we are properly taking care of them when they come home. And Mr. Harper has failed our veterans by nickel-and-diming them, by not giving them the service, the help that they need” (2015q). Harper dismisses Trudeau’s claim stating, “this government has made record investments in veterans. We’re spending 35 per cent more on the average veteran today directly than we were when we came to office. But let me go back to the central question of the ISIS mission” (2015c). Harper justifies Canada’s involvement against ISIS as the jihadist movement has slaughtered hundreds of thousands of people in Iraq and Syria, and has “singled out Canada and Canadians by name” (2015c). Harper continues, “it would be absolutely foolish for us not—not to go after this group before they come after us” (2015c).

In the final foreign policy segment, the key focus of the discussion is on the anti-terrorism act, Bill C-51.²⁸ Wells asks Trudeau about the persistent questions about his judgement with reference to opposing the government’s decision to take part in the international action against ISIL in Iraq and Syria and supporting Bill C-51 in parliament. Trudeau explains that a Prime Minister must “keep us safe” and “uphold and defend our rights and freedoms” and he supported Bill C-51 to “immediately and concretely protect Canadian security” with the intention to bring in amendments in to remove the “very problematic elements in it” (2015q). Trudeau, being mock-humble states, “perhaps it was naïve” to “take a responsible position at a time of politics of attack and division” where he claims Harper wants “everyone to be scared” about terrorism, and Mulcair “wants us to be scared for our Charter and basic rights and freedoms”

²⁸ The Anti-Terrorism Act, Bill C-51, is an Act to enact the Security of Canada Information Sharing Act and the Secure Air Travel Act, to amend the Criminal Code, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts (Parliament of Canada 2015).

(2015q). Trudeau proposes that any Canadian government must protect them both, although his language is fairly garbled (2015q). Harper, when asked about Trudeau's response, replies that he will "let Trudeau explain his own position. He's been both for and against the legislation at the same time" (2015c). Harper states, "our view is very clear, that security and freedom go hand-in-hand" (2015c). Harper explains that in developing Bill C-51 legislation, "we looked at what modern powers police and security agencies have across our allies, and we've made sure we are up to those standards" (2015c). Harper highlights the "important measure in C-51 to stop advocacy and promotion of terrorism" (2015c). Harper clarifies that he supports parliamentarians' oversight on legislation, but when it comes to the operations of government and security agencies, oversight should be completed by experts and judges. May suggests C-51 legislation fails to "confront the risk of radicalization" but rather "creates a secret police under CSIS²⁹ with no reporting requirement to the RCMP"³⁰ (2015d). May also claims there is "no expert oversight of C-51" and the "legislation must be repealed" (2015d). Mulcair believes "that Bill C-51 represents a real threat to our rights and freedoms with nothing in return" and guarantees that "the NDP will repeal Bill C-51" (2015f). On the world stage, however, Harper confirms that "Canada is the most admired – most admired country in the world because we take

²⁹ The Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) "is at the forefront of Canada's national security system. CSIS' role is to investigate activities suspected of constituting threats to the security of Canada and to report on these to the Government of Canada. CSIS may also take measures to reduce threats to the security of Canada in accordance with well-defined legal requirements and Ministerial Direction" (Canadian Security Intelligence Service 2019).

³⁰ The mandate of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) "includes preventing and investigating crime; maintaining peace and order; enforcing laws; contributing to national security; ensuring the safety of state officials, visiting dignitaries and foreign missions; and providing vital operational support services to other police and law enforcement agencies within Canada and abroad. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police is the Canadian national police service and an agency of the Ministry of Public Safety Canada. The RCMP is unique in the world since it is a national, federal, provincial, and municipal policing body. We provide a total federal policing service to all Canadians and policing services under contract to the three territories, eight provinces (except Ontario and Québec), more than 150 municipalities, more than 600 Aboriginal communities and three international airports" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police 2019).

strong stands, we do what we believe is right” (2015c), which was promoted in a CPC Debate tweet (2015d) (Figure 0-28).

2.4.5. Closing Remarks

Each leader was allocated two-minutes to give closing remarks at the end of the debate. Harper took this opportunity to promote his “proven experience to keep Canada safe and our economy strong” (2015c). Harper highlighted that through falling oil price and market turmoil in China, Canada has had the best economic growth, the best job creation, and the best growth in middle class incomes among advanced, developed nations. He touts a balanced budget and lower taxes. Harper claims the other parties would raise taxes, take away part of the Universal Child Care benefit, income splitting for families and seniors, and tax-free saving accounts.

Mulcair follows Harper saying “there is a clear choice: four more years of Stephen Harper’s Conservatives, or my plan for positive change” (2015f). Mulcair claims “it is time for a change – change that is built on hard work, living within your means, and accountability” (2015f). Mulcair proclaims that his “number one priority is to kick-start the economy and get Canadians working” (2015f). Mulcair ends his remarks saying, “Canadians are ready for change,” then deliberately puts on the representative-leader mask to speak as the party, “We’re ready too,” and finishes by dropping back to the personal level: “I invite you to join us” (2015f).

May takes this opportunity to highlight some of the social policies that were not discussed during the debate, such as “how we respond to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission” and “expand[ing] our Medicare system to include pharmacare” as well as addressing the “crushing levels of student debts” (2015d). May asks viewers “to consider the Green Party” stating “we’re not a one-issue party” (2015d).

Trudeau has the final word and uses his closing statement to confront the relentless *ethopoeic* attack ads of the Conservatives claiming that he is “just not ready.” He proposes a question to viewers: “how can you decide whether someone is ready to be your Prime Minister?” He recommends that they ask what that person wants “to do with this job, and why they want it in the first place” (2015q). He then states that for him, “you need to love this country, love it more than you crave power” and that “better is always possible” (Trudeau 2015q).

In reviewing the topics, the leaders’ responses, and the issues discussed, the 2015 *Maclean’s* Leaders Debate provided viewers with a sufficient understanding of where each party resided in terms of their policy platforms and principles.

Canada’s 2015 election concluded with the Trudeau Liberals winning a majority government by securing 184 seats of 338 seats in the House of Commons, a major victory that raised their seat count by 150 from the 2011 election. The Harper Conservatives lost power and the party was reduced to 99 seats from 166. Mulcair’s NDP won just 44 seats in the election, down from 103 in 2011, and consequently also lost the role of Official Opposition. The May Greens held onto its only seat, May’s. And the Duceppe Bloc Québécois gained 10 seats, even though Duceppe failed to win his own riding.

2.5. The Leaders in Canada’s 2019 Federal Election

This section provides a descriptive summary of Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate, which occurred four years after Canada’s 2015 *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate. In the 2019 Debate, the influence of social media impacted the coverage of topics, issues, and policy discussed, and more importantly for our purposes, social media imperatives also influenced the structure of the debate.

The leaders featured in the 2019 Canadian federal election were:

- Justin Trudeau, Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, and now incumbent Prime Minister. Trudeau entered the 2019 election with a majority government.
- Newcomer Andrew Scheer, replacing Stephen Harper in 2017 as the Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada, and leader of the Official Opposition. It was a contentious Conservative leadership race to replace Harper, as Scheer narrowly won and closest rival Maxime Bernier deflected from the Conservative Party to create and lead the People's Party of Canada.
- Newcomer, and first racialized leader of a Canadian federal party Jagmeet Singh, elected Leader of Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP) in 2017. Singh replaced Mulcair, who was voted out by his party in an unprecedented move in 2016.
- Elizabeth May, Leader of the Green Party of Canada (2006-2019), and longest serving female leader of a Canadian federal party.
- Newcomer Yves-François Blanchet, elected Leader of the Bloc Québécois (BQ) in 2019 by default, as he was the only declared candidate. Unlike Gilles Duceppe, Blanchet participated in Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate.
- Newcomer Maxime Bernier, founder, and leader of the right-wing populist People's Party of Canada (PPC) launched in 2018. Bernier was a Member of Parliament (MP) from 2006 to 2019 under the Conservative Party (until his 2018 resignation) and served as a prominent Cabinet Minister (2006-2007 Industry; 2007-2008 Foreign Affairs; 2011-2015 Small Business and Tourism) in the Conservative government of Stephen Harper. Bernier lost his seat in the 2019 election under the PPC banner.

2.6. The Format of Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate had the following format:

- Five moderators, all female, which was a source of some minor controversy before and after the debate. The moderators were renowned Canadian journalists and ensured that leaders’ responses were brief:
 - Lisa LaFlamme of *CTV News*
 - Althia Raj of *Huffington Post Canada*
 - Susan Delacourt of *Toronto Star*
 - Dawna Friesen of *Global News*
 - Rosemary Barton of *CBC News*
- The debate was held at the Canadian Museum of History in Gatineau, Québec, Canada.
- A two-hour debate broadcasted live on 7 October 2019 from 19:00 to 21:00 ET on all major television news networks, including CTV, CBC, Global, OMNI, and CSPAN. On radio, it could be heard through CBC Radio One and Global News Radio Network. On digital media, the debate streamed on more than a dozen online platforms, including thestar.com, ctvnews.ca nationalpost.com, huffingtonpost.ca, cbcnews.ca, globalnews.ca, macleans.ca, as well as social media networks Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube (Counter 2019).
- The debate was translated into eleven languages—French, Arabic, Cantonese, Italian, Mandarin, Punjabi, American Sign Language, and Québec Sign Language. It was also live-streamed online in Inuktitut, nêhiyawêwin (Plains Cree) and Anishinaabemowin (Ojibway) by CBC and APTN (“Watch the Federal Leaders’ Debates Translated into Indigenous Languages” 2019).
- The debate had no opening statements and no closing statements.
- There were five topics for debate discussion:

- Leadership in Canada and the World
- Polarization, Human Rights, and Immigration
- Indigenous Issues
- Affordability and Income Security
- Environment and Energy (*Maclean's* 2019c).
- The five debate topics were divided into 22-minute segments, and divided further into four distinct parts:
 - One question from a Canadian
 - One question from the moderator
 - One question from a leader to another leader
 - A leader-to-leader open debate.
- Visually, a countdown timer was placed in the corner of the viewing screen, similar to what is seen in a boxing match. It displayed the number of seconds a leader had to provide their response, in focus for the audience to observe, with a typical response time being 30- to 75-seconds allotted for leaders to answer the question, or each other, depending on the segment. This created a sense of urgency and anticipation of clever statements and knock-out punches of the sort social media loves, because the moment the timer expired, the leaders were silenced by the moderator.

2.7. Leaders' *Ethos* in Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

2.7.1. Justin Trudeau

Justin Trudeau entered the debate after recently dealing with several public scandals, with Andrew Scheer happily publicizing the many etymological 'masks' Trudeau wears (reconciliation, feminist, middle-class, etc.). Scheer opens the debate by blasting Trudeau for the

multiple recently ‘surfaced’ images of him wearing ‘blackface,’ and for exerting influence over female, Indigenous Attorney General Jody Wilson-Raybould, to resolve a fraud case against SNC-Lavalin Group, with Trudeau’s influence being in violation of Section 9 of the Conflict of Interest Act (Gollom 2019). Contrary to the ‘fighting Justin’ persona he performed during Canada’s 2015 *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate, four years later Trudeau was relatively subdued on stage, emphasizing his accomplishments of cutting taxes for the middle class and raising them for the wealthiest one percent, lifting 900,000 people out of poverty with investment in families, and reaching three-quarters of the way to Canada’s 2030 climate change targets (2019k). He also pledged that he would continue to do more for Canadians by planting one billion trees and making Canada net-zero by 2050 (2019k), with his adversaries protesting he was not to be believed.

2.7.2. Andrew Scheer

Andrew Scheer began the debate confrontationally, directing a scathing *ethopoeic* denouncement of Trudeau for hypocritical *prosopopoeia*: wearing multiple masks. But he quickly fell into the background of the debate with so many other voices petitioning to be heard. Scheer had difficulty getting uninterrupted speaking time during the debate, but what time he did have, he used to express sloganeering Conservative statements such as “so Canadians can get ahead” and put “more money in your pocket” statements, and to further chastise Trudeau, while emphasizing his own plan for tax credits, to be paid for by reducing Canada’s foreign aid grants by 25 per cent.

2.7.3. Jagmeet Singh

Jagmeet Singh was clever, engaging, passionate, and thoughtful in the debate, bringing in wry humour and a clear message to Canadian viewers. He stated that he was different from the

other leaders. He was “going to fight for you” (2019i). He challenged Trudeau’s rhetoric versus his action, suggesting that Trudeau “says nice words” (2019i) but his actions do not align to what he professes. Singh also had a clear policy plan that he communicated directly to the voters, on providing universal pharmacare and dental care, and a focus on building housing. However, as Blanchet pointed out in the debate, Singh’s plans tended to interfere and infringe onto provincial jurisdiction.

2.7.4. Elizabeth May

Elizabeth May was knowledgeable and direct, the person voters could depend on during the debate to challenge another leader’s narrative with facts when the leader went awry, similar to her role during the 2015 Debate. With the Green Party in fourth place in the polls, May’s focus during the debate was to communicate that she wants to work together “like a family” to meet the climate crisis (2019g). During the debate, however, May was often being spoken over by the (male) leaders, with her frustration rising to a level where near the end of the debate, May remarked, “How about a woman’s right to speak in a debate?” and reminded leaders (and viewers) that she is “the only woman leader of a party” and the leaders who participated in the TVA French language debate were “perfectly happy to keep women out, off the stage” (2019g). May also questioned Scheer’s *ethos* in stating that she thinks he may not protect “the hard-earned rights of women in this country” (2019g), and reprimanded Trudeau for his hypocrisy, remarking that it’s “heartbreaking” to look at him, knowing that he “could have done so much more the last four years” (2019g).

2.7.5. Yves-François Blanchet

Yves-François Blanchet promoted Francophone rights, as well as provincial jurisdiction and autonomy, where his focus during the debate was on advocating for those Canadians in the

province of Québec, as Québec was the only province where the Bloc Québécois had candidates running in the election. Blanchet quipped that becoming “Prime Minister is a bit unlikely” but took a shot at Trudeau’s *ethos* in connection to his boxer persona, remarking that “you don’t try to show biceps if you only have tiny biceps” referring to Canada arresting China’s Chief Financial Officer of Huawei, Meng Wanzhou. Blanchet then remarked he would “support somebody with real leadership, not making mistakes” (2019e).

2.7.6. Maxime Bernier

Maxime Bernier was permitted to join the Leaders’ Debate despite his party polling at only two per cent. His presence in the debate appeared to be an annoyance to the other leaders, first because of his Party’s ideology of promoting populist right-wing views with a Canada-first focus, which Singh and May clearly spoke against in the debate, but also because of his interruptions during the debate, speaking over other leaders, sabotaging their allotted speaking time, and impeding them from sharing a clear and clean message, which often had the effect of ruining their curational moments.

2.8. Descriptive Synopsis of Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate

In 2019, the Leaders’ Debate Commission had the mandate for debates to be “as accessible as possible, on a variety of platforms,” encouraging “the use of new media,” and the attempt to reach “new audiences” (“The Leaders’ Debates Commission” 2019). The sharp increase in the number of viewers on social media and “dramatic jump” in penetration levels of Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate compared to the 2015 Debate confirmed this digital expansion (Wright 2019). Canadian Press Christian Pass-Lang highlighted that there were higher viewership numbers compared to the 2015 Debate “despite complaints that the format favoured conflict over substance” (2019), though the truth might be that the higher numbers were

because of the conflict that format fostered. Being Canada's only planned English-Language federal debate in 2019, the debate reached an audience of 9.64 million viewers with an average audience of 3.9 million Canadians tuning in (calculated as the average number of individuals watching per minute during a specific period) (Paas-Lang 2019). On radio, the audience totaled 867,000 listeners. On digital media, there were 2.7 million digital views of the debate (Paas-Lang 2019), with the discussion among leaders streamed on more than a dozen online platforms (Counter 2019). The official debate hashtag #CanadaDebates2019 was tweeted 2,259,614 times ("Blog: 2019 Canadian Election Leaders' Debate" 2019). Yet, following the debate, there was widespread disapproval of the format, acknowledged by debate commissioner David Johnston, with criticism directed especially at the "busy stage" (Wright 2019). Rather than hosting four of Canada's principal party leaders, the 2019 Debate hosted six party leaders, including the leader of the regional Bloc Québécois party, and the leader of the populist People's Party of Canada. Political leaders were positioned from left to right, beginning with Elizabeth May, Justin Trudeau, Andrew Scheer, Jagmeet Singh, Maxime Bernier, and Yves-François Blanchet. The 2019 Debate had five moderators, each handling one of the five official topics. And there were five, 22-minute segments, divided into four parts. BlogTO's Lauren O'Neil stated, "wondering who won last night's federal leaders' debate in Canada? So is almost everyone else who watched it go down" (2019). *Maclean's* Stephen Maher described the debate as "filling your plate at a buffet with too many different kinds of dishes on offer" (2019). Maher observed that there were "too many people making too many points, at the same time, in short bursts," but that "it was a good picture of the range of opinion in the internet era" (2019). It was not only the busy stage, however, that generated censure, but also audience expectations not being met. One notable difference between the 2015 and 2019 debates was its form. In 2019 the debate was designed

predominantly for circulation on a social media platform rather than for a legacy-style televised debate. Sonja K. Foss asserts, if the rhetoric does not fulfill the generic expectations, “the audience tends to be confused and to react negatively” (1989, 233–34). Perhaps seeming excellent in theory, the execution of the debate was chaotic and left many viewers perplexed. With additional political fringe leaders, additional contentious topic segments, and more division in the format as compared to 2015, the time to respond by leaders to questions was limited and competition for the rhetorical oxygen was fierce. Curated to be a “lively debate” (LaFlamme 2019) with enough time for a zinger or pithy statement, discussion of more in-depth substance was greatly narrowed.

2.8.1. Theme One: Leadership in Canada and the World

The first theme of the 2019 Debate on Leadership in Canada and the World opens with first moderator, Lisa LaFlamme, handing over the opening question to an audience member who highlights our divided world and asks how leaders plan to protect Canadian interests and values on a world stage. Appearing inexperienced with this type of debate launch, leaders thank the audience member, Reagan, for his question and dive into a 45-second, half-opening-half-response, narrative.

Trudeau responds first by providing the Liberal Party’s *prosopopoeic* soundbite for direct investment in Canadians so they are able to succeed on a world stage, as well as in “building a stronger economy for the future” while also protecting the environment (2019k). Bernier comments that “the UN is a dysfunctional organization” and his PPC will “put Canada first” (2019i). Singh criticizes the Liberal and Conservative governments for not standing up to the powerful and wealthy, and asserts, “I don’t work for the rich and powerful; I work for people” (2019i). Scheer opens with an *ethopoeic prosopopoeia* accusation, condemning Trudeau on his

hypocrisy, executed for later circulation on social media, which promptly followed. Scheer asserts, “Justin Trudeau only pretends to stand up for Canada. You know, he’s very good at pretending things. He can’t even remember how many times he put blackface on” because “he’s always wearing a mask” (2019g). Scheer is highlighting four brown/blackface digital artefacts of Trudeau circulating on social media, two of them photos from a 2001 ‘Arabian Nights’ costume party, one of them a high-school age talent show where Trudeau sang Harry Belafonte’s *Day-O*, and the other a video of him from the 1990s wearing brown/blackface makeup in a clownish/thuggish impersonation of an inner-city black youth (*CBC News* 2019). Scheer is reminding viewers of Trudeau literally impersonating others—a Sultan, a Jamaican folk singer, a young thug—in ways that are distinctly at odds with the multicultural values Trudeau espouses, and that are part of his family’s political heritage. It is at this point that Scheer launched the accusatory *apostrophe* at Trudeau discussed in section 1.9 above. Scheer ends his proclamation stating, “Mr. Trudeau, you are a phoney and a fraud, and you do not deserve to govern this country” (2019g). LaFlamme might have exercised some discretion here and given Trudeau some time to respond to Scheer’s accusations, but she stuck to the format, which left no time to respond, and moved onto May, asking May to respond to the audience member’s question, telling leaders that they will have the opportunity during open debate to respond to each other. Scheer’s statement was never later addressed by Trudeau.

The debate then launches into its most explicitly ethotic phase, a discussion on the character, integrity, and temperament of a leader, and LaFlamme begins by addressing Bernier, stating, “you like to tweet” and brings in the divisive and contentious use of Twitter by Bernier (2019). LaFlamme suggests that Bernier’s tweets describe “diversity in Canada” as “a cult and extreme multiculturalism,” that he used the terms “ghetto and tribes to describe newcomers,” and

that he stated that newcomers “bring distrust and potential violence” (2019). LaFlamme also stated that Bernier described 16-year-old climate change activist Greta Thunberg as “clearly mentally unstable” (2019). Bernier responds to LaFlamme by defending his online Twitter messages, about which Singh comments in his allotted time that Bernier should own his mistakes on Twitter instead, and say, “‘hey, man, I messed up.’ Because those are pretty horrible tweets that you made” (2019i). Singh says that, “a true leader is someone who tries to find bridges, bringing people together” (2019i). But Bernier defends his actions again, interrupting Singh’s precious 75-second speaking time, which reduces Singh’s reply to just 37 seconds. When it was Scheer’s turn to debate Bernier, Scheer was interrupted by Bernier after just 20 seconds of speaking time. After additional cross-talk between them both, LaFlamme intervenes, allowing Scheer to ask his question, to which Scheer uses an *ethopoeic prosopopoeia* zinger accusing Bernier of hypocrisy, as “someone who used to believe in an immigration system that was fair, orderly, and compassionate” to now making “policy based on – trying to get likes and retweets – from the darkest parts of Twitter” (2019g), to which Bernier retorts, “Absolutely not” (2019i). May, aghast, says she finds “the things that – that Maxime Bernier has to say to be completely appalling” and that “I’d have to put my head in my hands – because it was so horrific” (2019g). Bernier targets May’s climate plan and suggests that “we won’t be able to create any wealth with your policies” (2019i), to which May replies that the climate crisis is the single biggest economic opportunity, adding that support for immigration is what Canada needs (2019g). Blanchet addresses Bernier’s aggressive discourtesy directly, “How many seconds will you leave me before you jump in?” (2019e), he asks. Then Blanchet suggests that Bernier denies climate change. Predictably, Bernier talks over Blanchet, leading Blanchet to signal the time, “ten seconds” evoking audience laughter (2019e). Trudeau tries to discuss the opportunities around

globalization and how it redefines what it means to be Canadian, but when crosstalk ensues again, Trudeau throws out a back-pocket zinger, interrupted by Bernier throughout, “Mr. Bernier – your role on this stage tonight seems to be – to say publicly what Mr. Scheer thinks privately” (2019k). Trudeau is *ethopoeically* accusing Bernier of a stealth *prosopopoeia* (Bernier is not just speaking for himself but speaking for Scheer) to *ethopoeically* characterize the muted Scheer as indistinguishable from the candid Bernier. Trudeau here is alluding to Scheer’s pretenses and masks that he also wears—such as Scheer’s private pro-life beliefs which he avoided discussing. Trudeau’s disjointed quip to Bernier later appears wholly put together in a tweet on social media (Trudeau 2019f) (Figure 0-119).

The remaining segment consisted of leaders expounding their election platforms. Trudeau was provided with 60 seconds of uninterrupted speaking time when Singh asked him a question, and responded using language similar to his 2015 platform, that he “cut taxes for the middle class and raise[d] them for the wealthiest one percent” (2019k). Trudeau also stated that the Liberals are “three-quarters of the way to our 2030 climate targets, which we will meet and surpass” while acknowledging that it is not enough, pledging to do more, “like planting two billion trees,” providing funding for home retrofits, and “making Canada net-zero³¹ by 2050” (2019k). Trudeau also emphasized lifting “900,000 people out of poverty” with the Canada Child Benefit,³² while highlighting that Scheer and Singh both voted against this plan (2019k).

The final section was a frenzied open debate. Singh alerted viewers that Trudeau’s Finance Minister as well as the President of the Treasury Board used offshore tax havens to

³¹ Achieving net-zero emissions means Canada’s economy either emits no greenhouse gas emissions or offsets its emissions, for example, through actions such as tree planting or employing technologies that can capture carbon before it is released into the air (Government of Canada 2020).

³² The Canada child benefit (CCB) is administered by the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA). It is a tax-free monthly payment made to eligible families to help with the cost of raising children under 18 years of age (Government of Canada - Canada Revenue Agency 2020).

avoid paying their fair share of taxes. Trudeau stated he closed tax loopholes but claimed that Scheer will reopen them. Scheer repeated one of his familiar claims, that Trudeau called entrepreneurs and small business owners ‘tax cheats.’ He didn’t. Trudeau suggested in a 2015 interview that some wealthy people use incorporation to tax-shelter money (Bryden and Press 2015). Scheer then launched into promoting his universal tax cut plan, interrupted by Bernier, who claimed they all are “spending, spending, spending” (2019i), to which Scheer retorted, “tax cuts are not spending” and “we’re going to undo his [Trudeau’s] tax hikes” (2019g). May states she is disappointed with the Liberals for ignoring IPCC³³ advice and claims her party is the only party with a climate-action plan (2019g), which Scheer exploits by tossing in the Conservative’s 2019 anti-Trudeau *ethopoeic* slogan, “Trudeau: not as advertised” (2019g).

2.8.2. Theme Two: Polarization, Human Rights, and Immigration

The second theme on Polarization, Human Rights, and Immigration begins with a new moderator, Althia Raj, but with no introduction or hand-off by LaFlamme. Raj is exceedingly aware of the countdown timer for each of the 75- to 30-second debate segments. This time constraint hindered the substance of the debate, for in addition to leaders being interrupted by each other, leaders were often cut off in the middle of a sentence by Raj when the timer hit the zero mark, which may be advantageous for snappy messages and media timing, but not necessarily for viewers watching the debate anticipating a more comprehensive response to important topics being discussed.

Theme two begins with a question from Raj to Singh on the *arete* dimension of *ethos*, of him having “not shown the courage to fight Québec’s discriminatory law,” Bill-21, a very

³³ The IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change created to provide policymakers with regular scientific assessments on climate change, its implications and potential future risks, as well as to put forward adaptation and mitigation options (“IPCC — Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change” 2020)

recently passed law under Québec’s provincial jurisdiction that restrains individuals from wearing religious symbols from some provincial employment (2019), under legal challenge at the time by the Canadian Civil Liberties Association. Singh states that he is clearly against Bill-21, visually signaling his yellow turban, and moves quickly to *pathos*, saying that this law “hurts,” and he “feel[s] sad,” but as a federal leader, he will not intervene in Québec’s provincial jurisdiction (2019i). Instead, Singh refocuses the next part of his statement on what unites him with the people of Québec, identifying with them in the fight on the climate crisis, promoting the rights of women, a women’s right to choose, and abortion services (2019i). Scheer speaks next, congratulating Singh for his handling of race and identity issues, also stating “we will not intervene in this [Bill-21] court case as a Conservative government” (2019g). May concurs with Scheer on Singh’s confrontation of race and identity issues, and highlights that “anyone with white skin has privilege” questioning what is the best way for a federal government to protect human rights within Québec (2019g). May positions the Green Party, like the NDP, in opposition to Bill-21, but also will not interfere with the provincial laws of Québec (2019g). Blanchet informs viewers that Bill-21 is not polarizing in Québec, for 70 per cent of Québec’s population and 70 per cent of the Members of Parliament in Québec support Bill-21. Blanchet states, “Québec does not need to be told what to do or what not to do about its own value, nor its language, nor themselves as a nation” (2019e). But Singh disagrees with Blanchet, stating that Bill-21 “just says to people, because of the way they look, they can’t do a job” (2019i). Singh then tries to redirect the discussion to protection for women, the LGBTQ2+ community, speaking over Blanchet’s cross-talking, with Singh’s final question asking “where is the separation of church and state?” (2019i).

Trudeau asks Singh why he, as someone who has fought discrimination his whole life, would not intervene in the question of Bill-21 in Québec? Trudeau proclaims,

I am the only one on this stage who has said yes, a federal government might have to intervene on this because the federal government needs to protect minority rights, needs to protect language rights, needs to protect women's rights, and needs to do that right across the country. (2019k)

In a candid response, Singh subtly signals Trudeau's inherent privilege as a white male and his position as the current Prime Minister of Canada to intervene with Bill-21, stating, "every single day of my life is challenging people who think that you can't do things because of the way you look" (2019i). Singh continues with a statement suggesting that he *is* challenging Bill-21; "I'm running to be Prime Minister of this country—and I'm going to Québec—and telling people I want to be your Prime Minister" (2019i), as Trudeau speaks over him. Bernier questions why Singh did not want him in the debate, stating, "you're for diversity, but what about diversity of opinion?" (2019i), to which Singh replies, juxtaposing their respective *ethoi*, "you don't deserve a platform ... because your ideas are hurtful to Canada. I will always work to build unity and bring people together, unlike you" (2019i).

In the next segment, the leaders' speaking time is reduced yet further, to 40 seconds from the prearranged 45 seconds, but Raj fails to inform the leaders, which results in several incomplete statements. In the next one-on-one debate segment, Scheer turns and faces Trudeau, and questions him on twice breaking ethics laws, his interference with a criminal court proceeding, shutting down a parliamentary investigation into his corruption, and firing two caucus members "for telling the truth" (2019g). Trudeau responds to Scheer by putting on the role-mask of Prime Minister, telling him that "the role of a Prime Minister is to stand up for Canadian jobs, to stand up for the public interest, and that's what I've done, and that's what I will continue to do every single day" (2019k). Trudeau then alerts viewers to Scheer's plan to

give a \$50,000 tax break to the wealthiest Canadians, but then states that “we don’t entirely know your plan because you haven’t released your costed platform yet” (2019k) to which Scheer retorts, “Where is your costed platform?” claiming that Trudeau is “making things up again,” as “half” of his platform “isn’t even costed” (2019g). The debate then veers into the allegations of the Prime Minister’s Office attempting to influence former Minister of Justice and Attorney General, Jody Wilson-Raybould, concerning an ongoing prosecution of SNC-Lavalin, and her expulsion from the Liberal caucus. Trudeau defends his actions again with an explicit PM-*prosopopoeia* and again lecturing Scheer, saying that “the responsibility of any Prime Minister is to stand up for jobs” (2019k).

The open debate subsequently moves into family issues, Singh prefacing his address of the issues with a doubly negative characterization of the two previous combatants: “What we have here is Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Scheer arguing about who’s worse for Canada. Really, we’ve got to start presenting who is going to be best for Canada” (2019i). Singh then suggests his plan will save families over \$500 a month with investment in pharmacare and childcare, and for families who earn less than \$70,000, they will be provided dental care (2019i). Scheer interjects promoting his universal tax credit of \$850 (2019g). Bernier suggests that pharamacare is in provincial jurisdiction and asks Singh, “Where will you find the money?” (2019i) to which Singh responds that he is going to ask the wealthiest Canadians to pay more, to which May asserts, that these wealthy Canadians “will continue to hire lawyers and evade their taxes” (2019g).

2.8.3. Theme Three: Indigenous Issues

The third theme on Indigenous Issues opens with Susan Delacourt as the debate moderator and she asks a question to Scheer about how he would “consult, accommodate, and obtain consent from Indigenous peoples” when pursuing his proposed energy corridor (2019b).

Scheer proposes that “duty to consult means that concerns are heard and addressed” but also means finding “a path to letting things get built in this country” (2019g). May suggests Scheer’s version of consultation with Indigenous communities looks like, “we will consult with Indigenous people until we get them to agree with us” (2019g). Delacourt intervenes, reminding leaders the theme is Indigenous rights. Trudeau speaks next, suggesting that respect for Indigenous peoples is grounded in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which he accuses Scheer’s party of consistently blocking. Scheer turns the table and states, “I have nothing to learn from Mr. Trudeau, who fired the first Indigenous Attorney General for doing her job,” referring to dismissing Attorney General Jody Wilson-Raybould, and reminds viewers that Trudeau has “cancelled two pipelines” and directs his comment to Trudeau that “the one [pipeline] you bought you can’t build” (2019g). Singh highlights a court decision the Trudeau government is appealing, which was in favour of a group of Indigenous kids set to receive equal funding after being discriminated against by the Harper and Trudeau governments. Singh also raises attention about a community affected by mercury poisoning, Grassy Narrows, and spins it *ethopoeically* by highlighting a recent episode during a Trudeau fundraiser where an Indigenous activist was mocked by Trudeau. (Trudeau said to her, as she was being hauled away, “Thank you for your donation,” referring to paying for a ticket to attend his event). Singh asks, “what kind of Prime Minister does that” (2019i), and Scheer chimes in with his *ethopoeic* debate tagline, “because he’s phony” (2019g). Singh asks the same question again, and Scheer again *ethopoeically* responds, “because he’s a fraud [... who] doesn’t deserve to be re-elected” (2019g). Trudeau remains silent during this exchange.

May begins the leader-to-leader debate segment signaling this debate’s “very fractious discussion on Indigenous issues,” and addresses Trudeau on the climate emergency asking if he

would increase the target carbon reduction rate from 30 per cent to 60 per cent by 2030 (2019g). Trudeau responds that “we’re going to be surpassing the targets we inherited, but targets are not a plan” describing the Liberal plan as “realistic, ambitious, and doable” signaling his strategy to ban “single-use plastics” and “putting a price on pollution” (2019k), to which May comments, “your target is a complete failure. That’s why it’s so doable and achievable, it doesn’t do what the IPCC³⁴ says we must do” (2019g). Trudeau rebuts, “We’ve done more over the past four years than any government in the history of Canada” (2019k), to which May replies, “No, that’s not true. Paul Martin did more, but that’s alright. No one remembers the Paul Martin plan in 2005. It was better” (2019g).³⁵ Scheer chimes in, stating “just because you say something over and over and over again doesn’t make it true” (2019g), to which Trudeau rebuts, “It would be nice for you to learn that, Mr. Scheer” (2019k), to which Scheer replies, “Nobody believes your numbers, Justin” (2019g), reminiscent of the 2015 *Maclean’s* debate, when NDP leader Tom Mulcair addressed Trudeau by his first name and asked Trudeau for his “number” (2015f) and when Trudeau stated to Harper, “Nobody believes you” (2015q). Singh jumps in stating, “You do not need to choose between Mr. Delay and Mr. Deny,” referring to Trudeau and Scheer (2019i). Singh continues, “There is another option. We are committed to a real plan that’s going to take on the biggest polluters” and reduce emission by more than half (2019i), which became a NDP and Singh tweet (NDP 2019a; Singh 2019h) (Figure 0-121 and Figure 0-124). Discussion ensues with Bernier suggesting that Trudeau and Scheer are the same on climate change, with Trudeau imposing a carbon tax, and Scheer a “big tax on the big emitters” (2019i).

³⁴ The IPCC was created to provide policymakers with regular scientific assessments on climate change, its implications and potential future risks, as well as to put forward adaptation and mitigation options (“IPCC — Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change” 2020)

³⁵ Paul Martin was Canada’s 21st Prime Minister and Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada from 2003 to 2006.

2.8.4. Theme Four: Affordability and Income Security

The fourth theme of the debate, on Affordability and Income Security, begins with the familiar change of moderator as Dawna Frieson announces that “comments have gone a little long” and this segment will trim even more time (2019). In this segment, the leaders’ time to respond is reduced to 35 seconds, with some segments allowing for one minute. May uses her time to tell viewers that her policies will address “offshore money that’s being hidden” and target those “who have more than \$20 million in wealth” (2019g). Blanchet says he will create policies to tax web giants “that steal the money from our advertising companies” (2019e), with May concurring with Blanchet saying that “we call for taxes on the e-commerce companies, the virtuals, the Amazons and the Googles and the Facebooks that mine billions of dollars out of this country and pay virtually no tax” (2019g). Trudeau totes his platform cliché, “to invest in the middle class and people working hard to join it,” and reiterates that his government has “lifted 900,000 people out of poverty, including 300,000 kids” as well as provided support for students and seniors, which in turn created more than one-million new jobs (2019k). May interjects during Trudeau’s statement commenting on the form of the debate, stating, “This is a 40-second debate with eight-seconds left for me” (2019g). May then asks Trudeau if he is going to accept Eric Hoskin’s recommendation for universal, single-payer health care,³⁶ to which Trudeau responded, “We have, we have accepted—” with Trudeau’s response cut-off by Friesen stating, “I’m afraid time’s up for you” (2019), so no real answer is provided to May’s question.

Singh suggests that “Trudeau does not have the courage to take on the insurance and the pharmaceutical lobbyists” who do not want dental and medical care covered by the government

³⁶ Dr. Eric Hoskin’s report, “A Prescription for Canada: Achieving Pharmacare for All” recommends that Canada implement universal, single-payer, public pharmacare (Canada Health 2019).

(2019i). Scheer promotes the Conservative’s “universal tax cut,” which “will mean \$850 in the pocket of a hardworking, average-income Canadian” (2019g). Scheer also promises to “bring back the fitness tax credit” as well as the “green public transit credit” and suggests his plan will help fight climate change by bringing in the “green home renovation tax credit” (2019g), which is similar to the policy plans Harper discussed during the 2015 Debate, except that Scheer now adds the adjective “green” to describe them. Scheer says his funding for these tax credits will be found by cutting Canada’s foreign aid budget by 25 per cent (2019g), which May says to Scheer “may be the worst idea in your whole non-platform” (2019g), calling his policy “short-term, misguided, [and] greedy” (2019g).

An audience question on income inequality and affordability in Canada is asked. Trudeau proposes “a tax break for low- and middle-income Canadians and nothing for the wealthiest” (2019k), by increasing the Canadian Child Benefit by 15 per cent for kids under one, and increasing the Old Age Security (OAS) for seniors over 75 years (2019k). Trudeau also proposes a plan for students, who will not have to pay back their student loans until they are earning \$35,000 a year (2019k). Singh accuses Trudeau of “talk[ing] a nice game” saying, “I admit he says nice words” but reminds viewers that Trudeau has “given \$14 billion to the richest corporations to buy private jets and limousines in the last Fall Economic Statement”³⁷ (2019i). Scheer proposes that his universal tax cut “is much better for middle-income Canadians” than Trudeau’s proposal, where under Trudeau’s plan, “someone earning \$47,000 a year is somehow too rich for a tax cut” (2019g).

³⁷ The budget, usually tabled early in the year, is generally preceded in the fall by another major statement, the *Fall Economic Statement* (Government of Canada - Department of Finance 2020).

Friesen states that Québec Premier Legault has said he would like to wean Québec off equalization payments and asks Blanchet if he agrees with Legault. Blanchet believes that the equalization payment is being used “as a threat over Québec, which citizens do not want, to be a passage for this oil through their territory” and proposes, instead, an equalization plan based on “how provinces perform in fighting climate change” (2019e). Trudeau clarifies that the purpose of equalization “exists so that every Canadian across the country, regardless of the province they’re born into or live in, access the same quality of services right across the country,” before unexpectedly, and *ethopoeically*, provoking Blanchet by calling him a sovereigntist and saying that he is “looking for opportunities to create fights between Québec and the rest of Canada” to advance his “separatist agenda” (2019k). Crosstalk ensues between them with Blanchet asking Trudeau, “what can a Canadian do that a Québecker cannot do?” with Trudeau responding with a zinger, “a Québecker can do anything a Canadian can do because a Québecer is a Canadian – and will remain a Canadian under my watch, Mr. Blanchet” (2019k). Singh brings the conversation back to healthcare and promotes his universal pharmacare plan, to which Blanchet states, “You have good ideas, but your ideas always interfere and infringe into jurisdictions, which are those of the provinces” (2019e). Singh responds, “We got to work together. We can do that” (2019i). Scheer suggests that Blanchet’s priority is working with the Parti Québécois on sovereignty and that he prefers to purchase his oil and gas from the United States (2019g). Friesen addresses Scheer and Blanchet stating, “You’ve talked over each other and you’re both out of time” (2019).

Blanchet in the next segment asks Scheer about a statement he made in English stating he was strongly against the idea of Bill-21, but then in French stated that he would do nothing to go against the law and would protect Bill-21 (2019e). Scheer suggests that the answer is very

simple, reiterating that he “will not intervene in the court case that is currently before the courts” (2019g) and claiming that “the Conservative Party has always stood for individual liberty, for fundamental human rights” (2019g). Trudeau then chimes in that Scheer “won’t defend a woman’s right to choose” and “hasn’t apologized” for his “words against LGBT Canadians years ago” (2019k). Scheer responds with a clearly planned statement on the issue. Scheer states, “Mr. Trudeau, millions of Canadians have a different position on this issue. And like millions of Canadians, I am personally pro-life. It’s okay in this country to have a difference of opinion, something you do not recognize” (2019g). Scheer continues that “laws and access on this issue have not changed for 30 years under Liberal Prime Ministers, under Conservative Prime Ministers. It will not change – once I am Prime Minister” (2019g). Crosstalk ensues and Friesen states, “nobody can hear what you’re saying anymore” (2019). Singh jumps into the conversation between Trudeau and Scheer stating, “A man has no position in a discussion on a woman’s right to choose. Let’s be very clear on that” (2019i). May jumps in, “How about a woman’s right to speak in a debate?” (2019g). May highlights the fact that women were not included in the TVA debate, “which did not let our little girls see that there’s a chance for a woman in this country to be Prime Minister, to run as the leader of a party” and that we should “never allow a single inch retreat from the hard-earned rights of women in this country, not one inch” (2019g). Trudeau applauds May’s statement, visually upholding his persona for equity, but the posturing comes off as hollow in this moment, as he did participate in the French-Language TVA debate without her.

2.8.5. Theme Five: Environment and Energy

In the fifth and final theme of the debate on Environment and Energy, leaders discuss concrete plans they have in addressing big business polluting, in 38 seconds or less. Blanchet promotes the California and Québec emissions trading system “that forces businesses to lower

their emission[s] through time,” which he accepts ownership of negotiating, and for the signing of the deal (2019e). Trudeau wants to ensure that a pollution “price is put right across the country because it is a mechanism that will both lower emissions and ensure that Canadians can afford this transition” (2019k). Bernier calls the People’s Party the “only real environmentalist party” but that “we won’t have a tax on carbon” (2019e) with the remainder of his statement cut off by the moderator, Rosemary Barton, abruptly stopping him with, “Time’s up. Time’s up” (2019). Singh reiterates that Trudeau “has said a lot of nice things” about fighting the climate crisis, but asks viewers to “look at what he’s done,” and provides examples of Trudeau exempting “the biggest polluters from his price on pollution,” giving massive subsidies to oil and gas companies, and purchasing a pipeline (2019i). Scheer agrees with Singh on Trudeau’s pretense, reminding viewers that “on the environment, like so many issues, Justin Trudeau says one thing and then does something completely different” (2019g), discussing Trudeau’s inability to meet 2030 targets, providing a 90 per cent exemption from his carbon tax to the country’s largest polluters, while commuters have “to pay the full brunt of that [tax]” (2019g). As Scheer begins to discuss the Conservative plan to take the “climate change fight global,” Barton interjects, “That’s it, Mr. Scheer. I’m dropping the hammer, coming to the end of the show” (2019). May warns if we fail on the climate, “the goal of holding global average temperature to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius, we fail to give our kids a livable world” (2019g).

Barton asks Trudeau about his commitment to combating climate change, while at the same time proceeding with the purchase and approval of the Trans Mountain Expansion (2019). Trudeau agrees that we need to move faster and do more, and returns to his mantra that he will “not just surpass our 2030 targets, but go beyond it” (2019k). Trudeau highlights the Liberal Party’s initiatives for banning single-use plastics, putting a price on pollution across the country,

and fighting Conservative premiers who do not want to do their part to reduce climate change. Trudeau states, “we should have less oil by rail and we need to get to new markets so we can invest [...] all the money coming in from this pipeline into that green energy transition, into fighting climate change” (2019k). Barton then cuts off Trudeau, stating, “Ok, we’ve got to end it,” but then interjects afterwards, “I noticed you didn’t answer the last part of that question, whether we were on our last pipeline” (2019), but then does not let him respond to her question. Bernier believes that “there’s no climate emergency” (2019e). Singh *ethopoeically* accuses Trudeau of *prosopopoeia*, saying:

But the problem is that you said a lot of these things in 2015 and you made it sound like you were going to make climate a big priority, but the reality is [...] you bought a pipeline, you continue to subsidize oil and gas, and you continue to exempt the biggest polluters. So, what’s it going to take now for Canadians to believe that you’re actually going to follow through on your promises? What’s it going to take for you to follow through on these commitments, because your words are not good enough anymore. (2019i)

Trudeau responds to Singh using a red herring logical fallacy, and says that Singh is planning to build a “massive refinery in Alberta” (2019k) to which Singh responds, “it’s not our plan at all. That was not our plan” (2019i). Scheer brings attention to the three major pipeline projects that were ready to go and failed under Trudeau’s watch. Scheer also highlights the hypocrisy of Trudeau in saying he cares for the environment, but then is flying two campaign planes in the 2019 election, “which is just a thing that privileged people can do to keep polluting” (2019g). Crosstalk ensues between Trudeau and Scheer with Barton interjecting, “Mr. Scheer, no one can hear you. Please.” More crosstalk continues, and Barton states, “Ok. Time is up for you as well, Mr. Trudeau” (2019). Attacks on Trudeau’s climate advancement ensue. May addresses Trudeau directly and asserts that “we must listen to science. We must not build the Trans Mountain Pipeline” (2019g). May frustrated with Trudeau’s hypocrisy, states:

You can't negotiate with physics. You can't, as Prime Minister, you can't as leader of the Liberal Party. There's a carbon budget, it doesn't budge. And that's why it's so heartbreaking for me to look at you today and know you could have done so much more the last four years. (2019g).

Ending with perhaps her most impactful *ethopoieic* move, she pleaded to Trudeau, "Please God you don't get a majority this time around because – you won't keep your promises" (2019g).

Leaders are alerting viewers that Trudeau is a hypocrite. Trudeau does not keep his promises.

There is frustration on the stage with the other leaders agreeing that Trudeau says that he will do one thing, but then does something different in his actions and policy decisions. Blanchet also joins May in showing his disappointment towards Trudeau's climate action advancement addressing Trudeau directly stating, "You claim to have done a lot, but Canada is the worst emitter of GHG³⁸ in the G20³⁹ per capita. So that's not much of a success" (2019e). Blanchet asks Trudeau if he will allow a pipeline to cross Québec. Trudeau responds that he has brought in a process that works with Indigenous peoples, local communities, respects environmental science, and follows Bill C-69 (2019k), to which Blanchet highlights that Trudeau avoids answering the question; "no answer" (2019e).

Approaching the final moments of the debate, Trudeau asks Scheer about his plan to reduce taxes by \$50,000 for multimillionaires, also interjecting that Scheer's platform, like Doug Ford's, is secret (2019k). Scheer responds, "First of all, Mr. Trudeau, you seem to be oddly obsessed with provincial politics. There is a vacancy for the Ontario Liberal leadership, and if

³⁸ Climate change is caused by the increase in concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere. These increases are primarily due to human activities such as the use of fossil fuels or agriculture (Government of Canada - Environment and Climate Change 2020).

³⁹ The Group of Twenty (G20) is the primary forum for international economic cooperation among its members, the world's major economies, representing all inhabited continents, 85% of global economic output, two thirds of the world's population, and 75% of international trade. The G20 reflects a recognition that global prosperity is interdependent, and our economic opportunities and challenges are interlinked. The G20 comprises 19 countries and the European Union. The 19 countries are Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Korea, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States (Government of Canada - Global Affairs 2019).

you are so focused on provincial politics, go and run for the leadership of that party, Mr. Trudeau,” which is followed by audience applause (2019g). Scheer then states that Trudeau’s tax hikes means that “80 per cent of Canadian families pay higher taxes today” than when he first took office (2019g). Discussion ensues about the Canada Child Benefit, which Trudeau asserts he lifted 300,000 people [children] out of poverty (2019k), to which Scheer rebuts that his benefit plan was “based on a Conservative principle” (2019g). Interjections and crosstalk ensues, with Scheer attempting to speak over Trudeau stating that the Conservatives will have a universal tax cut and bring back the children’s sports and fitness credit (2019g), to which Barton ends the chaos with, “That’s it” (2019).

It is obvious that the form of the debate was curated to cause divisiveness. Leaders were frustrated with the debate time limitations and responded by ensuring that their platform sound bites were stated during the debate. The open debate finale is more of the same regurgitated sound bites with Trudeau confirming with Barton that this section is “starting with me” (2019k) and questioning Scheer on the Conservative’s plan of “lowering taxes by \$50,000 for multimillionaires” (2019k). Trudeau quipped, “Maybe you’ll answer it tomorrow in the press conference, but you haven’t answered it tonight” (2019k), with reference to Scheer not responding to Trudeau’s question during 2 October 2019 TVA’s French-Language Leaders’ Debate about his position on being pro-life, confirming it a day later in the press (Tasker 2019). Trudeau’s quip attempts to expose Scheer as wearing masks as well, hiding his true beliefs on important issues, with his statement going out onto social media afterwards. Scheer responds to Trudeau saying, “That is just not true. You haven’t answered a question your entire time as Prime Minister. I’ve sat across [from] you. You never answer” (2019g). Blanchet chimes in and paints Scheer and Trudeau with the same brush calling them “both experts in

multimillionaire[s]” (2019e). Singh reminds voters that Scheer’s tax cuts translates to “cuts to education, cuts to health care, vicious cuts to the most vulnerable people in society” but also that Trudeau is the same as Scheer, saying to Trudeau, “you sound a lot different, you sound a lot better, but you’ve done much of the same” (2019i). Trudeau disagrees with Singh, with a platform statement, “Nine hundred thousand people out of poverty” (2019k). Scheer, too, responds with a platform statement saying, “we’re going to get the money to pay for it [tax cuts] by cutting corporate welfare and reducing Canada’s foreign aid budget by 25 per cent” (2019g), finishing his statement by reiterating the Conservative brand tag line, “That is going to pay for our tax cuts for all Canadians, to leave more money in their pockets so that they can get ahead” (2019g). Bernier claims these are all “boutique tax credits” (2019e). May then publicly obliterates Scheer, verbalizing her prediction of the election suggesting that

With two weeks left in this election campaign, Canadians can know one thing. At this point, Mr. Scheer, with all due respect, you’re not going to be Prime Minister. The question is going to be on a seat count – if we have Mr. Trudeau in a minority or Mr. Trudeau in a majority. (2019g)

May then appeals to viewers stating, “Voting for Green MPs is your very best guarantee, Canada, that you don’t get the government you least want” (2019g). Scheer, astonished with May’s prophecy, snapped, “Well, I’m going to prove you wrong on that Ms. May. You just watch on October 21st” (2019g), to which May replied, smiling, “Well, I’ll – I’ll lay you bets right now” (2019g).

2.8.6. Pseudo-Closing Remarks

There were no official closing remarks in the 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate, but that did not stop the leaders from attempting to make a moment in the debate for their final words. In the last few moments of the debate, Bernier used his time to ask Scheer, using his first

name, “Andrew, are you a real Conservative? No. I think you are a Liberal” (2019e). Scheer used his time to generate a curatable pseudo-closing remark contrasting himself from Trudeau after a heated exchange with Bernier:

The fact of the matter is there’s a clear contrast in this election: Justin Trudeau’s endless deficits and tax hikes to pay for it, or a Conservative plan that will leave more money in your pocket. We will lower taxes for all Canadians. We’ll bring back popular tax credits like the kids’ sports and fitness tax credit, we’ll boost the RESP⁴⁰, we’ll raise the age credit for seniors, and we’ll bring in a green home renovation tax credit. That, all the while cutting corporate welfare and Canada’s foreign aid budget to bring that money back home so that Canadians can get ahead. (2019g)

Singh highlights the discrepancies between what Trudeau says, and what Trudeau does, claiming the NDP are in politics to fight for the people and are different from the Conservatives and the Liberals, grounding it all in *ethoi*:

This election’s all about who’s going to fight for you, who’s going to stand up for you. And we’ve seen with Mr. Trudeau, he says nice words, but he gave \$6 billion in corporate loan write-offs last year, \$14 billion to the richest corporations. He keeps tax havens open; he keeps loopholes open. He hasn’t closed them in four-years. We’re in it for people. We’re not in it for the rich. We’re going to deliver universal pharmacare for all, we’re going to deliver dental care programs, we’re going to invest in housing, we’re going to fight the climate crisis like we need to win it. That’s what you get with New Democrats. I ask people to support New Democrats – to hold to account this government, to form government in the next election. (2019i)

Trudeau uses his time to tie Scheer with Harper, and differentiate himself, highlighting what his Liberal government has done for Canadians, with a more policy driven statement than an aspirational one:

We have invested in Canadians. We made a very different choice than Stephen Harper did, very different choice than Andrew Scheer is proposing. We lifted 900,000 people out of poverty, we lifted seniors out of poverty, we’re putting more money in the pockets of students, and we’re seeing over a million jobs

⁴⁰ Registered Education Savings Plans are a tax-sheltered plan that help Canadians save for a child’s post-secondary education. Under the Canada Education Savings Grant (CESG) limits, the government of Canada matches 20 per cent on the first \$2,500 contributed annually to a RESP, to a maximum of \$500 per beneficiary per year (Government of Canada 2019)

created, most of them full-time, over the past year. But there is so – over the past four-years – but there is so much more to do. And that is what we have to stay focused on because the fight against climate change, the fight for the future of our economy matters, and that’s the choice Canadians need to make. (2019k)

May highlights the climate emergency and how it can be an economic opportunity:

We have completely mischaracterized our response to the climate emergency as something that somehow doesn’t help the economy. You have the biggest global economic opportunity in the history of mankind [Trudeau over-talk: “ Trudeau: I agree.] in moving all fossil fuels as quickly as possible. [Trudeau over-talk: “ Trudeau: I agree.] But then you’re keeping fossil fuels going because your target is exactly half of what’s required. If this election is [about] anything, it’s about trust and ethics, and we are in a climate emergency. We need grownups in the room to take responsibility. (2019g)

Blanchet announces his commitment to Québeckers:

Mr. Singh said that he wants to fight for Canadians, and that’s a good point. Who do we want to fight for? I want to fight for Québeckers and Québeckers only. If we agree with the Canadian government, then let it be. If we don’t agree, we’re going to fight, and this is what Bloc Québécois has always done and I can’t wait pour avoir ces gens- là dire en français ce qu’ils ont dit en anglais jeudi [(translated) to have these people say in French what they said in English on Thursday]. (2019e)

Scheer reiterates his economic focus for Canadians, but spends more time digging at Trudeau than on the CPC plan:

The fact of the matter is under Justin Trudeau, life will continue to get more expensive. He will continue to raise taxes. His carbon tax will go up. He’s afraid to tell you how much it will go up by. Under the Conservative plan, we’ll balance the budget, protect core services, and lower taxes for all Canadians. (2019g)

The debate concluded with Barton thanking viewers for watching the debate on their various screens. The form of Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate, fostering snappy, rather than comprehensive statements, with time limited responses, showcased a change from Canada’s 2015 *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate.

In Canada’s 2019 election, Trudeau weathered a few ethics scandals, and while losing some cabinet minister seats, the Trudeau Liberals won a minority government with 157 of 338

seats. The Scheer Conservatives lost the election to the Trudeau Liberals, despite winning the popular vote. They increased their seat count from 99 to 121 seats. This was not enough for the Conservative party, and soon it called for Scheer's resignation as leader. The Singh NDP was a bankrupt party heading into the election and saw their seat count shrink even further in 2019, from 39 to 24 seats. The May Greens increased their seat count to three. May stepped down as Green Party Leader following the 2019 election. The Blanchet BQs increased their seats by 22, securing 32 seats in the 2019 election. And Bernier lost his seat in the House of Commons, with the People's Party of Canada winning no seats in 2019.

3. 2015 Analysis: Social Media, *Prosopopoeia*, and *Ethopoeia* in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate

“How can you decide whether someone is ready
to be your Prime Minister?”
- Liberal Leader, Justin Trudeau,
Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate

In Chapter Two, descriptive synopses of Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate was offered to provide context in situating these next three chapters. This chapter analyzes how social media influenced Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders Debate by examining the use of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, instruments of ethotic incorporation and depiction, in the social media posts related to the debate. In examining the parties' and leaders' top shared Facebook posts, top retweeted Twitter posts, and top liked Instagram posts, six major debate-related themes were identified.

The two themes discussed in connection to Facebook are:

1. Recirculating edited versions of leaders' closing remarks
2. Asserting a party's leader “wins” the debate

The two themes discussed in connection to Twitter are:

3. Requesting followers to “agree” with, and share, parties' and leaders' debate-related posts
4. Reinforcing leaders' debate-related talking points and zingers

The two themes discussed in connection with Instagram are:

5. Providing followers with a behind-the-scenes intimate view of leaders
6. Curating information and visuals in favour of a particular leader

In each case, the first of these themes (1, 3, 5) is predominantly associated with *prosopopoeia*, the second (2, 4, 6) with *ethopoeia*. Examining these six main themes reveals how *ethos* is

refracted in social media and how the rhetorical figures of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* infiltrate the political parties' and leaders' social media accounts.

3.1. The Moderate Influence of Facebook on Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate

What Susan Delacourt calls "the real power of Facebook, is its ability to reach people who are not necessarily connected to politics, as well as their networks of friends" (2016, 305). The reach of Facebook through its web of connections is remarkable, so remarkable that during the 2012 U.S. election thirty-three million Facebook friends of incumbent President Barack Obama connected him to 98 per cent of Americans through their own networks of friends on Facebook's social media platform (Delacourt 2016, 305). Similarly, as remarkable was that in Canada's 2015 federal election, Trudeau hit many similar mileposts through Facebook's social media platform, connecting him to close to thirteen million voters (Delacourt 2016, 305).

3.1.1. Recirculating Edited Versions of Leaders' Closing Remarks

Marketers suggest that videos that are less than two-minutes in length, informative, and easily understood tend to be optimal in maintaining audience attention on social media (Fishman 2016; aschmidt 2017). Well suited for a social media platform, then, leaders in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate were each provided two minutes for their closing remarks. And following the debate, edited clips of their closing remarks populated all four of the parties' or leaders' Facebook feeds, with each video-post performance becoming one of their top three shared posts on Facebook's social media platform. Gaining second and third place for the most shared debate-related Facebook posts were two video posts of Trudeau's closing remarks, both published through his Facebook account. Trudeau's "real change" closing statement was a 1-minute-50-second video clip lifted directly from the debate and posted on 6 August 2015. It

received 144,458 views, 3,900 likes, 2,101 shares, and 576 comments (Trudeau 2015i) (Figure 0-9). On 11 August 2015, an edited version of Trudeau’s closing remarks was posted on Facebook. Trudeau’s “A better Canada is always possible” clip was reduced in time to 1-minute-33-seconds, incorporated upbeat music, open captions, and positive campaign video clips of him dispersed throughout the video-post, ending with his debate statement, “better is always possible” (Trudeau 2015t) (Figure 0-10). This post received 109,469 views, 3,944 likes, 1,918 shares, and 435 comments. Posted 12 August 2015 on Twitter, Trudeau’s “A better Canada is always possible #elxn42” video post was the top retweeted debate-related post receiving, 621 likes, 378 retweets, and 50 comments (Trudeau 2015u) (Figure 0-36). Trudeau was the final leader to speak during the debate.

The political Liberal slogan in Canada’s 2015 federal election was “real change,” and Trudeau’s closing remarks played up the “real change” branding through an affirmative case construction strategy. Trudeau’s closing message promoted the “real change” framing by not only differentiating himself from his adversaries politically, but also in displaying a change from what is typical in debate closing remarks. Kathleen Hall Jamieson and David S. Birdsell assert that “debate gains its vitality from direct challenge” and “debaters enter such confrontation in the belief that the stronger side will prevail, truth will triumph over falsehood, *logos* over *pathos*” (1988, 11–12). Harper’s, Mulcair’s, and even May’s closing statements all play to this belief. Not Trudeau’s. Trudeau mentions no specific *logos*-based Liberal policies or economic plans. Instead, more suited to a growing media landscape that emphasizes character and attitude, Trudeau utilized a variety of strategic ethotic moves to differentiate himself from the Harper Conservatives and the other leaders vying for the job as Canada’s next Prime Minister.

To begin, Trudeau’s closing statement focused on only one competitor—Harper. Trudeau directly addressed the Conservatives’ “just not ready” attack ads circulating on media and described them as “silly” (Trudeau 2015i). For the Conservative Party, negative *ethopoeia* campaign strategies had been their bread and butter, working in the past to brand 2008 Liberal leader Stéphane Dion as “not a leader” and his 2011 Liberal leader successor Michael Ignatieff as “just visiting” (Lindell 2013). David Rosenberg, partner and chief creative officer at Toronto advertising agency Bensimon Byrne had observed that “there’s a rule that you’re not supposed to parrot the language your opponents are using against you” (Krashinsky 2015). But Trudeau flaunted this rule, capitalizing on binary categorization. In Kenneth Burke’s terms, binary oppositions create a “deflection of reality” (1966, 45), which “artificially constrains the inherent complexity and dynamism of that which would be represented” (Stillar 1998, 111). Glenn Stillar suggests that binaries “trade on a kind of logico-semantic purity: Something is either this or that, is or is not, and so on” (1998, 111), and Burke proposes that binaries reflect a pursuit of the “semantic ideal” (1938, 503). By describing the Conservative Party’s negative *ethopoeia* “just not ready” advertising campaign as “silly,” Trudeau’s debate closing statement performance became paired to the Conservative’s *ethopoeia* campaign against him. Pairing himself with the negative Conservative messaging during the debate was a bold move, but Trudeau was in third place in the polls (“Election 2015: NDP Leads, but CPC’s Base Is Most Solid” 2015), and boldness can reward an underdog. The pundits took note. *The Globe and Mail*’s Campbell Clark stated, “It was Cautious Tom and Fighting Justin” (2015). Trudeau the boxer had ducked the just-not-ready haymaker and counterpunched by labelling the dour and stolid Conservatives as “silly.”

Clearly more persuasive than the negative Conservative advertisement circulation, Trudeau's closing statement performance and video clip addressing the Conservative remarks, along with additional pundit reviews on his performance, were widely liked, shared, commented on, and watched repeatedly through the affordances of social media, juxtaposing and devaluing the unsubstantiated messaging that the Conservatives had been promoting with their negative campaign advertisements.

Another noteworthy element of Trudeau's closing statement is that he identified himself as a father and directly addressed the elephant in the room, his famous familial lineage with his own father. Prior to Canada's 2015 election campaign, the name *Trudeau* was already widely recognized by the Canadian population. Pierre Elliott Trudeau served as Prime Minister of Canada for 16 years, from 1968 to 1984 (with one short interregnum),⁴¹ so when his eldest son ran for Prime Minister in 2015, the name *Trudeau* already evoked positive and negative thoughts and images in the minds of Canadians. Pierre Elliott Trudeau was highly recognized for his charismatic personality, youthful energy, and "swinging young bachelor" persona when he was sworn into office ("Swinging Young Bachelor" 1968). While his popularity ebbed and flowed during his career, by the time he retired he was widely admired among progressives and widely reviled among Conservatives, especially in the West where Harper's power was anchored. Justin Trudeau's job was to both separate himself from his father and also to borrow from him. Viktor Shklovsky's *ostranenie* concept is useful here for the first part, separating himself from Pierre.⁴² *Ostranenie* extracts a familiar object from its familiarity. The essence of defamiliarization is simply this: something ordinary, commonplace, or familiar (an object, event, situation, or

⁴¹ Progressive Conservative Party leader Joe Clark served as Prime Minister of Canada from June 1979 to March 1980.

⁴² In English, *ostranenie* is rendered most directly as "making strange," but is more frequently translated as "defamiliarization" (Stacy 1977, ix)

tradition) is made to, in one way or another, appear unfamiliar (Stacy 1977, 8). In his closing statement, Trudeau turns himself from a familiar *son* into an unfamiliar *father*. “I’m a 43-year-old father of three kids,” Trudeau says (2015i). Once he has defamiliarized, Trudeau then capitalizes on his lineage, stating, “What I learned from my father is that, to lead this country, you need to love this country, love it more than you crave power. It needs to run through your veins. You need to feel it in your bones” (2015i), before transitioning to the philosophical difference between his leadership and Harpers.’

Trudeau’s “real change” closing statement differentiates himself from the Harper Conservatives’ “stay on course” (Harper 2015c) economic focused, status quo plan, by promoting the Liberal’s messaging of “better is always possible.” Trudeau states, “Mr. Harper and I part ways on many issues, but our differences go deeper than just policy. Mr. Harper is dead wrong about one thing. He wants you to believe that better just isn’t possible. Well, I think that’s wrong” (Trudeau 2015i). He adds, “better is always possible” (Trudeau 2015i). Trudeau is enacting a party-leader *prosopopoeia*, performing the Liberal Party’s positive-politics “real change” *ethos*. In an email to the *National Observer*, former Liberal leader Michael Ignatieff wrote Trudeau is “an actor, a professional politician who fully inhabits the role with a confidence that comes from having always known this was the role he was born to play” (Mandel 2015).

In “A Better Canada is Always Possible” video-post, Trudeau’s closing statement was used as a voiceover, with the prominent element being visually complementary video clips of Trudeau observed performing the words from his closing remarks, upbeat music, and open captions (Trudeau 2015t) (Figure 0-10). This was Facebook’s third most shared debate-related post and Twitter’s first most shared debate-related post. Rather than simply watching Trudeau speak the words in a debate setting as he does in the “Real Change” post, thematic images are

interjected to show Trudeau's words in action, showing him as a father, with his children running up to him, shaking hands as a leader, smiling, and publicly interacting with supporters across Canada, visually demonstrating his love of the country and the Canadian people, vividly setting him off from the staunch, economic-focused, fear-inducing Harper Conservatives. This binary strategy serves Trudeau further by narrowing the field to only two choices—Harper or Trudeau—effectively dismissing Mulcair and May as contenders for Prime Minister. It's not just the verbal script that narrows the field for the viewing audience. The medium of Facebook also narrows the choice. The closing statement is detached from its debate context, uploaded, and viewed, through Trudeau's Facebook account; it is not viewed in the context of the *Macleans*'s debate. Trudeau's Facebook account isolates and edits the statement. On Facebook only Trudeau's closing statement is present. The other leaders' closing remarks are not. Facebook bypasses the gatekeeping fourth estate of media. This is a marked change from the traditional relationship media had with politicians, where media selected and highlighted what they thought to be the most significant information for viewers. Now the politicians and their strategists curate for themselves. In "Democratic Prosopopoeia: The Rhetorical Influence of the I-Will-Vote Image Filter on Social Media Profile Pictures during the 2015 Canadian Federal Election" (Kampherm 2019), I argue that image-filters on Facebook and Twitter profile pictures are *prosopopoeic* acts—in particular, that the incorporation of filters bestows a speaking-for-a-type *prosopopoeia*. The social media poster with an image filter is now speaking not only for themselves but for (in the case I analyze) the class of people who have voted, giving them greater democratic authority over non-voters. This can also be understood synecdochally (Burke 1941a), the part (one voter) speaking for the whole (the set of voters). Party leaders have this

representative function automatically. No image filters needed. The performance of Trudeau, as the most salient part of the Liberal Party of Canada, performs the values of the Party.

The Conservative Party circulated an edited version of Harper's closing statement, paired with uplifting instrumental music and a tagline reading "Prime Minister Stephen Harper made the clear choice last night. Canadians need Proven Leadership to keep Canada safe, and our economy strong. #elxn42" (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2015c) (Figure 0-2). The video-post on 7 August 2015 received 69,950 views, 4,513 likes, 1,095 shares, and 731 comments. It ranked as Facebook's sixth most shared debate-related post. Harper did not adopt a binary framing like Trudeau did, but rather subtly stated, "this election is about who has the proven experience to keep Canada safe and our economy strong," thinly insinuating that the other leaders do not have this experience. Noteworthy for this clip is that the Conservative Party removed an entire minute of Harper's original two-minute closing statement. In Facebook's edited version of Harper's closing statement, elements where Harper evoked fear and uncertainty about Canada's economy were removed, altering Harper's negative tone and words. We can consider this a routine act of *ethopoeia*, as the Conservative Party altered Harper's words to depict a different, less corrosive, Harper. More technically, the Conservative Party machinery has altered the Harper-as-candidate mask on social media. The party's version of Harper was curated into a more positive image, highlighting and promoting his encouraging statements, where Harper repeated "we have the best economic growth, the best job creation, and the best growth in middle class incomes among any of the advanced developed nations" as well as highlighting his positive policies, such as "increased money for things that matter, transfers for health care, education, for infrastructure, and for benefits for families like yours" (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2015c).

What these two closing statement curations reveal is the thin, perspectival line that separates ethotic maneuvers in the borderlands of political strategizing. We have Trudeau adopting the Liberal Party messaging through *prosopopoeia*, and on the Conservative side, we see the party apparatus using *ethopoeia* to construct Harper's image and words in an altered format on Facebook, producing a softer image of Harper on the social media platform. The situation becomes more complicated, of course, when we consider that both Trudeau and Harper are also part of their party's decision-making system, in an ultimately untraceable feedback loop, the origin points of the videos provide a clear methodological dividing line. The Trudeau video comes from Trudeau's account. The Harper video comes from the Conservative Party of Canada. But, in principle, representative speaking/performing is an act of *prosopopoeia* (in this case, Trudeau performing for/as the Liberal Party), and re-presenting the speech/performance in acts of reformulation is an *ethopoeic* move (the Conservative Party curating and restructuring the performance of Harper).

Mulcair's closing statement was also distributed through Facebook (Mulcair 2015a) (Figure 0-18) and Twitter (Mulcair 2015b) (Figure 0-53), concisely summarizing his vision for Canada, highlighting his years of experience in public service, and appealing to Canadians to join him in creating change, *prosopopoeically* representing the NDP. But his message did not receive the same social reach with shares, likes, or comments as Trudeau or the Conservative Party did. Also, the Green Party shared May's closing statement (Green Party of Canada - Parti vert du Canada 2015c) (Figure 0-22), providing the Green Party with ethotic capital, as this was the only debate which included May, but similar to Mulcair, the post was not as widely shared as Trudeau's or the Conservative Party's. In recirculating edited versions of the leaders' closing

remarks on social media, the political parties and leaders altered the debate narrative, editing the flaws through removal of content, and curating the message with associated images and music.

3.1.2. Asserting a Party's Leader "Wins" the Debate

In addition to Trudeau using *prosopopoeia* to adopt the Liberal Party's "real change" philosophy in his closing statement, and the Conservative Party using *ethopoeia* to modify Harper's *ethos* in the edited Facebook version of his closing statement, another noteworthy social media event that was prominent after both the 2015 and 2019 debates were declarations of winning the debate. The Conservative Party asserted that their leader had won the debate—Harper "wins" in 2015, and Scheer "wins" in 2019—and both Facebook posts achieved the most debate-related shares on the platform. Facebook's 2015 debate-related post receiving the most shares was an image posted on 6 August 2015 following the debate of a smiling Stephen Harper with the text, "Prime Minister Stephen Harper Wins First Debate." The tagline (and Conservative slogan), "proven leadership for a strong Canada" is embedded in the image. The Conservative Facebook message states, "Stephen Harper shows #ProvenLeadership and wins first debate! SHARE if you agree #elxn42 #macdebate" (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2015a) (Figure 0-1). This image received 6,747 likes, 2,945 shares, and 1,923 comments.

But the next day, on 7 August 2015, a post appeared declaring "Tom Mulcair wins first leaders debate" (Mulcair 2015h) (Figure 0-17), showcasing three pundit comments over an image of the group of leaders and moderator. The pundit comments read, "Mulcair was strong" – Laura Payton, *CBC News*; "prime ministerial" – Michael Den Tandt, *National Post*; and "The strategic victor is Tom Mulcair's NDP" – Nicky Woolf, *The Guardian*. Mulcair's post was the eighth most shared debate-related Facebook post and top shared Facebook post by Mulcair

gaining 2,118 likes, 944 shares, and 371 comments. Two days following the debate on 8 August 2015, an image-link showing Trudeau shaking hands outside of the debate with a visually teeming Liberal crowd appeared on the Liberal Party's Facebook page. The post states, "The Reviews Are In: First round goes to Trudeau," with a repetitive tagline, "The reviews are in. Please share to show your support" (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2015c) (Figure 0-6). The link, when clicked, opens to a Liberal Party produced article of sixteen favourable pundit quotes on Trudeau's debate performance curated into one document, compiled to act as supporting evidence of Trudeau's "first round" victory in the *Maclean's* debate ("The Reviews Are In: First Round Goes to Trudeau" 2015) (Figure 1-7). Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate was the first of five debates, and the article title is written in a similar fashion to a boxing match judge awarding a round to a boxer who scored the most punches in a fight. Although not placing as one of the top-ten shared posts overall on Facebook, this was the second most shared Liberal Party post on Facebook receiving 2,142 likes, 655 shares, and 342 comments. The Green Party did not promote Elizabeth May on social media as having won the debate, although if they reviewed Nicky Woolf's article from *The Guardian*, where Mulcair appropriated the excerpt for his "winning" social media post, the Green Party would have observed that in Woolf's full statement she said, "The immediate winner tonight is Elizabeth May. But the strategic victor is Tom Mulcair's NDP" (Woolf 2015). Instead, Facebook's Green Party posted on 7 August 2015, "After last night's performance in the *Maclean's* debate, it is clear Elizabeth May belongs in all the debates. Sign-on today to demand she be included in the remaining leaders' debates: green.ca/qUF" (Green Party of Canada - Parti vert du Canada 2015a) (Figure 0-21). This post was Facebook's tenth most shared debate-related post overall and was

the second most shared Green Party post on Facebook receiving 2,401 likes, 814 shares, and 201 comments.

Political parties endorsing their leader is a common move in the game of politics. And the media declaring a winner in a debate is not new; nor, of course, are differently aligned pundits making different declarations. But what may not be realized is that when a political party characterizes their leader as a winner through social media, the political party is not simply endorsing their leader, but is enacting *ethopoeia*, constructing their leaders' *ethos*, promotionally, as a "winner." Craig Crawford suggests that "the truth threatens many politicians. They try to control what we think is true. They define truth on their own terms, which often is not the truth at all" (2006, 26). The Conservative Party used the *ethopoeic* statement, "Prime Minister Stephen Harper Wins First Debate" (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2015a), and gained the most shares on Facebook. The Liberal Party used *ethopoeia*, derived from pundit reviews, to claim the "first round" of the *Macleans*' debate to Trudeau. On Mulcair's social media account both *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* are in play. Mulcair's Facebook account posts "Tom Mulcair wins first leaders' debate" which would have fit decorum coming from the NDP's Facebook account. Mulcair is adopting a voice or stance originating with others, the pundits, to claim on his own Facebook page that he won the *Macleans*' debate, which is *prosopopoeia*. However, as the statement is written in third-person language, "Tom Mulcair wins," rather than "I won," it is *ethopoeia*, the NDP Party developing the image and statement about Tom's "win" and posting it from Mulcair's Facebook account. This post is an example of *prosopopoeic ethopoeia*.

The strategy behind each political party proclaiming their leader as the winner of a debate on social media is straightforwardly ethotic, with the purpose of satisfying the faithful's

confirmation bias that their candidate has the leadership qualities required to triumph. Promoting their leader as a “winner” through Facebook’s algorithm-affecting shares and likes, provides even more social reach, as the “winning” parties’ and candidates’ victory message is propagated post-debate—further satisfying the faithful, possibly attracting undecideds or discouraging support for other leaders (if they aren’t the winners, they must be losers). More dramatically, it can also skew the viewer’s memory of the debate itself, so that unfavourable elements are forgotten, and only the positive glow, abetted by images and clips. Human memory “is immensely enhanced by the awesome search and retrieval powers of digital memory” (Lanham 1993, 76); it can also, in effect, be *replaced* by digital memory. Viewers remember this illusory definite version. It is imprinted through repeated and focussed exposure, so that the initial debate experience (for those who viewed the debate) is altered and displaced. The *prosopopoeic* moves of the Mulcair and Trudeau declarations notably included quotations, which provide evidence behind those declarations, and more of it for Trudeau than Mulcair, as well as leveraging the aggregate *ethos* of the people and organs they quote.

In a study on electoral expectations, “among those with high levels of knowledge, expectations appear to facilitate more sophisticated, rational decision processes, such as strategic coalition voting” (Meffert et al. 2011, 814). But among those with low levels of political knowledge, it was found that “perceiving a party as a clear winner appears to increase the likelihood of casting a vote for this party, even in multiparty systems [...],” a phenomenon called *the bandwagon effect* (Meffert et al. 2011, 814), something abetted in the declarations of Mulcair’s and Trudeau’s “wins” by the voices they quote, pundits who seem either to be on the bandwagon already or at least endorsing its direction and momentum.

With this rhetorical method, once the voter gets on the bandwagon, or the “winning” team, and shares a message on social media that their chosen leader has “won,” it provides the voter with a feeling that they too are a winner through the principle of association. Robert Cialdini suggests “if we can surround ourselves with success that we are connected with in even a superficial way (for example, place of residence), our public prestige will rise” (2009, 167). He suggests “we purposefully manipulate the visibility of our connections with winners and losers in order to make ourselves look good to anyone who views these connections” (Cialdini 2009, 167). *Ethos*, in this sense, is transitive. This helps to explain why ‘[Insert Leader Here] Wins the Debate’ posts on social media tend to be shared and gain traction. What Cialdini calls “the principle of association” is the cognitive disposition related to *metonymy*. In the way that *crown* stands in for ‘the institution of the monarchy’ or that *Ottawa* is linguistic short-hand for ‘the current Canadian federal government,’ an image of Harper tagged with “wins debate” comes to represent, in people’s memories as much as in social media, the leader of the Conservative Party; who in turn represents the party itself, which is a kind of ‘container’ of the faithful; with this image, a container of winners. Burke says that *metonymy* is a ‘reduction,’ but also that “a reduction is a *representation*” (1941a, 426). The job of these social media instances is to reduce complex individuals and policies and parties into simple, robust linguistically tagged images—representative *positive* images of winning in this case.

Shares and likes, however, without support from good evidence, make for a fragile argument, an *argumentum ad populum*, and “popular belief does not establish the truth of a matter” (Walton 2008, 107–8; 112). Popular belief can be true, but it can also be untrue. Popular belief can evade proof, appeal to the lowest common denominator, offer misinformation, give irrelevant facts, or can have subjective arguments to support claims. However, the social media

share does have rhetorical influence, and popular sentiment may contaminate the true winner of the leaders' debate. A study conducted by Lisa K. Fazio, David G. Rand, and Gordon Pennycook has found that "repetition increases the likelihood that a statement will be judged as true," often called the illusory truth effect, even when individuals are faced with "highly implausible statements," as the implausible statements become "more plausible with enough repetition" (2019, 1705). One only needs to look to the United States 2020 Trump-Biden election and its ongoing aftermath to see how repetitive misinformation about voter fraud claims by past President Donald Trump incited division within the nation. Less demagogic, but still persuasive, is the Conservative debate "win" post of Harper, the most debate-related shared Facebook post 2,945 times, providing a significant amount of traction to a single, unsubstantiated claim, in comparison to the Liberal Party's "First Round Goes to Trudeau" post linking to a collection of sixteen favourable pundit reviews on Trudeau's debate performance, which only received 655 shares, or Mulcair's self-proclaimed "win" displaying three favourable pundit reviews, receiving 944 shares.

To be a part of the 'container' of faithful, or container of winners, the debate post is shared by friends and followers on their own Facebook pages. By sharing the political party or leaders' winning Facebook post, the individual has not simply *done* something, but has *become* something—an advocate of the party, the leader, and the '[Insert Leader Here] wins debate' message through the process of Burkean identification (Kampherm 2019, 61). The act of sharing the political message on their own personal Facebook page is also a form of *prosopopoeia* (or *prosopopoeic ethopoeia*), as the user is absorbed into a specified identity, as a supporter and virtual volunteer of the political party and leader.

3.2. The Moderate Influence of Twitter on Canada's 2015 *Macleans* Leaders'

Debate

Alan Durant suggests that discourse through Twitter becomes transformed by the medium rather than simply being amplified (which he contrasts with Facebook, perhaps naively), because the medium encourages association, where users think about the inclusion of hashtags, or if someone should be @- mentioned (2010, 5). Additionally, Dhiraj Murthy finds that the communicative act of Twitter has an element of self-advertising, where “tweets as a mode of communication inherently involve methods to promote the propagator of a tweet to a larger audience” (2018, 35); that is, while Murthy doesn't use the term, methods to enhance the propagator's *ethos* as a curator of valuable insights and opinions. Over six-million election-related tweets were sent over the two-and-a-half month period leading up to the 2015 election (Ladurantaye 2015) with #cdnpoli the most mentioned 'made in Canada' hashtag, while #elxn42 was listed as the third most mentioned (Doyle 2015). The official hashtag of Canada's 2015 federal election, #elxn42, received 3,685,885 Twitter mentions (Ruest and Milligan 2016) throughout the campaign, in comparison to 715,000+ mentions of #elxn41 during the 2011 Canadian federal election campaign (“What Role Did Social Media Play in #ELXN42?” 2015). Twitter numbers following the *Macleans* debate showed that Liberal Leader Justin Trudeau was the most discussed leader with 13,244 Twitter mentions, while NDP Leader Thomas Mulcair was the least discussed, with 7,160 mentions (Spurr 2015).

In my study, Trudeau's 2015 *Macleans* debate-related posts dominated Twitter in gaining the most retweet traction. In examining the top shared debate-related Twitter posts from political parties and leaders, Trudeau's posts received the most retweets overall, with Trudeau's

debate-related tweets in first,⁴³ second, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth (tie with Harper), and tenth place for shares. The only spot Trudeau’s Twitter account does not occupy in this list, the third, is held by the Liberal Party’s Twitter account. In examining the effect of Twitter on the debate, this section examines two prominent areas that gained the most retweet traction for political parties and leaders, which was accomplished by soliciting followers to “agree” with parties’ and leaders’ tweets by retweeting/sharing their message through the social media platform, and through reinforcing leaders’ debate-related talking points and zingers on social media.

3.2.1. Requesting Followers to “Agree” With and Share Parties’ and Leaders’ Debate-Related Posts

Anacoenosis, which is the move of turning judgement over to one’s audience, is traditionally ‘only’ a figure of speech, where no reply is really sought, but strategically seeks to induce agreement with the rhetor’s position. Social media, however, changes the game. Through affordances of retweets, shares, and likes, a rhetorical situation (Bitzer 1968) is created where followers *are* invited to participate in agreement by liking, and/or sharing the debate-related post on their own personal social media page, even adding their own supportive commentary (though also opening the door for subversive or antithetical commentary). The retweet function on Twitter was the parties’ and leaders’ most preferred form of audience engagement in both elections. In the hierarchy of social media, the share is the most dominant form of agreement. When parties’ or leaders’ posts are shared by followers on social media, various outcomes are triggered. Foremost, this signals a “conversion” for the political party, which in digital business

⁴³ Trudeau’s “A better Canada is always possible #elxn42” video tweet was the most retweeted debate-related Twitter post receiving 378 retweets. However, to avoid repetition, this post will not be discussed in the 2015 Twitter section as the post was previously discussed in the 2015 Facebook section.

terminology means that the post-sharer could be a potential lead for future business through social media (Delacourt 2016, 305–6). In politics, the effect is similar. Susan Delacourt reveals that for politicians, “digital advertising is a cost-effective way [...] to raise money and test various appeals for support” and through calls-to-action requests, political parties can use this information for their own promotion (2016, 306). Knowing who responded to which calls-to-action initiatives provides political parties with the opportunity to “send out slightly different versions of a fundraising email” to specific people “and then measure which one pulled in the most dollars” (Delacourt 2016, 306). Additionally, when a Twitter user shares the party’s message, it carries more rhetorical influence than simply endorsing the content with a like, but rather initiates the person as a virtual volunteer for the political party or leader by advancing the political statement on their own personal page for all friends to see, acting as a spokesperson for the political message, and allowing the political parties’ or leaders’ access to their follower circle.

One example of a political party using a call-to-action share request on a Twitter post was from the Liberal Party, which tweeted on 7 August 2015 an image of Trudeau from the *Maclean’s* debate with CP24 Craig Oliver’s quote beside the image stating, “This was prime time and Justin Trudeau was clearly ready” (Liberal Party 2015b). The Liberal Party’s message associated with their image used a classic idiom originating from the 1800s (Ammer 1997, 275) reading, “He did us proud. Share if you agree #elxn42 #cdnpoli,” (Liberal Party 2015b) (Figure 0-33). This was the third most shared debate-related post overall on Twitter and the top shared Twitter post from the Liberal Party gaining 232 likes, 343 retweets, and 30 comments. On Facebook, this post was the seventh most shared debate-related post overall and gained 2,826 likes, 1,092 shares, and 304 comments (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2015b)

(Figure 0-5). The Liberal Party's image post and quote from Oliver directly addresses the Harper Conservative messaging that had plagued Trudeau since he became leader of the Liberal Party.

To provide additional context, Oliver's full quote states:

It changes the perception created by two years of Conservative advertising that Trudeau is not ready for prime time. Because this was prime time and Trudeau was clearly ready. – Craig Oliver, *CP24*, August 7, 2015. (“The Reviews Are In: First Round Goes to Trudeau” 2015)

Prior to the 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate, the Conservatives were declaring that Trudeau was “not ready” to be Prime Minister in numerous attack advertisements. News articles published before the debate included statements from Kory Teneycke, Harper's director of communications, that expectations for Trudeau have “probably never been lower for a leader going to a debate” and that if Trudeau “comes on stage with his pants on, he will probably exceed expectations” (The Canadian Press 2015). Teneycke predicted that leading up to the debate Trudeau “likely spent hours memorizing ‘a lot of attacks’ and rehearsing ‘pithy responses,’” but commented that “at the end of the day, this isn't a debate for the sake of a debate. It is to pick somebody who is capable of managing that \$1.9-trillion economy” (The Canadian Press 2015). So, when the *Maclean's* Debate transpired, and Trudeau performed effectively as the Liberal Party Leader, debate watchers responded, using the affordances of social media.

There are a variety of noteworthy takeaways from the Liberal Party's social media post. The Liberal Party is a political organization with a liberalism ideology. Through *prosopopoeia* and the affordances of social media, the Liberal Party and its ideology is “Metaphorically brought [*sic*] and represented as a person” (J. Smith 1657, 153). When the Liberal Party account tweets, “He did us proud. Share if you agree #elxn42 #cdnpoli” (Liberal Party 2015b), the Liberal Party's account on Twitter is adopting a *prosopopoeia* mask with human qualities,

similar to a coach (Twitter's Liberal Party account) speaking about its team captain (Trudeau), encouraging its fans (Twitter followers), to virtually cheer Trudeau on (like, retweet, and comment on post). Marjolaine Madore argues that the facility with which supporters are mobilized through social networks is one of the characteristics of fandom politics, since "fans rarely just like something; they tend to do something to exhibit their support and gather others to join them" (Madore 2009; Bronstein 2013, 187). Mark Pack posited that citizen marketing, which is getting ordinary members of the public to take up your messages and distribute them, complements the Holy Grail of personal recommendation and word of mouth (2010, 5). Marshall Ganz suggests that public narrative is "an exercise of leadership by motivating others to join you in action on behalf of a shared purpose" (2009). An immediate action that voters can do is to like and share the social media post as they are requested, imparting themselves in the election as one of the social media sharers in support of the Trudeau Liberals. Aristotle states, "the political orator is concerned with the future" and "political speaking urges us either to do or not to do something" (2001, pt. 1358b). When the Liberal Party fans echo the Liberal Party's "He did us proud," statement through liking and sharing the message on their own personal Twitter account, a *prosopopoeic ethopoeia* act, a variety of outcomes for the Liberal Party are probable. One outcome is that this simple 'share' action draws the supporter into a web of commitment and consistency pressure for future favourable actions related to the Liberal Party and their leader, Trudeau, with the pinnacle being voting for Trudeau on Election Day. Cialdini proposes that commitment strategies "get us to take some action or make some statement that will trap us into later compliance through consistency pressures" (1984, 75), and "most people, once they take a stand or go on record in favour of a position, prefer to stick to it" where "even a small, seemingly trivial commitment can have a powerful effect on future actions," similar to rooting on your

favourite team in a sporting match (Cialdini 2001, 76). A ‘thumbs-up’ like button on Facebook, ‘favourite’ button on Twitter (a ‘star’ icon in 2015 and ‘heart’ icon in 2019), are examples of the social media platform encouraging assent for the Liberal Party’s statement asking viewers to “share if you agree.” And as Kenneth Burke suggests, “you are drawn to the form, not in your capacity as a partisan, but because of some ‘universal’ appeal in it. And this attitude of assent may then be transferred to the matter which happens to be associated with the form” (1950, 58). Burke is not talking about form in the material sense of Twitter, but in the linguistic sense of narrative or rhetorical figures, and how it brings one into agreement. But in this instance, the “share if you agree” message and the “favourite” and “share” buttons on Twitter, work together in visibly demonstrating the viewer’s agreement publicly. And because of commitment and consistency pressures, viewers who liked and favourably shared a Trudeau Liberal post publicly, may also then like Trudeau’s page, and may then vote for Trudeau in the election, as they have already approved of him on social media, for all ‘friends’ to see.

Another opportunity for the Liberal Party in encouraging followers to ‘share’ their debate-related message is that their follower count may expand through these shares, as like-minded people tend to want to appear similar to their peers and may also begin to follow the Liberal Party and/or Trudeau if their ‘friends’ are doing so. In Cialdini’s phrasing, “social creatures that they are, human beings rely heavily on the people around them for cues on how to think, feel, and act” (2001, 75), offering a kind of social-science moral to Burke’s famous parlour allegory, where without having been there from the beginning, one can listen in on an argument to catch the tenor, and join in the conversation (Burke 1941b, 94–95). The Liberal Party’s liberalism ideology, presented through *prosopopoeia* on Twitter, is then re-

communicated by peers, *prosopopoeic ethopoeia*, which solidifies the conceptual message more fully in the social sphere with human ‘friend’ endorsement.

But Trudeau was not the only leader asking followers to agree with and share a political social media post. Twitter’s ninth⁴⁴ most shared debate-related post overall, and Harper’s most shared image post, was a wide shot of the four podiums with *Maclean’s* debate images in the background. The image showed Harper with his two children, then 15-year-old Rachel and 19-year-old Benjamin, each behind a leaders’ podium. Harper is pointing at Benjamin and Benjamin is pointing at his father, with Rachel observing the antics between them both. The text reads, “I am sure if you have teenagers you’ll agree with me – these two are well practiced debaters! #elxn42 #macdebate” (Harper 2015b) (Figure 0-32). The image post gained 417 likes, 258 retweets, and 116 comments. What is interesting about this post from 6 August 2015, is that Harper directly communicated with his followers through social media, visually identifying himself as a parent of teenagers, and associated Canada’s 2015 *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate with everyday family ‘debates’ parents may have with their own teenagers. Harper uses *prosopopoeia*, in incorporating the debate *ethos* into an image of him with his children, through the words, “well practiced debaters,” and election and debate related hashtags, “#elxn42” and “#macdebate.” *Prosopopoeia* is also evident in the timing of the post, published three-hours before the *Maclean’s* debate begins, providing followers an exclusive visual behind-the-scenes glimpse of the *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate studio before Canadians have had an opportunity to see it, displaying his *ethos* as Prime Minister of Canada and his power to provide this insider image to his followers.

⁴⁴ Tied with Trudeau fourth place in debate-related shares.

The image Harper posted on Twitter could be viewed a few different ways. The more wholesome and fun-loving way to view the image and post figures Harper as playful father, with the support of his family around him on this important debate day. Harper appears to be joking around with his teenage children before the debate, showing social media followers a more personal and relatable side of himself. Sharing the image on Twitter identifies himself as a father and associates him with other like-minded parents of teenagers, while also displaying his power to give his followers an exclusive glimpse into the workings of the *Maclean's* debate set-up before the debate begins. Harper was adopting *prosopopoeia*, as the Conservative Party appears to be moderating Harper's *ethos* and image on social media. The neutral way of viewing this image is that Harper is providing his Twitter followers a behind-the-scenes glimpse of how the debate is structured. Harper and his teenagers are acting as stand-ins for the other debaters to assist the stage crew in positioning the equipment, helping the crew in adjusting the stage lighting and the camera angles, in getting prepared for the live television debate. The more sinister way of assessing this image is viewing the act of Harper's teenagers behind the leaders' podiums as a play on the Harper Conservative's low expectations for the other party leaders in the debate, visually depicting Teneycke's debate-related comments, in displaying his debating competition as inexperienced youngsters. As there is only one photo associated with Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate from Harper's Twitter account, and the photo selected is of Harper with his teenage children rather than a photo or video of the debate itself, or an image with the other political leaders, it may appear to Twitter followers that Harper is overconfident heading into the debate. The single playful image with a questionable meaning associated with it may infer to followers that Harper does not feel the need to prove his leadership ability from the *Maclean's* Debate through his social media. Instead, Harper's single image post suggests he is

not pandering to social media, rather relying on his track-record of ten consecutive years as Canada's Prime Minister to speak for itself in this leaders' debate. What followers may not have realized, however, is that the Conservative Party did not effectively understand the constraints and affordances of social media at the time and used the Twitter platform ineffectively for Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate. Rather than utilizing the well-established following Harper and the Conservative Party had on Twitter, with 920,434 followers and 76,246 followers respectively, the Conservative Party created a new Twitter account for the debate, CPC Debate @cpcdebate, which was distributing serious, policy focused, debate-related information. However, with Twitter's CPC Debate @cpcdebate account only acquiring 684 followers, many of these Harper Conservative posts likely went unseen by followers of the Harper and Conservative Party Twitter accounts.

3.2.2. Reinforcing Leaders' Debate-Related Talking Points and Zingers

In addition to using *prosopopoeia* to include the debate in social media messaging and asking followers to share their political posts, also significant during the 2015 Debate and on social media was the use of *ethopoeia* to depict the character of opponents through talking points and one-line zingers. *Ethopoeic* zingers are typically striking or amusing remarks that cause interest, surprise, or shock directed to, or about, another candidate. Stanley Fish argues that "politicians ... [are] armed with talking points, and when a host asks a question, out pops a talking point whether or not it has anything to do with the question" (Fish 2016, 53). Alex Marland states that "political elites can influence public opinion if they can control how they and their opponents are projected" (2016, 168). Scripted talking points and one-line zingers are typical in political debate, but the concern with the advent of social media is that political leaders' debates are becoming increasingly *only* talking points and zingers reinforced by, and on,

social media. Christ'l De Landtsheer, Philippe De Vries, and Dieter Vertessen assert that “one cannot deny that political content has lost substantive territory to the advantage of the communication style and form” in what they call the “toddlerization” of politics (2008, 229). De Landtsheer, De Vries, and Vertessen suggest that “persuasive rhetoric, the manipulation of appearance, perceived personality, and other aspects of political impression management could be considered imminent threats to democracy” and that the tools enabling politicians to gain votes based on capacities and characteristics “are not necessarily present in the true personality of the candidate” (2008, 229). With the affordances of social media, talking points and zingers typical in leader debates are no longer “one and done” statements scattered throughout the debate to appeal to the viewing masses through television, but rather are carefully crafted statements spoken and reinforced during the debate, and then parsed and circulated, widely and repeatedly, through the function of shares and retweets on social media. Deen Freelon and David Karpf have found that “candidate gaffes and zingers routinely spark such spectacles [...] expanded through the viewertariat’s participation” (2015, 391). Jeff Hemsley identified that during the 2014 U.S. gubernatorial election of state governors, “while candidates tend to post tweets that advocate for themselves the most, the public is more likely to retweet attack messages and messages labeled as call-to-action,” which are also tweets that “tend to reach the broadest audience” (2019, 280). During the debate, key talking points and zingers were sometimes displaced, sometimes spoken at contextually inappropriate times, but spoken, nonetheless. What is highlighted on social media platforms for the viewing public may be events taken out of context, or sensational images or statements that may not accurately describe the tenor of the debate. Public relations is the “persuasion business” (Wynne 2016) and Marland asserts that “PR staff seek to manipulate so-called earned or free media” and “promote a brand as part of their promotional mix” by ensuring

that “media messages are consistent with the operation’s broad strategic positioning, such as through party discipline” where “all brand ambassadors are prepared for situations with scripted comments vetted by the party centre” (Marland 2016, 166–67). This ensures that the party’s brand message conforms and is consistent with the party’s ideology and can be edited and included in social media publication for circulation—which it is.

Twitter’s second most retweeted debate-related message is an example of a reinforced *ethopoeic* talking point. Posted on Trudeau’s Twitter account on 6 August 2015 with the tagline, “Stephen Harper broke his promise never to appoint a single Senator. 59 times. #elxn42” received 258 likes, 356 retweets, and 22 comments (2015j). The silent, *logos* filled video reads, “In 2006, Stephen Harper promised not to appoint a single Senator. Then, he broke that promise 59 times... and we know how that turned out” (Trudeau 2015j) (Figure 0-37). The background shows images of Senator Patrick Brazeau, Senator Pamela Wallin, and an image of Harper shaking hands with Senator Mike Duffy. These were three Harper-appointed senators accused of filing improper expense claims for housing and travel allowances (Foot 2019). Trudeau’s social media video post with images of senators in ill repute was visibly created before the debate, as it was posted on Twitter at 21:12, whereas the statement by Trudeau during the debate related to the Senate was said at 21:14. Trudeau stated:

Mr. Harper has just said it, his plan on Senate reform is to tell the provinces stop me before I appoint again. The fact is, he made a solemn promise never to appoint a senator and he broke that promise on his very first day as Prime Minister by appointing Michael Fortier to ... to the Senate. And then he broke that promise 58 more times. (Trudeau 2015q)

Trudeau’s pre-planned statement during the debate was worded with a different number compared to his social media post, as a problem arose a moment before Trudeau spoke—Mulcair had raised the issue of Harper breaking his promise to never appoint senators. Mulcair said:

Mr. Harper promised solemnly to Canadians that he would never name an appointed senator. He's gone on to break a record and name 59 of them, and the list of Conservative senators under RCMP investigation continues to grow. (Mulcair 2015f)

Mulcair's statement most likely required Trudeau to pivot during the debate, saying instead "and then he broke that promise 58 more times," rather than "59 times" to not appear as to be mimicking Mulcair. But knowing that the social media post was prepared and being posted, Trudeau restated "You broke your promise 59 times" (Trudeau 2015q) a few minutes later in the debate at 21:18, as crosstalk ensued, ensuring that the correct social media phrase was spoken, even if no one could hear it. What is noteworthy about the relationship between social media and the debate in this instance, is that based on the timing of Trudeau's Twitter video post release, and the timing of Trudeau's debate statement about the Senate, it is evident that the published social media video post influenced Trudeau's words during the debate. Based on centralized control of communications, it is likely that Trudeau was instructed by Liberal Party campaign advisors to communicate during the debate the statement that Harper "broke that promise 59 times" to ensure that the wording was consistent with the pre-recorded silent video post message that was being published on Twitter, to fit the with the temporality of social media. But during the debate the *microkairos* was off when Trudeau spoke it, as Mulcair had already stated it, and when Trudeau eventually did speak the words, May had moved the conversation onto to a constitutional concern related to Harper leaving 22 Senate seats vacant. Trudeau, using social media to visually highlight the three unethical senators that were under investigation, and connecting Harper to the senators in the debate through his appointment of them, is *ethopoeia*. However, it is also *prosopopoeia*, as Trudeau was adopting the voice of the Liberal Party in the debate to ensure the "broke that promise 59 times" statement surfaced. On the other hand, Harper in the debate distanced himself from the scandalous senators suggesting that his enforcement of

rules was the reason why the corrupt senators were being investigated in the first place. Harper stated, assuming his ‘leader’ mask (though strangely aligning that with a first-person plural pronoun):

Well, first of all, I certainly did not name all of the senators that are in trouble. You know, the Senate has been an institution that has these kinds of problems for 150 years. I’d say for the first time, we actually have a Senate that now has clear rules and is enforcing those rules. What I will say is this, Paul. My role is not to apologize for the bad actions of others. When bad actions arise, the role of a leader is to take responsibility and hold people accountable, and that’s exactly what we’re doing. (Harper 2015c)

The topic of the Senate was given a significant portion of attention in the second part of the segment on democracy, which makes a social media post related to the Senate fitting. However, what is focused on in Trudeau’s Twitter video post in *ethopoetically* constructing Harper’s character, is a logical fallacy, *ignoratio elenchi*, ignoring the issue, as the content of the tweet “fails to prove the conclusion it is supposed to prove, and instead, is directed towards proving some irrelevant conclusion” (Walton 2008, 79). After Mulcair and Trudeau both raised the subject of Harper naming 59 senators during his ten years as Prime Minister, May refocused attention to the substance of the talking point, alerting Harper, the other leaders, and viewers, that a Prime Minister refusing to appoint senators is improper, declaring, “Whoever gave you the advice that simply announcing you wouldn’t appoint senators is constitutional needs to go back to law school. What you’re doing is unconstitutional” (May 2015d). Harper’s policy to not name senators, leaving 22 Senate seats vacant, is the *real* legislative issue that should be focused on. Senators are appointed by the Governor General on the advice of the Prime Minister. By Harper refusing to appoint 22 senators, leaving the seats vacant, the provinces were deprived their rightful representation, and Parliament was not in its proper form (Wherry 2015). Trudeau’s social media video post made it appear that Harper appointing senators was improper and

focused on Harper's "59 broken promises" of not appointing senators, where the focus should have been directed on the issue of Harper leaving 22 Senate seats vacant. As Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca suggest, in "selecting certain elements and presenting them to the audience, their importance and pertinency to the discussion are implied" (1969, 116). Trudeau's video post aimed to associate Harper with the Senate scandal, and of Harper breaking a promise not to appoint senators, whereas attention should have been focused on educating the viewing public on the proper form of government. Another consideration of note is Trudeau's ethotic capital when the politically charged video is shared by others through a retweet. If a user "trusts" the outlet they are following (e.g., Liberal Party leader Justin Trudeau's Twitter account), they are less likely to double check the validity of the story. And when the follower then shares this content with their followers, the receiver of the message is "not seeing information from a fake news or hyper-partisan site" but from someone they also "trust," and are therefore much less likely to critically analyze the source information (Ball 2017, 158). It is true that Harper appointed 59 Senators. As Prime Minister that is his responsibility, to fulfil the requirements of Parliament. Leaving 22 Senate seats unfilled, however, is where questions to Harper should have been directed, as May declared. Harper was caught in a no-man's land of his own making in terms of *prosopopoeic* roles: hypocritical as a politician for failing to follow out his campaign promise of not filling Senate seats and irresponsible as the prime minister for failing to fill all of the Senate seats.

Another example of a reinforced talking point which was posted on Trudeau's Twitter account on 6 August 2015 had the tagline "Trudeau to Harper" and Trudeau's debate statement addressed to Harper stating, "'Canadians know that you've let them down because you've chosen to give benefits and tax breaks to the wealthiest Canadians.'" – Justin Trudeau" (Trudeau

2015k) (Figure 0-39). This was Twitter’s fifth most retweeted debate-related post receiving 362 likes, 330 retweets, and 26 comments. On Facebook, this post also was highly circulated ranking as the fourth most shared debate-related post with 9,432 likes, 1,662 shares, and 984 comments (Trudeau 2015l) (Figure 0-11). In this statement, Trudeau *prosopopoeically* positions himself as an advocate for middle-class Canadians while *ethopoeically* depicting Harper as an advocate for the rich. The image associated with the tweet used a wide image of the four debaters but used a red isosceles trapezoid shape to cover Mulcair and May from the image. The visual removal of Mulcair and May in the post narrowed the scope of the image to just two candidates: Trudeau and Harper. What is not evident from this single Twitter post was that Trudeau’s “wealthiest” and “tax-break” statement was a reinforced talking point stated five times during the debate, which was later posted on social media. In the debate, we heard Trudeau say (repeating himself):

1. “Canadians know that you’ve let them down because you’ve chosen to give benefits and tax breaks to the wealthiest Canadians.’ – Justin Trudeau” (Trudeau 2015k) (Figure 0-39)
2. “He [Harper] has consistently chosen to give opportunities and tax breaks and benefits to the wealthiest Canadians in the hopes that would create growth [...]” (Trudeau 2015q).
3. “We need solutions for that, and it’s not to continue to give benefits to the wealthiest, it’s to actually bring a fresh approach [...]” (Trudeau 2015q).
4. “And that’s why I can’t quite understand why Mr. Mulcair has ruled out doing what we’re doing, which is asking the wealthiest one percent in this country to pay more tax, so we can give a big tax break to the middle class” (Trudeau 2015q).
5. “Mr. Harper has continued to give tax breaks to the wealthiest, and that’s not actually stimulated or helped our economy in anything” (Trudeau 2015q).

Trudeau performed and repeated the same words throughout the debate. Trudeau’s reinforcement of the same concept repeatedly promoted the Liberal Party’s messaging which could then be used to promote their ideology on social media. The idea was simple. He used plain language, and he repeated the message to create consistency. Frank Luntz suggests that “finding a good message and then sticking with it takes extraordinary discipline, but it pays off tenfold in the

end” (2007, 13). He continues that “many in your audience will be hearing it for the first time. The overwhelming majority of your customers or constituents aren’t paying as much attention as you are” and suggests that when it is spoken, “it needs to sound as fresh and vital to your audiences as it did to your own ears the first time you said it” (Luntz 2007, 13). Repetition of the same information on social media may be ideal to reinforce the message, but repetition of the same talking point during a live leaders’ debate is also risky, in that it can appear disingenuous, especially if it conveniently fits into 2015 Twitter’s 140-character count.

3.3. The Moderate Influence of Instagram on Canada’s 2015 *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate

As a relatively novel social media platform in 2015 compared to Facebook or Twitter, Instagram was not as widely used by political parties or political leaders during the leaders’ debate. The Instagram accounts of Trudeau and Mulcair were the only two that posted debate-related content. In 2015, Stephen Harper, Canada’s NDP, and the Green Party of Canada did have Instagram accounts, but debate-related posts were not shared. The Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, and Elizabeth May did not have Instagram accounts. What is notable for Trudeau, who did use Instagram during the debate, is that his Instagram account at the time of the debate had 33,815 followers (with Mulcair having 7,633 followers), and Trudeau’s Instagram posts received relatively strong engagement in likes, showcasing the strength of Instagram’s more visual platform.

3.3.1. Providing Followers with a Behind-The-Scenes Intimate View of Leaders

Both of Trudeau’s debate-related Instagram posts incorporated *prosopopoeia* and visual rhetoric in providing social media followers with a visually appealing behind-the-scenes intimate view of himself. Instagram’s most liked debate related image post was posted on 6 August 2015

on Trudeau's account and received 3,706 likes and 276 comments. It stated, "Called my top advisor. Thank you Sophie. // Un appel avec ma conseillère la plus importante. Merci Sophie. #macdebate #cdnpoli #polcan #elxn42" (Trudeau 2015b) (Figure 0-62). The image shows Trudeau on a mobile phone walking across a Toronto street at night, with a few bystanders and security personnel nearby. Contrary to rational choice theory that suggests people make political decisions based on a cost-benefit analysis that serves their own self-interests (Parsons 2005, 43; Bronstein 2013, 185), social media has altered the nature of politics, drawing on pop culture, where people engage in politics based on self-identification and affective alliances rather than dissent and self-interest (Bronstein 2013, 185). There is nothing overtly political, economic, or policy related in Trudeau's debate-related image on Instagram. Instead, the message associated with the image of Trudeau on a phone call to Sophie post-debate generates *pathos*, exhibiting a *partner-prosopopoeia*, in presenting likeable partner-relationship qualities to his audience. *Ekphrasis* making the audience "'see' the subject in their mind's eye" (Webb 2016, 2) through a rhetor's descriptive words, can be literally realized with the audience's physical eyes, in the age of social media, but Trudeau's words sketch a few details to stand for the whole event, and imposes a frame on the image, cementing an idea of Trudeau in a loving and collaborative partnership with his wife, Sophie. Ruth Webb suggests, "*ekphrasis* aims to induce the audience to share the speaker's state of mind by placing them imaginatively in his position" (Webb 2016, 149). Wayne Booth asserts, "we infer intention to create value" (Booth 2001, 1510). In this post, the audience is led to imagine, using *phantasia*, the context and events that are directly evoked through the *ekphrasis*. Social media also allows us to gauge the *pathotic* effects of the literal *ekphrasis*: comments on this post included "GOALS," and "AHHHH THEY'RE SO CUTE" (Trudeau 2015b). Burke's parlour analogy is present again, where without knowing the entire

context, the Instagram audience participates anyway. The term “GOALS” from one of the participants is in reference to relationship goals, with a desire to emulate Trudeau’s loving partnership with Sophie, which brings us back to *ethos*. The poster wants to assume some portion of the Trudeaus’ bonded *ethos*. As Burke suggests, “emulation means the ethical desire to pattern one’s life after ‘noble’ models” (Burke 1969, 130), with “imitation as the most generalized term” (Burke 1969, 131), in reference to consubstantiality, since “men can either crudely imitate one another’s actions as revealed on the surface, or subtly imitate the underlying principles of such action” (Burke 1969, 131).

What is interesting about this image is that it was also the first image posted on social media by Trudeau post-debate through Facebook and Twitter. The Liberal Party and Trudeau navigated the rhetorical figures *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* effectively when identifying the real author on Trudeau’s social media platform posts. Trudeau may or may not author his social media posts in 2019, but in 2015 Trudeau makes it appear as if he is in direct control of his personal social media accounts. “The difference between memoir and fiction ... has stirred public reflection on authenticity, credibility, truth, and trust—all issues related to genre expectations” (Miller 2018, 178). The genre expectation on social media platforms is that the person posting content is authentically the person claiming to hold the account. Trudeau conformed to the expected genre of social media, as during the 2015 Debate Trudeau communicated that he was relinquishing control of his accounts. On Facebook on 6 August 2015, Trudeau states, “Okay Facebook, I’m turning over my account to the Liberal Party’s campaign team for the #macdebate. Watch this page all night. #elxn42” (Trudeau 2015f) (Figure 0-12) and did the same on Twitter on 6 August 2015, “Okay Twitterverse, I’m turning over my account to @liberal_party’s campaign team for the #macdebate. Watch this account all night. #elxn42”

(Trudeau 2015g) (Figure 0-48). The Facebook post received 3,023 likes, 101 shares, and 388 comments. The tweet got 182 likes, 102 retweets, and 34 comments. When he returned online following the debate, his strategy on both platforms again echoed each other. The caption on Facebook reads, “De retour sur Facebook après le débat... et après un appel avec ma conseillère la plus importante. Merci Sophie. // Back on Facebook post-debate after calling my top advisor. Thanks Sophie” (Trudeau 2015c) (Figure 0-13), receiving 3,500 likes, 144 shares, and 301 comments. On Twitter it was “Back on Twitter post-debate after calling my top advisor. Thanks Sophie” (Trudeau 2015a) (Figure 0-49), for 576 likes, 181 retweets, and 61 comments. All Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram social media platforms used the same image of Trudeau with a mobile phone to his ear. This is *prosopopoeia*. Trudeau is publicly performing a role for social media as a loving husband who includes his wife in his political decisions by calling Sophie his “top advisor” and visually appearing in the image to be speaking to her on the phone while walking out the of the debate. Including the political hashtags to his message #macdebat, #cdnpoli, #polcan, and #elxn42 in his Instagram post displays that his declaration of Sophie as his “top advisor” is a public display, meant to be included in all debate and election-related newsfeeds.

But this was not the only instance that Trudeau used *prosopopoeia* in visually providing followers with an intimate view of himself related to the debate. The second most liked debate-related Instagram post received 2,033 likes and 161 comments and was posted on 6 August 2015. It stated, “Morning boxing session in Toronto. // Entraînement de boxe à Toronto ce matin. #elxn42” (Trudeau 2015e) (Figure 0-63). The image was more artistic in style, with the focus of the camera on a clear reflected image of Trudeau in a mirror, sparring in a boxing ring with a trainer (Trudeau 2015e). According to Roland Barthes (1973) the pose is an “important

realm of connotation in images that are able to signify broader values, ideas and identities” (Machin and Mayr 2012, 74). The still image of Trudeau, a youthful political leader, in a boxing stance in a boxing ring, is used to connote a particular set of attitudes, values, and actions for the Liberal Party. Simple decisions about how a person poses when photographed suggests if they are approachable, independent, or even moody (Machin and Mayr 2012, 74). When viewing the pose of Trudeau in a boxing ring, we observe that he is engaged in an activity, which brings “a sense of fun and energy” (Machin and Mayr 2012, 74) in contrast to Harper, Mulcair, and May, who tend to show rigidity, tension, and seriousness in their political communication. In this image, Trudeau is not looking at the camera. There is no demand on the viewer to respond while the image is available to be scrutinized and considered (Machin and Mayr 2012, 71). It also produces a visual metaphor of a fight between adversaries, boxing in a ring being like verbal sparring during a debate. But what it also displays is *prosopopoeia*. Trudeau is adopting the role of a boxer for Instagram to visually connect him with being a ‘fighter’ in the debate, which was not lost on political pundits, who then commented on the fighting analogy in their post-debate comments. Trudeau incorporated the same boxing theme during Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate.

3.3.2. Curating Information and Visuals in Favour of a Particular Leader

The third most liked debate-related image on Instagram displayed a crowd of smiling and cheering NDP supporters outside the debate studio behind a yellow barrier, standing in two levels, with some people elevated on a construction barrier and some standing on street level. NDP supporters held up orange-branded signs hosting various candidate names while waving and visually cheering. The image shows the backs of Mulcair and his spouse, Catherine Pinhas, in front of the crowd, holding hands, with Mulcair giving the crowd a thumbs-up sign, while his

partner appears to be giving the crowd an air high-five. Counting the NDP supporters in the image, approximately ten supporters are visible, along with approximately ten orange NDP signs, although how the image is cropped and depicted on social media on 6 August 2015, it appears to be many more. Mulcair's image post received 232 likes and 7 comments. The post states, "Canadians are #Ready4Change. We are too. #NDP #macdebate #elxn42" (Mulcair 2015c) (Figure 0-64). Visually, Mulcair has *ethopoeically* framed the NDP sign-waving supporters as representing Canadians, with Mulcair *prosopopoeically* speaking *for* Canadians when he says that "Canadians are "Ready4Change" (Mulcair 2015c), using the NDP election hashtags and representing the image of the NDP supporters outside of the debate as evidence for this statement. This is an example of *prosopopoeic ethopoeia*. However, if one looks at a wide-angle image of the crowd outside of the debate studio (M. Kennedy 2015) (Figure 0-65), one can see that there are also a number of debate supporters holding up blue Conservative signs, and red Liberal signs, with the orange NDP signs not as visually prominent as the cropped Instagram image Mulcair suggests. Mulcair is curating the information and visuals on Instagram with confirmation bias, in favour of how he would like the event to be memorialized. Although Mulcair suggests that Canadians are "#Ready4Change," using the NDP hashtag, implying change away from the Harper Conservatives toward Mulcair's NDP, this statement is a fallacy of hasty generalization. Douglas Walton suggests that "often a distinctive sign that an argument is fallacious is that it jumps to a conclusion prematurely by not taking contrary evidence into account, or perhaps even not being open to the possibility of contrary evidence" (2008, 162). The image and comment presented on Instagram by Mulcair is speaking for Canadians in wanting change. But Mulcair does not substantiate his claim with accurate evidence. Rather, he uses a

zealous group of a few individuals in favour of the NDP to curate an image on social media to visually represent Canadians in general and his #Ready4Change message.

3.4. Chapter Summation

It is evident that social media is moderately affecting Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate. We see the incorporation of *prosopopoeia* in several instances, such as in the leaders' speaking the words of their respected parties, and in leaders' closing statements edited and recirculated for voters to share and like. We see voters *prosopopoeically* sharing parties' and leaders' posts on their own social media wall for all their friends to see and comment on after being asked by parties to "share." We see *prosopopoeia* when Trudeau is performing for/as the Liberal Party, adopting the voice of his party, to ensure that the party's pre-planned social media posts are spoken, even if his statement is spoken during crosstalk or at an inopportune time during the debate. And we see *prosopopoeia* when Trudeau publicly preforms a role of a loving husband, calling his "top advisor" wife after the debate, and visually sharing this moment on all three of his social media platforms, including the political hashtags #macdebate, #cdnpoli, #polcan, and #elxn42 on Instagram, to include this message with all debate and election-related newsfeeds on the platform.

We see *ethopoeia* as well, with parties and leaders depicting others in a variety of instances during the 2015 Debate. We see *ethopoeia* when the Conservative Party curates and restructures the performance of Harper, so that on social media, his more negative closing sentences are eliminated, with his more positive content remaining. We see *ethopoeia* when the Conservative Party declares Harper's debate "win" through social media, constructing Harper's *ethos*, promotionally. We also see *ethopoeia* when an opponents' *ethos* is characterized through talking points and one-line zingers, or when visuals are curated to favour a particular leader on

social media, misrepresenting the truth. All these instances are examples of how social media, *prosopopoeia*, and *ethopoeia* are refracting *ethos*, affecting political debate.

4. 2019 Analysis: Social Media, *Prosopopoeia*, and *Ethopoeia* in Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

“Mr. Bernier – your role on this stage tonight seems to be –
to say publicly what Mr. Scheer thinks privately.”
- Liberal Leader and Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau,
Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

In Chapter Three, the effect social media had on Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate was examined, with a descriptive synopsis of both debates presented in Chapter Two. With four years in between Canada's 2015 and 2019 Leaders' Debates, this chapter studies the marked increased effect of social media on Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate by examining the top shared debate-related Facebook and Twitter posts and top liked Instagram posts. This chapter investigates how social media fosters political leaders and parties to incorporate *prosopopoeic* masks, and/or *ethopoeically* caricature or depict others. Examining the 2019 Debate, six main debate-related themes were identified and explored within political parties' and leaders' social media accounts.

The two themes discussed in connection to Facebook are:

1. Constructing an ideological and rhetorical divide between parties and leaders
2. Curating favourable leader posts by 'cherry-picking' traditional media

The two themes discussed in connection to Twitter are:

3. Providing a debate 'do-over' for leaders
4. Affording parties and leaders with a platform to debate contentious issues

The two themes discussed in connection to Instagram are:

5. Associating leaders' partners and families with the debate
6. Incorporating emotional appeals in leaders' visual performances

In each case, the first of these themes (1, 3, 5) is predominantly associated with *prosopopoeia*, the second (2, 4, 6) with *ethopoeia*. Within these six themes, one can see how *ethos* is refracted in social media and how the rhetorical figures of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* infiltrate the parties' and leaders' social media accounts.

4.1. The Vigorous Influence of Facebook on Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

Facebook was in full swing in 2019, with multiple debate-related images and videos posted by political parties and leaders, and followers responding in kind with likes, shares, and comments. Even if political parties, leaders, and followers were disenchanted with social media and its effect on leaders' debates, Facebook was a part of the political landscape. Since Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate, there was exponential growth of followers for many leaders, with Liberal Leader and Prime Minister Trudeau reaching over 6.89 million followers worldwide by the English-Language Leaders' Debate, which is a remarkable 1,560 per cent growth in "eyeballs" (Lanham 2006, 7–8; Losh 2009, 69) on Trudeau's Facebook account (Table 1). Social media took precedence in debates, and parties and leaders adjusted accordingly. This section discusses two areas that contributed to the most shared debate-related social traction on Facebook's platform for parties and leaders, which was the construction of an ideological and rhetorical divide between parties and leaders, and the curation of favourable leader posts by 'cherry-picking' traditional media.

4.1.1. Constructing an Ideological and Rhetorical Divide Between Parties and Leaders

In Burke's essay on Hitler's *Mien Kampf*, he writes, "men who can unite on nothing else can unite on the basis of a foe shared by all" (1941b, 165). There is a dialectical relationship

between identification and division. Individuals create a sense of group unity by dividing themselves from others and justify power over others through the process of othering. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg explained that “internally fragmented subjectivities assume a coherence [...] by being juxtaposed to multiple others—especially negative (feared or hated) others. In short, ‘we’ gain our sense of self through opposition; we ‘know’ who we are because ‘we’re not like them’” (1992, 846). This idea is particularly evident during political debates, as parties and politicians compete for votes; “a class of people cannot produce themselves as a ruling class without setting themselves off against certain others” (Armstrong and Tennenhouse 1989, 24).

One example of such a divide in Canada is the discord between English Canada and French Canada. This friction is so substantial in Canada that the Bloc Québécois (BQ) is a federal political party whose main priority is to champion the values and ideals of *only* Québeckers, whose primary language is French. The fifth most shared Facebook post overall and the top post by the BQ was an image of Blanchet stating, “Je souhaite juste que les francophones du Canada et les Acadiens aient le même traitement que les anglophones du Québec,” which translates to, “I want French-speaking people in English Canada and Acadians to get the same treatment as English-speaking people in Québec” (2019a). The tagline stated, “À la veille du débat en anglais, tenons-nous debout pour le Québec, pour les Franco-Canadiens et pour les Acadiens,” which translates to, “On the eve of the English debate, let’s stand up for Québec, for French-speaking Canadians and for Acadians” (Bloc Québécois 2019a) (Figure 0-92). This post from 6 October 2019 received 2,772 reactions, 2,254 likes, 1,431 shares, and 260 comments. This *prosopopoeic* statement is significant before the 2019 Debate as Facebook followers could interpret it in two distinct ways. A more positive way to interpret the post is that the BQ is promoting equality for French speakers in Canada, validating their inclusion as a federal party

entitled to participate in the English-Language Leaders' Debate, even though their party does not have a national interest. A more cynical way to regard this post before Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate is that the BQ is reviving the historically contentious and culturally divisive atmosphere between English-Canada and French-Canada. Québec's sovereigntist agenda has cooled since the marginally close 1995 independence referendum, where Québec was approximately half a percentage point away from voting to become independent from Canada. Blanchet's Facebook statement, however, reignites this unrest, signifying that French-speaking Canadians are marginalized in Canada and should resist oneness with English-speaking Canadians by standing up for Québec. In the debate, Trudeau addressed Blanchet in an *ethopoeic apostrophe*: "Unfortunately—you, Mr. Blanchet, as a sovereigntist—are always looking for opportunities to create fights between Québec and the rest of Canada to advance your separatist—agenda. Unfortunately, that's not something—that Canadians want" (2019k). Interrupted by Blanchet, and as crosstalk ensued, Trudeau continued, drawing on the stasis of definition to project an opposing *ethos* to Blanchet's: "I think by definition, a Québecker can do anything a Canadian can do because a Québecker is a Canadian—and will remain a Canadian under my watch, Mr. Blanchet" (2019k). This message by Trudeau during the debate was clearly pre-planned. The structured repetitions suggest it was being held up Trudeau's sleeve. Also, its location within the debate after Blanchet's discussion of federal equalization payments did not fit the *microkairos* of the moment, but it did provide Trudeau an opportunity to directly address Blanchet. Trudeau's response to Blanchet was a top shared Liberal Party post on Twitter (Liberal Party 2019a) (Figure 0-113). Trudeau in his debate message used a collection of rhetorical figures, coordinated by *ethopoeia*, to depict Blanchet in terms of a separatist agenda, which Blanchet had not explicitly stated during the debate, but which he alluded to on Facebook and is

an ideology that the BQ fundamentally represents. It is unknown if the BQ's social media post stating, "let's stand up for Québec" (Bloc Québécois 2019a) (Figure 0-92) the day before Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate provoked Trudeau to respond to Blanchet during the debate in kind stating, "a Québecker can do anything a Canadian can do because a Québecker is a Canadian" (Trudeau 2019k) (Figure 0-113), but it might have, which would be an example of the influence of social media on shaping the content of the debate, but also in generating greater ideological divisions within political parties in the rhetorical construction of an enemy.

In addition to social media fostering divisions between English and French Canada, an explicit sign of separation between political parties is often enforced by totemic colours; red associated with the Liberal Party, blue with the Conservative Party, orange with the NDP, green with the Green Party, navy with the BQ, and purple with the People's Party. The Liberal Party took this colour differentiation to a new level when, localizing it to a binary division in targeting their primary 'enemy,' the Liberal Party developed a red vs. blue word cloud silhouette of Trudeau and Scheer and posted it on Facebook. Within each leaders' silhouette, language used during the 2019 Debate by Trudeau and Scheer is contrasted in the word clouds. On Trudeau's side, viewers can see words in large print such as "women's rights," "climate change," "billion trees," "middle class," and "housing" (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2019b) (Figure 0-76). On Scheer's side, the words in large print include "phony," "abuse," "threatening," "mask," "corruption," "failing," "lies," and "doing nothing" (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2019b) (Figure 0-76). The tagline states, "Who has the positive plan? Their words from the debate last night speak for themselves" (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2019b) (Figure 0-76). This was the third most shared post by the Liberal

Party with 1,371 reactions, 1,055 likes, 286 shares and 722 comments. What is significant about this post is how the Liberals position colour, language, and silhouettes of the leaders to display an ideological difference between the two candidates and create an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ division. Highlighting words in a word cloud has the illusion of a scientific corpus of data to support the Liberals’ argument of Trudeau as having a positive plan versus Scheer as having a negative one based on word frequency during the debate. However, the scientific basis is an illusion. The word clouds for each leader are not accurate. The words selected, and size depicted, do not represent the genuine frequency of words used by each leader during the debate. What is also misleading in the word cloud image is that the negative language used by Scheer was spoken by Scheer during the debate to *ethopoically* describe the leadership qualities of Trudeau. Instead, the image portrayed by the Liberal Party’s social media post makes it appear that the negative language used by Scheer depicts Scheer’s *ethos*, as the words are located within Scheer’s blue silhouette, embodying him, in the same way that the Liberals wish viewers to connect the language used by Trudeau within his red silhouette to personify him. What the Liberals are doing is creating visual and logical divisions between the two main political parties mimicking a scientific word cloud corpus, using words spoken from the debate out of context, to emblemize the leaders. It may be accurate to state that Scheer stated these negative words during the debate, but without being situated in the context of the debate, it is a form of misinformation as the words represented in Scheer’s silhouette were directed towards characterizing Trudeau’s *ethos*, not his own, as the Liberal post visually implies. The Liberal Party’s social media post is contributing to fostering the logical fallacy of contextomy in skewing the language from the debate to influence voters on the ‘positive’ virtuous *ethos* of Trudeau versus the ‘negative’

corrupt *ethos* of Scheer by creating a visual and textual ideological divide between the two parties based on language and party colours.

Political party ideals operate on the leader, and social media mobilizes how to characterize them. As it happens, Scheer was happy to own up to the negative vocabulary of the Liberal word cloud. The second most shared post from the Conservative Party and the second most shared Facebook post overall from the debate, was a black-and-white image of Trudeau gazing downwards with a quote from Scheer on a bright yellow background stating, “‘Mr. Trudeau, you’re a phoney and you’re a fraud and you do not deserve to govern this country.’ – Andrew Scheer” (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2019b) (Figure 0-68). Scheer’s statement during the debate, repeated on Facebook through the Conservative Party’s Facebook account, is a clear *ad personam* attack and was the last sentence from Scheer’s opening remarks during the debate, which was viewed by some media outlets as one of the harshest statements Scheer made towards Trudeau that evening. The image was posted on 9 October 2019, and the Facebook message associated with the image used the Conservative “help you get ahead” messaging and indirect *prosopopoeia*—*prosopopoeic ethopoeia*—in their routine *antithesis*, speaking *for* Canadians as a whole, stating, “Canadians are tired of Justin Trudeau’s weak leadership. It’s time to elect a strong Conservative government that will help you get ahead.” The post received 6,234 reactions; 5,537 likes; 2,622 shares; and 1,225 comments (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2019b) (Figure 0-68). All debate statements addressed to opponents are *apostrophes*, meant to be *overheard* by the audience far more than they are meant to be heard by the addressees, but this example is a particularly savage use of *apostrophe*. Scheer is not so much telling Trudeau that he is a phony and a fraud, as he is posturing for debate viewers to see him saying this to Trudeau, which can then be distributed on

social media. The accusation of phoniness is not just a general ethotic attack. It is an attack on Trudeau's use of deceptive *prosopopoeia*—*ethopoeic prosopopoeia*. Leading up to Scheer's jugular quip, he barely nodded at the question he was supposed to be answering, on how he would protect Canadian interests and values on a world stage, and instead lists off the different 'masks' Trudeau wears. "I will always stand up for Canada and Canadians' interests and promote free trade and defend our interests all around the world," Scheer said. Then:

But Justin Trudeau only pretends to stand up for Canada. You know, he's very good at pretending things. He can't even remember how many times he put blackface on. Because the fact of the matter is, he's always wearing a mask. He puts on a reconciliation mask and then fires the Attorney General, the first one of Indigenous background. He puts on a feminist mask and then fires two strong female MPs for not going along with his corruption. He puts on a middle-class mask and then raises taxes on middle class Canadians. (Scheer 2019g)

At this point, he literally pivots, faces Trudeau, and delivers his *coup de grace*: "Mr. Trudeau, you are a phoney and you are a fraud, and you do not deserve to govern this country" (Scheer 2019g).

Scheer's initial sentence in response to moderator LaFlamme's question stating he would always stand up for Canadians, and so on, was appropriate for a debate, but what viewers would have expected was for Scheer to explain how he intended to stand up for Canadians, promote free trade, and defend Canadian interests. This example provides perhaps the most tangled interconnections of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* of either election, and it was the sharpest point of the not-as-advertised *ethopoeic* Conservative campaign strategy. It is an *ethopoeic* attack that depicts Trudeau as a serial abuser of *prosopopoeia*, a pathological mask-wearer, hypocritically pretending to be compassionate, inclusive, and progressive—*ethopoeic prosopopoeia*. Rather than continuing to promote himself as standing up for Canadians, Scheer changed the channel completely and went on a scripted *ethopoeic* rant about masks, proudly attacking Trudeau

directly. And Scheer had the ammunition, leading his argument by referencing the notoriously near-literal brown- and blackface ‘masks’ worn by Trudeau at various times in his past, evidence of which the Conservatives had strategically surfaced just in time for the election. Scheer then shifts to the more figurative masks Trudeau wears, accusing Trudeau of wearing a “reconciliation mask,” a “feminist mask,” and a “middle-class mask” (2019g): referring in the first case to the expelling the former Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Jody Wilson-Raybould, and former Minister of Indigenous Services, Jane Philpott, from the Liberal caucus; as both are women, that covers the second case as well; and, in the third case, evoking the government’s elimination of transit and sport tax credits as well as income-splitting for couples with young children. The form and structure of the statement by Scheer was pithy, memorable, and thoroughly crafted. It utilized *symploce*, itself a combination of *epanaphora* and *epiphora* (that is, the repetition of initial-clause and final-clause phrases) in a parison triplet, the repetition of syntactic structure, with the second clause of each parison also utilizing *epanaphora* in subordinate clauses that reveal the phoney nature of the mask in the preceding clause—all as a set up for the last sentence, which is short and impactful, and, in addition to being memorable for the debate, also expressed so it could go viral in a social media environment. The moment was staged for social media, but we should not forget that its placement was a prime example of the influence of social media. The debate was structured to reduce speaking time, disprefer structured argument to pointed quips, and increase confrontation, all of which are calculated to generate social media content, and all of which led to the decision to eliminate opening statements. This conspiracy of factors almost forced Scheer to abandon the question he was asked and turn to a *de facto* opening statement.

The power of the attack was all the stronger because Scheer evoked several active topics trending in the media in his statement. Though neither Scheer, nor likely his speech writers, would have recognized it, he linked each of these topics to accusations of *prosopopoeia*, highlighting three instances where Trudeau is wearing a mask. The accusation is of hypocrisy: Trudeau presents himself, in his mask, as acting one way, but conducts himself in another way. The mask aligns with Trudeau's Liberal Party 'positive politics' brand curated on social media, but the conduct of Trudeau belies that brand in real life, which has the effect of making Trudeau appear disingenuous. The three instances Scheer recounts during the debate of Trudeau wearing a mask are examples of this. Scheer is revealing how social media fosters *prosopopoeia*, "giving a consciously *fictional* personality to an abstraction, 'impersonating' it, where the rhetorical practice requires a separation between the literary pretense of a personality, and the actual state of affairs" (Whitman 1987, 271). Trudeau dons the masks of the abstractions of progressiveness. When Scheer calls Trudeau a "phoney" and a "fraud," Scheer is leveraging the not-as-advertised *ethopoeic* slogan against the 'positive politics' social media image that is curated for Trudeau, publicized through talking points and Trudeau's social media accounts, that distorts and curates the perception viewers have of Trudeau. The importance of Scheer's statement during the debate is that he is disrupting the illusion of *prosopopoeia*, and revealing the purportedly authentic *ethos* of Trudeau, behind the various masks, which can weaken voter confidence for Trudeau. If voters believe they are being deceived by Trudeau's 'positive politics,' or if voters deem that the authentic *ethos* of Trudeau is hidden behind the masks that Scheer enumerates, the rhetorical illusion of *prosopopoeia* fails. But equally as important as the 'positive politics' mask, deceiving Trudeau's viewers that Scheer is attempting to expose, is that the 'positive politics' mask is also acting on the individual wearing it—Trudeau—evident by silence during the debate on topics

that did not fit with the ‘positive politics’ brand the Trudeau Liberals were promoting. As Burke tells us, when we put on a role, the role puts on us (1941b, 267–68).

4.1.2. Curating Favourable Leader Posts by ‘Cherry-Picking’ Traditional Media

One of Burke’s central concepts in his dramatistic conceptions of human society is the idea of hierarchy and order. Burke observes that “social ‘order’ is not just ‘regularity.’ It also involves a distribution of authority” (1984a, 276). Burke’s concept of authority is evident in the hierarchy of media, where most citizens give authority to reputable traditional news media outlets in guiding and informing their thoughts and beliefs. In 2015, 61 per cent of Canada’s population trusted traditional news media, compared to 37 per cent trusting social media, while in 2019, trust for traditional media increased to 71 per cent of Canada’s population, compared to just 31 per cent trusting general news and information from social media (Stokes 2019). Because of Canada’s greater trust in traditional news media over social media in 2019, it is a clever tactic for parties and leaders to incorporate the accolades and reviews garnered from traditional news media to corroborate their leaders’ virtues through the social media platforms. Some of the top shared debate-related posts from political parties on social media included this outside “collection of voices” (Harris 1988, 168). Followers of political parties and leaders on social media may already identify with the party, leader, or message stated; however, added verification from traditional news media may confirm, deepen, and intensify partisanship for the viewer, as the parties’ or leaders’ posts appear more objective, truthful, and credible, rather than political or propagandistic. This outside validation associated with the parties’ or leaders’ message then propagates, as followers share the post with their own friends. The issue with political parties and leaders using traditional media to add credibility to their own social media posts is that the traditional media is often not presented in entirety or in context on the social media platform.

One of the affordances of social media is that it provides the political party and leader the ability to select which traditional media to highlight on their social media account, capturing excerpts from ones that validate their claims or that praise their leader, and editing out the ones that do not, which essentially distorts the comprehensive review of the leaders' debate by the traditional news media. This distortion of traditional news media is evident in the top-shared Conservative, Liberal, and NDP debate-related posts, which all promoted traditional news media with select articles or quotes through their social media that favourably reviewed party leaders, which circulated widely through social media, skewing the original review of the debate by traditional media.

As an example, the right-leaning *Financial Post* news outlet provided a quote in support of Scheer in their review of the debate. As the burden of proof to demonstrate leadership capability is on the opposing political parties, the Conservatives used the *Post* article on their Facebook page to provide confirmation to viewers that Scheer is “worthy” of forming government (2019c). The quote taken from the *Post* on 9 October 2019 and displayed on the Conservative Party’s Facebook page read, “As Monday’s debate unfolded, only Andrew Scheer emerged as the candidate worthy of the support of Canadians who value sensible general economic policies free of radicalism and extremism” (2019c). The statement to introduce the quote read, “Justin Trudeau has no record to run on and has no plan for Canada’s future. The debate on Monday made one thing very clear: Andrew Scheer is the best choice for Canada” (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2019c) (Figure 0-69). Both sentences in this Facebook post statement displays *ethopoeia* praising Scheer. This post was the fourth most shared debate-related post overall on Facebook and the top-shared Conservative Party post receiving 5,479 reactions, 4,958 likes, 1,529 shares, and 1,191 comments. But what

the Conservative Party's Facebook post fails to state is that the *Financial Post* article was taken from the FP Comment section, written as an opinion piece by a conservative leaning commentator, Terence Corcoran. The Conservatives are using the more respected fourth estate, the press, to impart influence on the third estate, the audience, by promoting a favourable quote about Scheer's debate performance through its Facebook page, and accrediting the source as "Financial Post, October 9" (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2019c) (Figure 0-69). By accrediting the content to the trustworthy *Post* newspaper and highlighting certain features to focus on within the article, voters believe that they are receiving accurate information on social media when, in fact, they are receiving partial information. In the article, Corcoran's following statement after the Conservative's Facebook post quote ended is:

Scheer's full Conservative platform, to be released formally on Friday, will not be without serious flaws and inconsistencies. The party's support for agriculture supply management is an untenable sop to rural constituencies. His innumerable tax expenditure gimmicks and other vote-buying schemes are as deplorable as those of Justin Trudeau's Liberals and Jagmeet Singh's New Democrats. (2019)

The link to Corcoran's article was not provided to the audience in the Conservative Party's Facebook post. And unless social media readers investigated further to locate the *Post* article themselves, they would not see the context surrounding Corcoran's statement. Social media has shifted the dynamics of how politicians communicate with voters, and subsequently how voters receive information.

The Conservatives were not unique in using the traditional media hierarchy of trust as a means to support their own partisan social media posts, evoking *ethopoeia*. Canada's NDP used mainstream media to support Singh's performance in the debate and his ability to lead with a Facebook video post of 13 favourable comments received from various media personalities and news platforms reflecting on the debate. This *ethopoeic* video post was the top shared NDP post,

with the tagline stating, “Last night, Jagmeet stood up for everyday people and showed how he’ll make life better for families – and the response has been incredible. Here’s what they’re saying about Jagmeet’s performance at last night’s debate” (Canada’s NDP / Le NPD du Canada 2019c) (Figure 0-80). The post received 12,000 views, 453 reactions, 464 likes, 242 shares, and 78 comments. The NDP selected the best remarks and statements from each pundit or article discussing the debate and compiled the text into one video for audience viewing. Rhetorically, compiling the text into one place skews the media’s reporting from the debate into specific celebration statements towards Singh’s performance without the article’s analysis and context. This again reveals Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca concept of *presence*, which “acts directly on our sensibility” (1969, 116). This curated compilation of data with only favourable statements about Singh, and omissions of unfavourable press or reviews on the other leaders’ debate performance, leads to a biased collection of distorted information, under the veil of truthfulness, as the quotes used were captured from the more trusted traditional news media.

The Liberals, too, used the mainstream news media on social media to support Trudeau by casting doubt in the minds of Canadians on the integrity of the Conservative Party. The Liberal Party’s Facebook post linked to an article produced by *CTV News* entitled, “Truth Tracker: Conservatives falsely claim Trudeau lowered taxes for millionaires” (Slaughter 2019) with *CTV News’s ethopoeic* title suggesting that the Conservatives were propagating misinformation. Accompanying the *CTV News* “Truth Tracker” article, the Liberal Party’s Facebook tagline put on a *prosopopoeia* ‘corporate’ mask of the community and used an *erotema* to reinforce their place in that community while speaking for the community—*prosopopoeic ethopoeia*—stating, “Are we really surprised that the Conservatives have been caught lying to Canadians - again?” (Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada 2019c) (Figure 0-73).

This 9 October 2019 post, suggesting that the *ethos* of the Conservative Party is questionable, was the most shared debate-related post on the Liberal Party’s Facebook account with 1,209 reactions, 896 likes, 584 shares, and 922 comments, and was the third most shared Liberal Party post on Twitter gaining 1,118 likes, 435 retweets, and 275 comments (Liberal Party 2019c) (Figure 0-115). The suspect use of *ethopoeia* from the Liberal Party is the “again” statement in their tweet, stating that the Conservatives were “lying to Canadians—again,” as this claim is unsubstantiated, but stylistically bolstered with the “not surprised” phrasing. However, the Liberal Party had good reason to call out the Conservative Party in their tweet, using traditional media to support their point. The Liberal Party’s “Truth-Tracker” post was a social media response post to a Conservative Party tweet, which used credible information from the news media to invent a falsehood about Trudeau. The Conservatives tweeted on 7 October 2019, “It’s already been confirmed by the media that Justin Trudeau lowered taxes for millionaires. You can’t trust anything Trudeau says. ... #NotAsAdvertised #cdnpoli #elxn43 #Leadersdebate2019” (Conservative Party 2019b). The post received 517 likes, 279 retweets, and 46 comments. In this message, the Conservative Party used *prosopopoeia*, claiming to ‘speak as’ the credible legacy *Global News* media outlet, while saying something inverse to what *Global News* said in their news article. The Statistics Canada report, in which the news article is based, states that “the overall effective tax rate for Canada’s top 1% of tax filers edged down from 31.3% in 2016 to 31.0% in 2017” (Government of Canada - Statistics Canada 2019). The Conservative’s claim in their Twitter post that Justin Trudeau lowered the tax rate is false. The tax reduction for the top 1% was not tied to the Trudeau Liberals, but tied instead to “lower provincial effective tax rates for the top 1%” of tax filers (Government of Canada - Statistics Canada 2019). The Trudeau Liberals increased “the effective federal income tax rate for Canada’s top 1% of tax filers ...

from 18.4% in 2015 to 18.8% in 2016, and [it] remained at that level in 2017” (Government of Canada - Statistics Canada 2019). There was indeed a tax reduction for the top 1% of Canadian earners (Blatchford 2019), but the Conservatives presented misinformation in their tweet suggesting it was Trudeau who was responsible for this tax reduction. The Conservative Party used *prosopopoeia* by speaking as *Global News*, incorporating its voice and *ethos* in their tweet, to project *ethopoeia*—*Global News* speaking about Trudeau in a false way—*prosopopoeic ethopoeia*. This is a compact case of how rhetorical figures work in layers. The Conservative Party falsely claimed that Trudeau lowered taxes for the top 1% of tax filers, and falsely claimed that this was confirmed by *Global News*, in linking their tweet to the *Global* article. As both premises are false, it is invalid for the Conservative Party to use these premises to conclude that Trudeau can’t be trusted. Therefore, the Liberal Party responded through social media with a tweet calling out the Conservative Party on their false claim with a link to the *CTV News* “Truth Tracker” article on the topic. But what this example shows is how condensed social media statements, appropriated from traditional media without appropriate context and detail, utilizes *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* and can cast doubt into the minds of voters. Omissions, half-truths, and misinformation are all factors to consider when social media uses traditional media to inform and influence a voter.

The significance of using traditional news media coverage to support the political leaders’ and parties’ social media posts, is that it aids in adding *logos* and *ethos* for the claims being made by the parties and leaders for their viewing and sharing social media audiences. As Canadian mainstream news media is trusted to be providing an objective understanding of the debate, it provides vetted validation on the *ethos* of the leader. But as the political parties and political leaders ‘cherry-pick’ traditional news stories and comments about the election that best

reflects their own agenda, it is curated content with the illusion of vetted truth, because the news item is selected with a favourable slant towards the party or leader for the audience to see.

4.2. The Vigorous Influence of Twitter on Canada's 2019 English-Language

Leaders' Debate

From 2015, followers for parties' and leaders' accounts on Twitter grew, but not at the same scale or speed as other platforms such as Facebook or Instagram. Liberal Leader and Prime Minister Trudeau saw the most growth in followers from 2015, reaching just over 4.61 million Twitter followers—a 453 per cent gain (Table 2). Compared to Conservative Leader and Prime Minister Harper, Scheer's following was 78 per cent lower, with just 198,289 followers by the English-Language Leaders' Debate. Singh, on the other hand, saw a 31 per cent increase in followers compared to his predecessor Mulcair, obtaining 250,398 followers, while May increased her following 65 per cent to 332,358 followers (Table 2). The political parties' accounts also increased their followings (Table 2). The Conservative Party had learned from their 2015 *Macleans*'s Leaders' Debate snafu, and now utilized the Conservative Party's and Andrew Scheer's Twitter accounts effectively to promote debate-related information, rather than attempting to create a dedicated Twitter CPC Debate account, as they had in 2015.

4.2.1. Providing a Debate 'Do-Over' for Leaders

One of the most powerful ways to gain interest and produce social traction for leaders is to bring their perspectives into the social realm by providing the debate audience with a claim of value statement. A claim of value statement resides in the realm of evaluation, and is based on a standard, such as good or bad, right or wrong, moral or immoral. It can sometimes be difficult to make a distinction between a claim of fact and a claim of value, as facts and values often intersect. Echoing a major theme in rhetorical stylistics, from Isocrates through Bakhtin and

Burke, Richard Lanham noted that “language is intrinsically value-laden ... Every ‘fact’ comes with values attached” (1993, 171).

Rhetoricians have also long known that the time and the place of a statement affect the value it exhibits. Knowing the importance of an overt value claim, Singh slowly spoke over Scheer and Trudeau who were debating each other on women’s rights, stating “a man has no place in a discussion of a woman’s right to choose” (Singh 2019i). Singh’s message went unheard initially. So, Singh said it again, using the term “position” instead of “place,” with the in-studio audience laughing and clapping in response to his comment. Even Trudeau and Scheer had smirks on their faces when Singh restated his remark. This instance by Singh is an interesting case of ‘representative’ *prosopopoeia* (Kampher 2019, 70), when the rhetor takes on the voice of type—a voter, a citizen, a soldier, a scientist, and so on—to speak not as an individual but as a representative of a class; in this case, men. But Singh speaks as a man against the proposition that a man should speak. It is a complex jurisdictional move that amounts to: you men need to not speak, and I need to be seen telling you to not speak. Singh is speaking as a man, an ontological set that includes Trudeau and Scheer, to declare that he knows what the appropriate position for a man to adopt on this issue is (namely, none), thereby defining Trudeau and Scheer as inappropriate, if not hubristic. And the *microkairos* is exquisite, with Trudeau and Scheer acting out, with sanctimonious hostility on one side and just hostility on the other, exactly what Singh decries. They are his Exhibit A and Exhibit B. Decorum is closely connected with jurisdiction, and Singh is simultaneously defining and leveraging the indecorousness of Trudeau and Scheer.

The term *place*, as well as, less directly, *position*, evokes the stasis of place/jurisdiction—that Trudeau and Scheer did not have the right to pass judgement on this

matter. And being a value statement by Singh is itself humourous, and also ironic, because Singh is actually speaking out of turn himself, and out of place, to scold Trudeau and Scheer for speaking out of place, and of course Singh is inserting himself, another man, to speak on a topic related to women's issues along with Trudeau and Scheer. But the statement by Singh is also amusing because Singh re-delivered his statement a second time on live television, similar to doing a 'second take' during a scripted televised acting performance. Again, we see the influence of social media. Singh had said it once, and ran the risk of saying it again to a similarly blank response, flogging a dead *bon mot*. But the audience for the live event paled in comparison to the audience the line could reach on social media, who may never even know about the first, flat attempt. Live televised political debates do not typically have 'do-overs,' but Singh made sure it did. Meanwhile, social media loves the do over—the share, the retweet, the memefication—and Singh's pronouncement made the rounds.

Twitter provided Singh the opportunity to restate and repeat this message again through social media. Singh may or may not have reiterated his statement, more loudly and more authoritatively, in a broadcast-only environment. Soundbites, after all, were born in the pre-digital world of electronic media. One might even imagine Lincoln repeating something to Douglas (to use Postman's favoured pre-electronic comparison), because he did not want it to be missed. But there is certainly more of a premium on such opportunities in our digital era, when, for many voters, the statement on social media might be the *only* version they encounter. It would have been foolish indeed for Singh to 'lose' a quip like this when Facebook and Twitter awaited, when it could be curated and propagated for political advantage—as, of course, it was.

Singh textually posted his muted and restated debate message, "A man has no place in a discussion of a woman's right to choose. #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn42" (Singh 2019c) (Figure

0-124) on Twitter, and the Twitterverse erupted. For many voters, not only was the social media statement the only exposure they got to Singh's timely pronouncement, but it was also one they saw repeatedly. Singh's tweet on 7 October 2019, garnered 22,720 likes, 4,206 retweets, and 561 comments, making it the top retweeted Twitter post related to the 2019 Leaders' Debate. As this example displays, one of the affordances of Twitter for political parties and leaders is the ability to restate and repeat messages from the debate, to gain audience support, but also to highlight particular elements of the message, especially if the execution did not turn out as expected. This leads parties and leaders to pre-plan statements for the debate, ones that they believe can go viral on social media. For Singh, his message was also a statement of value, which helped it gain traction. Singh's comment was in reference to the deeply contentious issue of abortion, where in Canada, the federal and provincial governments have taken the position to permit and partially fund abortion within all stages of pregnancy in compliance with Section 7 of Canada's Charter of Rights of Freedoms. Canada's principle towards a woman's right to choose differs from parts of the United States, when at the time of Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate some U.S. States were limiting abortion rights for women.

What is important about Singh's re-statement during the leaders' debate is how it demonstrates the debate incorporating more of the curated artistic qualities seen on social media, revealing the performative element of debate, where lines are stated and restated if they are not received appropriately. This takes on the quality of social media, where a platform can reward a 'do-over,' where statements that might have been missed can be backed up and said again to make sure the best version is available for social media.

The repetitive nature of Twitter, where information is reordered, shared, and reshared, provides social reach for messages that the debate itself could not have offered, but which shapes

how the debates now occur and how the debaters now perform. This viral reach can be measured through the social performance of the post by measuring the number of likes, shares, and comments. Displaying Singh's debate message on Twitter did two things. First, the message itself explicitly shared the Singh NDP position on abortion, where the party and leader promote the rights of a woman to choose, but also that no man (and perhaps no government led by men) should opine on, or decide about, what a woman chooses to do with her body. In addition, the message also subtly differentiated Singh's NDP from May's Green Party, where Singh suggested in prior media statements and social media posts that the Green Party had candidates that did not have a clear position on a woman's right to choose, and that May would not whip votes or prevent MPs from putting forward legislation on the topic of abortion ("Singh Criticizes Greens on Abortion" 2019; The Canadian Press 2019). May denied Singh's charge and clarified that all candidates running under the Green Party banner are to support abortion rights, but Singh's claim raises a question of value in the minds of progressive voters. The ground is shaky for Singh on this, because of May's gender, which Singh has declared is the only one whose views matter on this topic. But Singh's point is that he and his candidates will get out of all women's way on the matter of abortion while May will not ensure that all her candidates will do so.

In this move, Singh also leveraged an important differentiation of women's rights for the NDP from the Trudeau Liberal Party, which share the same progressive views on the rights of women and the right to choose. While there is no substantive difference between Singh and Trudeau on this question, Singh was able to establish a major perceptual difference from Trudeau by effectively merging Trudeau with Scheer into a pair of 'old boys club' members squabbling over women's reproductive rights. Trudeau was *defending* these rights, but Singh

made it seem like he was another patriarchal meddler where he did not belong, and did so in a social media friendly, second-take, debate moment.

These strategic calibrations by Singh leads voters who appreciate the progressive aspects of the Liberal Party and Green Party, but dislike other policy platforms—and dislike the hypocritical, smoke-filled-back-room *ethos* that had been accreting around Trudeau—to consider the NDP as a viable party choice. Singh’s moves were wholly ethotic. There were no policy differences of significance. But Singh (1) performed a more-progressive-than-thou *ethos* with respect to both May and Trudeau, (2) *ethopoically* depicted May as not controlling her party on a fundamental issue of reproductive rights in previous media⁴⁵ and (3) merged and personified Trudeau with Scheer to highlight his Exhibit A/Exhibit B, Tweedledum/Tweedledee, (and elsewhere, Mr. Delay/Mr. Deny), characterization of the Liberals and Conservatives (NDP 2019a; Singh 2019h) (Figure 0-121 and Figure 0-125). Social media rewarded these moves. The viral popularity of this men-have-no-place statement signifies voters’ approval of Singh’s NDP stance on women’s rights and visually illustrates support.

But Singh was of course not the only candidate to promote value claims during the leaders’ debate to be propagated on social media. Trudeau made a claim of value during the debate that did not fit the *microkairos* of the scene. Bernier was badgering and talking over Trudeau. Bernier took the floor for a moment before Trudeau followed up with his clearly scripted retort:

Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: It will transform itself as we – as we —

Hon. Maxime Bernier: Mr. Trudeau —

⁴⁵ This theme resurfaced in the debate again, when Blanchet addressed May stating, “your own MPs could come up with a law against abortion and you said that you will tolerate it” (2019e), which May again disputed.

- Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: — take leadership, as we move forward. And the values (crosstalk) —
- Hon. Maxime Bernier: You always (crosstalk) —
- Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: — are universal values (crosstalk) —
- Hon. Maxime Bernier: — diversity.
- Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: — people around the world (crosstalk) —
- Hon. Maxime Bernier: We must celebrate our history. We must celebrate who we are. And I'm proud Canadian like you. And you know, we built this country together, and we want this country to be like that in 25 years. We love this country, and it's not because I want to have a discussion about immigration that I'm a radical.
- Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Bernier —
- Hon. Maxime Bernier: Only six percent —
- Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: — your role on this stage tonight seems to be —
- Hon. Maxime Bernier: — only six perc—
- Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: — to say publicly what Mr. Scheer thinks privately.

Trudeau used a kind of ‘stealth’ *prosopopoeia* (Bernier is not just speaking for himself but speaking for Scheer) to *ethopoeically* characterize the muted Scheer as indistinguishable from the candid Bernier—*ethopoeic prosopopoeia*. While Trudeau’s performance of the well-scripted quip was unimpressive, on Twitter the quote appeared clearly in text, “Mr. Bernier, your role on this stage right now seems to be to say publicly what Mr. Scheer believes privately” – Justin Trudeau” (Trudeau 2019f) (Figure 0-119). What was missing was any usable statement from the debate itself. Trudeau did not claim his do-over opportunity, as Singh did. But one of the principal affordances of social media—an example of Walter J. Ong’s “secondary orality,” which is “a more deliberate and self-conscious orality, based permanently on the use of writing

and print” (1982, 136)—provides for another type of do-over: an image of Trudeau’s statement with white lettering on a red background taken from the leaders’ debate prefaced by “@JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli” (Trudeau 2019f) (Figure 0-119). This social media message was likely prepared even prior to the debate (a do-before rather than a do-over). It was posted on 7 October 2019 and received 3,960 likes, 898 retweets, and 607 comments. It was the ninth most shared debate-related Twitter post and was the fourth most shared debate related Twitter post by Trudeau. On television, Trudeau’s statement, evident by the debate audiences’ reaction, appeared to be pre-scripted. Singh got away with bringing out a pre-planned retort. Trudeau did not. The difference was in ethotic performance. Even in repetition, Singh came across as natural and authentic. As a one-off under Bernier crosstalk, Trudeau came across as wooden and insincere. However, secondary orality largely dissolves these differences. On Twitter, Trudeau’s remark appears seamless, amplifying doubt in the minds of voters who may have been considering voting for the Conservative Party as an alternative to the Liberal Party by merging the Conservative Party leader with the People’s Party’s leader. The quote plays to those who may have been surprised by the populist, far-right views and statements of Bernier during the debate, recognizing that Bernier was a viable opponent and runner-up to Scheer as leader of the Conservative Party in 2017. The major difference with Singh’s Twitter-targeted quip and Trudeau’s, is that Singh was deliberate enough in his performance in that he stated his message again. Trudeau did not.

Trudeau’s value claim that Scheer’s private thoughts are Bernier’s public statements was a masterful *ethopoeic* move: labelling Bernier as a kind of *prosopopoeic* ventriloquist’s dummy for Scheer, leading voters to notice Scheer’s absence from engagements with certain demographics of the Canadian population and his failure to comment on contentious issues,

raising questions of his personal opinions on these matters. TVO's Steve Paikin highlighted comments made by 35 Toronto-area Conservative candidates after Scheer's election defeat, which identified a number of issues candidates had with him as their Conservative Party leader. One candidate commented on Scheer's lack of effort and weak ties with the million Muslims in the Toronto area (Palkin 2019). Another candidate highlighted Scheer's refusal to march in the Pride Parade with the LGBTQ2+ population (Palkin 2019). And the most fatal flaw that Conservative candidates saw in Scheer was his failure to realize that his role as Prime Minister would not simply be to protect women's rights, but to promote women's rights (Palkin 2019). In many ways, the Conservative Party candidates used Burke's concept of fractional scapegoating (1984b, 188–89) to vilify and blame Scheer for the intrinsic problems of the Conservative Party. Trudeau's value statement used Bernier's radical statements to occupy the silence of Scheer on these matters. Social media afforded this to be brought to the forefront, whereas Trudeau's disjointed message during the debate would have been lost within the crosstalk of Bernier.

4.2.2. Affording Parties and Leaders with a Platform to Debate Contentious Issues

One of the affordances of Twitter is that it provides parties and leaders with a platform to debate contentious issues. Indicating that he did not get an answer from Scheer during the debate, Trudeau *apostrophizes* Scheer again on Twitter stating, "I asked you during the debate, @AndrewScheer and you still haven't answered: why are you offering millionaires a \$50,000 tax break and 17 billion dollars in cuts for everybody else? #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli" (Trudeau 2019e) (Figure 0-118). Restating Trudeau's debate comment on Twitter gives new life to the message, while linking it to the debate. In addition to reinforcing the claim, it *ethopoeically* depicts Scheer's character, as a question avoider (which Trudeau also does), while also highlighting that Scheer considers policies for the wealthy over "everybody else" (Trudeau

2019e). But what it also does is pique audience interest and invites audience participation to also heckle Scheer on Twitter. In this case, Scheer did not respond on Twitter to Trudeau. However, in the next example, the Conservative Party accuses Trudeau of a ‘hidden agenda’ on Twitter, and Trudeau does respond through Twitter.

On the day of Canada’s 2019 English Language Leaders’ Debate, Trudeau’s Twitter revived and responded to a timeworn 12 September 2019 Conservative Party post. The Conservative Party tweet suggested that Trudeau and Liberal MP Adam Vaughan have a plan to “tax the sale of your home at 50%,” showing a full page of a 12 December 2018 Ontario Caucus Submission prepared by Vaughan on housing affordability (2019a) (Figure 0-107). Trudeau’s Twitter response on 7 October 2019 denied this idea of a capital gains tax on primary residences, *ethopoeically* depicting the Conservative Party as speaking untruths. The text in Trudeau’s Twitter video tweet reads:

Andrew Scheer is sending a letter to millions of Canadians with his latest lies about our platform. TO BE CLEAR We will not put a 50% tax on the sale of your home. Here’s what we will do: Lower the price of your first home by 10%. Give more money to people in places where houses cost more. Tax vacant homes owned by people who don’t live in Canada. Give Canadians an interest-free loan up to \$40,000 to adapt their homes for climate change. Whatever mistruths you hear from the Conservatives, know that we’re for moving forward—for everyone. Choose Forward. (Trudeau 2019j) (Figure 0-116)

The Trudeau video response received the second highest overall number of retweets with 300,400 views, 5,522 likes, 1,816 retweets, and 1,862 comments. It was noticeable however, that during Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate, Trudeau’s discussion on housing was limited, with Trudeau only stating, “we were able to invest in housing...” (2019k), while Singh proposed that “federal money used to be invested in building, in partnership with provinces to build housing” (2019i) and “we want to do that again” (2019i). The Conservative’s claim about

the Trudeau Liberals imposing a 50% home sales tax was not discussed by Scheer during the debate.

The Liberal Party did not include the ‘hidden agenda’ tax on housing in their election platform released on 30 September 2019, so the Liberals were then able to flip the housing tax topic and make it appear that the Conservatives were being deceptive on 12 September 2019 by speaking mistruths about the Liberals. What is significant about this exchange between the Conservative Party and Trudeau, is that the conversation occurred through social media, not through Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate. Trudeau posting his housing response on Twitter the day of the debate is significant, for the Liberals knew that eyes would be following Twitter that day when they asserted that Conservatives were spreading mistruths. Vaughan, too, the day before the Leaders’ Debate, revived the same topic in the Housing Debate, stating that Conservative MP Pierre Poilievre will propose “that there is some notion that we are going to present a first time ... er ... a capital gains tax on your principal residence. This has been debunked by all media. It’s a lie. It’s untrue. If he [Poilievre] references that more than once I will start calling him Peter lollypops because he’s playing you for suckers” (*Federal Candidates Debate Housing Issues* 2019). Poilievre did not. Generally, it is deemed to be unwise for politicians to repeat the negative messaging put forward by opposition parties. And typically, tweets tend not to form a coherent or even consistent narrative. Twitter’s character count, and the flow-oriented design of its feed that separates tweets by whatever the algorithm decides is more worthy of immediate attention by a given user, does not encourage extended debate (Bolter 2019). Even the ‘reply’ affordance does not support free exchange, because replies are always subordinate to the sponsoring tweet, and are again, algorithmically interrupted. However, in this case, the message from Trudeau did repeat the words of the Conservative Party’s tweet,

connecting Trudeau's video tweet as a direct response to that specific message, and the conversation was extended publicly through Twitter. In Scheer's case, the initial letter to the Conservative supporters and then subsequent post of the Ontario Caucus Submission on Twitter by the Conservative Party functioned in part as an *apostrophe*, rhetoric that is meant to be *overheard* as much as it is meant to be heard by the addressee. Scheer, we can suppose, knew that the Conservative Party's communication would be shared, possibly *directed* that it be shared, as it looks to have been written with a larger public audience in mind. The result of such X-says-Y-lies-and-Y-says-X-lies social media encounters is that it amps up the polarizing dimensions of *ethos*. If everyone seems to be lying, you 'go with' the one you like for reasons external to credibility. The Conservative's communication of distrust towards the Trudeau Liberals was in line with their marketing of Trudeau on social media, as the Conservative's third most shared post, "Justin Trudeau is a compulsive liar. #NotAsAdvertised #Elxn43 #cdnpoli #LeadersDebate2019" (Conservative Party 2019e) (Figure 0-109) also communicated this same line of messaging. Considering Ware and Linkugel's tactics and strategies of apologetic discourse (1973, 276), Trudeau's subsequent *apologia* response seeks acquittal from the Conservative Party's charge by directly acknowledging the Conservative's statement, denying the substance of their claim, and responding directly to what was said. To refute the Conservative's claim, Trudeau's tweet simply stated that Scheer was spreading mistruths and clearly stated what the Liberal's platform on home sale taxation is in four simple statements. Trudeau's highly *logos*-based, executive summary *dinumeratio* response to the Conservative's claim, posted on Twitter the day of the English-Language Leaders' Debate, attempts to discredit the Conservatives, while at the same time, transferring the burden of proof back onto the Conservatives.

4.3. The Vigorous Influence of Instagram on Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

One noticeable difference in 2019 compared to 2015 is that all political parties and all political leaders embraced Instagram (with Elizabeth May as the exception) and included debate-related content in their visual Instagram posts. Trudeau, being an early Instagram adopter, and Prime Minister of Canada, had over 3.24 million followers, a 9,553 per cent increase since 2015, and significantly more followers than other political parties or leaders (Table 3). Singh's following on Instagram was second to Trudeau, with 435,011 followers, a 5,599 per cent increase from Mulcair's following (Table 3), and the platform where Singh had the most followers. In viewing the 2019 debate-related digital gallery of traditional posts, and carousel posts, which are multi-image photo or video posts, Trudeau and Singh's Instagram posts gained the most traction. This section discusses two areas that contributed to the most shared debate-related social traction on Instagram's platform for parties and leaders, which was associating leaders' partners and family with the debate, and the incorporation of emotional appeals, such as sexuality and humour, in leaders' visual Instagram performances.

4.3.1. Associating Leaders' Partners and Family with the Debate

Popular in 2015 on Facebook and Instagram were leaders adopting representative 'family values' *prosopopoeia* to identify with viewers using images and text referring to their spouses and families. Similarly in 2019, on the most visual social media platform, top liked images of family and partner posts were prominent. Instagram's demographic of users tends to skew to 25 to 34-year-olds ("Instagram Demographics in 2021: Important User Stats for Marketers" 2021) and image posts on this digital gallery tend to hold a longer social media shelf-life compared to Facebook and Twitter, which could account for the increased audience attention and engagement

of these debate-related posts on Instagram. Instagram's top-liked debate-related image post was from Trudeau and received a staggering 181,464 likes and 2,647 comments—70,088 more likes than Trudeau received for the same image post on his Facebook account, which also received an impressive 130,994 reactions, 111,376 likes, 2,422 shares, and 7,600 comments, and was the third most shared debate-related image on Facebook (Trudeau 2019g) (Figure 0-77). The debate-related post receiving this strong attention on Instagram is a selfie of Trudeau, with his two youngest children, Ella-Grace, and Hadrien, posing for a photo walking to school on the day of the leaders' debate. Trudeau's post states, "The best kind of debate prep: walking these two to school this morning! CA La meilleure préparation pour un débat : aller les reconduire à l'école ce matin!" (Trudeau 2019h) (Figure 0-162). This smiling selfie of Trudeau with two of his elementary school-aged children and descriptive words which define the moment the image was taken, promotes Trudeau's good moral character (*arete*) and goodwill (*eunoia*), and connects with the Trudeau Liberal brand leading into debate night. By posting a voting selfie, Trudeau enacts what Barthes calls a "biographeme" (2010, 30) and inscribes himself and his family into a national event. Publicly displaying this 'private' selfie, walking his children to school, displays an identifiable and forward-thinking modern family dynamic where both parents equally share childcare responsibilities. This is a textbook case of one of the examples Burke gives for his defining concept of identification. "'Identification' at its simplest," Burke says, "is also a deliberate device, as when the politician seeks to identify himself with his audience" (1951, 203). Trudeau performed authenticity by visually displaying an image, a piece of public evidence that meets "a set of expectations regarding how such a thing ought to look, sound, and feel" (S. Smith and Watson 2014, 75). Parents walk their kids to school, at least in their ideal lives. Parents also take selfies in their everyday lives. Trudeau is here doing both. He is living up

to his act of *prosopopoeia*. Like Burke, Barthes is also concerned with consciousness, and states that “the type of consciousness the photograph involves is indeed truly unprecedented, since it establishes not a consciousness of the *being-there* of the thing (which any copy could provoke) but an awareness of its *having-been-there*” (1977, 159). The *having-been-there* image of Trudeau walking his children to school when shared with social media audiences provides greater salience of authenticity and truthfulness than simple text could ever produce. It is no surprise then, in maintaining his image as a loving father, an image of Trudeau with his children before the leaders’ debate would be publicly displayed as a voting selfie.

This image and text displays Trudeau, the evolved Liberal, which would resonate especially for families with children, as parents may take a selfie with their children to remember the additional characteristics of the day surrounding an important event, which in this instance, is Trudeau taking a photo before Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leaders’ Debate. By sharing the selfie with his Instagram followers, Trudeau performs an apparently private and authentic perspective to viewers, different from a posed family image captured by a third-party, such as the images taken by Trudeau’s official photographer, Adam Scotti, and different yet to the political leader who will be observed debating that evening. The post realizes *prosopopoeia* because the words associated with the image provide context about when the image was taken, the morning of the debate, as well as additional information connecting Trudeau’s family moment of walking with his children to school with the leaders’ debate. When he speaks at the debate, the post declares he will be speaking (in part) as a representation of the (engaged, loving) family man. If the text were not included alongside the image, the debate connection would not be obvious to the public through the selected selfie alone. It is this additional information, a fiction that would not otherwise be there without the text associated with the image, that aids to curate the *ethos* of

Trudeau on the post as a debate-related message to his social media followers. *Prosopopoeia* is not only putting on the mask of another individual, but can also be performing a type-role (Kampherm 2019, 70). He is ‘Justin Trudeau’ in this image, but he is also representatively a ‘father,’ preparing for a debate by centring himself in his family life, walking his children to school.

Trudeau, however, was not alone in his display of family on social media the day of the debate. Scheer and Singh utilized family appeals as well, but with different ethotic effects. In the fourth most liked debate-related Instagram post, also prominent on Facebook as Singh’s second and third most shared debate-related posts (2019e; 2019f) (Figure 0-84 and Figure 0-85), Singh is shown holding hands with his partner, Gurkiran Kaur Sidhu, with a crowd of supporters behind them. Trudeau’s post sets up the debate. Singh’s post sets up the debate’s reception. Singh’s tagline states, “Debate night is a wrap! I love every opportunity I get to share the stories of the people I’ve met across Canada – and offer our plan to make life easier for people, instead of protecting the interests of the rich & powerful. #elxn43 #CanadaDebates2019 CA C’est fini pour le débat de ce soir! C’est très important pour moi de saisir chaque occasion pour partager les histoires des gens que je rencontre à travers le Canada et présenter notre plan pour rendre votre vie plus facile, pas celle des plus riches.” (Singh 2019d) (Figure 0-167). This image was posted on 7 October 2019 and gained 68,211 likes and 802 comments. But what is different with Singh’s Instagram carousel post is that he included seven photos in his post. On Facebook, Singh displays the exact same hero shot image, but the caption reads, “We’re here & ready to go 🇨🇦 Arrivé et prêt à passer à l’action.” (Singh 2019f) (Figure 0-85). The caption used on Singh’s Instagram was also stated on Facebook, but with a different set of images posted (2019e) (Figure 0-84). Does it matter if Singh’s primary photo on Instagram showed him coming to the debate or

departing from the debate, as it was a carousel of photos? Typically, timing matters for authenticity and accuracy in recording important governmental historic events, such as a leaders' debate. But on Instagram, and Facebook for that matter, the captured debate-related action shot with a curated debate related message is all that matters, so long as the post *appears* to be authentic. The Conservative Party used a similar social media mix-and-match quote and image in 2015 on Facebook, when the Conservatives quoted a statement of Harper alongside an image of Harper taken from a different time (presumably on the same day), evident with a wardrobe change from when he spoke the original quote (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2015b) (Figure 0-3).

What is significant about these top-shared Instagram posts is that they include the leaders' family or partner, using the affordances of social media to create a storyline about the lead-up to the debate and the events after the debate, providing audiences with "behind-the-scene authenticity," the personal moments and important people in the lives of the leaders, curating the *ethos* of a whole person, humanizing the politician for the viewing population, which also meets the expectations of the leaders' brand online—all of it realized through *prosopopoeia*. Trudeau's image walking two of his children to school on debate day evokes softer emotions for the viewer as a 'forward' thinking Liberal spouse, participating in the day-to-day activities of childrearing. Scheer, on the other hand, limits images of him with his five children on Instagram, Thomas, 14, Grace, 12, Madeline, 10, Henry, 8, and Mary 3 (Rabson 2019)—the very number of children perhaps emphasizing his social-conservative Catholicism—and rather, predominantly, includes images with his wife (Scheer 2019f) (Figure 0-158), appealing to a more frankly patriarchal, *logos*-based, pragmatic and business-minded Conservative viewer. Singh, without children at the time of the debate, performed the loving partner in a familiar urban relationship pattern. The

visual and textual description presented on each post provides additional information through its curated content that would not otherwise be available by viewing the leaders' debate alone. But *prosopopoeia* through social media acts not only on audience expectations, but also on the leader, as the leader is required to uphold the persona their social media brand professes, which may be separate from the actual personality of the leader, which is concealed from the viewing public. Scheer may spend more time with his children than the social media images suggest. Trudeau may spend less time with his children. Singh may spend less time with his partner. Or every image may be fully accurate. The images may be spontaneously captured or painstakingly posed. But the presence of the images on social media tells us one thing very clearly: the relation of each leader to his family has been curated to foster identification with the audience. They are being curated first as people, then as politicians (less so with Scheer), to produce a specific effect on audiences to perceive each leader in a certain light. This is another example of *prosopopoeia* influencing the debate, where audiences are primed with certain preconceptions about the leaders through social media before a leaders' debate begins, tarnishing Aristotle's idea of persuasion being "achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible" (350BCb, pt. 1356a).

4.3.2. Incorporating Emotional Appeals in Leaders' Visual Performances

According to Enny Das, Maryna Galekh, and Charlotte Vonkeman, "sex sells, but so does a good joke, or an attractive image" (2015, 418). Reminiscent of Trudeau's 2015 social media post of him boxing, the second most liked debate related message on Instagram with an astounding 176,691 likes and 5,315 comments posted on 2 October 2019 is an image reviving Trudeau's boxer persona. It shows a close-up image of Trudeau in a boxing stance with his hands close to his face, wearing black boxing gloves, a black tank top, and showing his upper

arm tattoo of a Haida raven, which Trudeau selected based on Robert Davidson's *Raven Bringing Light to the World* (McDonald 2016). In 2013, Trudeau remarked that "the raven is a symbol of the trickster ... who creates with irreverence a powerful force" (J. Wells 2013). The primary component in the boxing image composition is Trudeau's razor-sharp focus on his out of scene opponent, who is blurred in the background along with the rest of the scene. The comment associated with the image states, "Préparation pour le débat. Debate prep" (Trudeau 2019a) (Figure 0-163). It is an image and stance that could appear on any 'Tale of the Tape' boxing poster where pre-fight measurements are disclosed of each boxing opponent. The roles are distorted and distorting. Trudeau boxes, but he is not a boxer. He is the Prime Minister of Canada. That is his professional role. And Trudeau is not preparing to enter a boxing ring. He is entering a moderated verbal debate to converse with leaders of Canada's five opposing parties. So how does boxing equate to "debate prep" for Trudeau? Would not reviewing notes on key policies or rehearsing important points to be discussed during the debate be considered "debate prep?" Mundane, common tasks, however, are not as Instagrammable, and would not have the dichotomy, or sexual appeal, that an image of a young, attractive, strong, Prime Minister does when it comes to appealing to the Instagram viewership. The social media reach with number of likes and comments for this "debate prep" image on Instagram means that this post was, indeed, Instagram worthy. But this post is more than simply a good shot of the "super hot" (MacKinnon and El Akkad 2015) Canadian Prime Minister showing his brawn before the leaders' debate. Rhetorically, Trudeau is also visually performing a classic debate metaphor on social media with the Instagram image of him in a boxing stance wearing boxing attire. What Trudeau is doing is *prosopopoeia*. Trudeau is not performing another's *ethos* but is performing the *ethos* of an

abstraction—the classic allegory of a political leaders’ debate as a boxing match, and imparting himself as one of the pugilists, and sharing it on social media.

Debates have long been associated with boxing matches in the media. In 2015, for example, the *Maclean’s* Leaders’ Debate transcript is called, “Tale of the Tape.” A headline from the *Ottawa Sun* in 2015 reads, “The Top 5 Knockout Moments in Political Debates in Canada” and opened with, “In political debates, the gloves come off, and sometimes there are knockouts. These are the moments when time seems to stand still as one combatant reels from a verbal blow” (Bay 2015). In 2019, the trend continues with the addition of a countdown timer that is visible to the audience, similar to what is seen in boxing matches, and the *Toronto Star* headline comparing the debate to a boxing match, reading, “Six-way fight ends with no clear winner in leaders’ debate” (MacCharles and Champion-Smith 2019). But in metaphorically comparing a leaders’ debate to a boxing fight match, media has created the leaders’ debate into a theatrical act, where who wins or loses a debate is “primarily about image and narrative, which is why the smartest or most knowledgeable candidate rarely prevails” (Katz 2020). With the rise of social media, the leaders’ online personalities have been carefully crafted and developed so, in effect, the debate may not be so important. In the few minutes that leaders can speak, they tend to spew out brand messaging, with a few seconds of verbal sparring, speaking over each other before the referee—er, moderator—steps in to bring back some semblance of order and keep the conversation moving forward. Charles M. Blow, a *New York Times* columnist, wrote an opinion piece—“We don’t need debates” (2020). In the article, Blow argues that debates

are too much theater, too little substance. The debates test the performative aspect of leadership: stamina, mental agility, wit. Policy is discussed, but rarely if ever in greater depth than what the candidates have already published in some way. Times have changed. Candidates post their policy positions on their websites, readily accessible from voters’ phones. (Blow 2020)

What Trudeau is doing in this boxing image and the “debate prep” message on social media, is adopting the debate metaphor mask, transferring some of its ethotic force from the classic imagery of a boxer—strength, agility, power—to himself as a politician. But the actual job of a boxer is fundamentally different than the job of a Prime Minister, and is not connected in real life.

In terms of persuasion, humour also scores high on pleasure (Das, Galekh, and Vonkeman 2015, 418) and Singh’s social media is noticeably effective at handling complex issues with elegance and humour, a *pathotic* move that connects with *ethos* through goodwill (*eunoia*) or (when especially clever) wisdom (*phronesis*). As the first racialized leader of a federal party in Canada, it did not take long before Singh’s Sikh religion and identifiable *dastar*, or turban, became a topic of conversation in the Canadian press. One CBC news article headline published during the election campaign was, “5 things Jagmeet Singh wants you to know about his turban” (Thibedeau 2019). The Sikh turban is a religious symbol of equality and a metaphor for justice and charity and Singh wears it as a symbol of his faith. Joining in (or possibly poking fun at) the media’s fascination with his turban, Singh’s Instagram account posted an image of him looking out of his NDP plane window at the sun setting, grasping his hands in his lap with a pensive look. In looking at the image alone, it is peaceful, almost solemn. But attached to the image the caption read, “You know it’s been a long day when the ears are out

😂 #elxn43 CA Tu sais que c’est une longue journée quand les oreilles finissent par sortir

😂 #elxn43” (Singh 2019b) (Figure 0-166). Posted a day before the debate on 6 October 2019 and receiving 68,811 likes and 775 comments, this post was the third most liked debate-related post on Instagram. Nader Mohamed, Singh’s social media producer, stated that he had posted the statement and image of Singh’s ears poking out of his Turban on social media. Referring to the

comment attached to the image, Mohamed stated, “That’s a running inside joke. After a long day he takes his ears out of his turban. And he was totally cool with sharing that on social media because it’s a fun, lighthearted moment” (Dutt 2019). But more than the image and text being a lighthearted moment, what it also reveals rhetorically, is that Singh’s image and statement is classic *ethopoeia*, as the message and image is not written or posted by Singh himself, but is ghostwritten and produced by Mohamed. But the statement is also *prosopopoeia*, as it is shared from Singh’s personal Instagram account, and adopts his party’s mask, making it *appear* to Instagram viewers that Singh is speaking the words in the image post. *Ethopoeia* in its prototypical form, as introduced by Lysias and practiced in the progymnasmata, is the ability to capture the words, ideas, and style of delivery suited for the person for whom the address is written (Katula and Murphy 2003, 49). Scott Haden Church compares an ethopoetic remix as equivalent to a musical cover; “it retains the basic sonic properties of the original song but aims to create a ‘lifelike, charming’ representation rather than a portrayal that is completely accurate” (2018, 238). In the case of Singh’s social media post, Mohamed curated it—Singh is wearing it. Mohamed reveals that “humour is a huge part of using social media to build a personality, which is where Singh’s ‘cool factor’ is an advantage” (Dutt 2019). The fact that Mohamed uses “social media to build a personality” (Dutt 2019) for Singh is significant rhetorically, for it exposes the rhetorical figure *ethopoeia* in action, that would (and should) otherwise be hidden. Friends and followers of political leaders may or may not be aware that social media personnel are capturing a leaders’ image or writing a social media post on the leaders’ behalf, but what Mohamed reveals and confirms in the news article is that he does write and produce the social media accounts for Singh, and he does it to build Singh “a personality” (Dutt 2019).

Mohamed depicting Singh's character online affects political debate. With political leaders having a 'social media producer,' curating the content and essentially developing the leaders' online persona, having an authentic debate between leaders is more important now than it ever was before. In the way debates function currently, the leader does not have to do much legwork in introducing who they are, instead relying on their moniker, developed by others, and on the brand of their political party and social media persona, also developed by others. Social media has developed for leaders a perceived notion of who they are. Their role is to perform their prescribed persona during the debate, utilizing the same language used in the posts, and drawing on the affordances of the debate to ensure that certain elements are captured so that it can be highlighted on social media. But when voters are considering who could be Prime Minister, they are not electing a persona, they are electing a person who has an authentic personality and makes critical decisions for a country. Authentic debate where a leader can be rattled, such as in 2015 when Mulcair convinced Harper to admit that Canada was indeed in a recession, is important in extracting genuine information to make informed electoral decisions come election day. In 2019, we see authenticity being stifled in conforming to the form of social media, where leaders' debates are essentially being (re)shaped into a spectacle of election statements, quips, and irrelevant scripted one-liners, and where *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* are refracting *ethos*.

4.4. Chapter Summation

Trudeau's prior career as a teacher (most famously teaching drama) may have helped him to maintain the illusion of a 'positive politics' leader and Prime Minister during Canada's two-hour 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate in dodging the *ethopoeic prosopopoeia* claims levied at him, made by the other party leaders on his hypocrisy in being "a phoney" and "a fraud" (Scheer 2019g) (Figure 0-68) or for "say[ing] a lot of nice things" (Singh 2019i). But

when May turned to Trudeau and stated, “Please God, you don’t get a majority this time because – you won’t keep your promises” (2019g), this message from May must have affected Trudeau and the viewing debate audience. However, as May’s “you won’t keep your promises” (2019g), statement was not promoted well on social media, buried within a compilation of election highlights (2019j) (Figure 0-91), the impact on Trudeau was short-lived, recorded over by more entertaining or targeted statements propagated on the social media platforms. Scheer, on the other hand, could not outrun his faith-based beliefs on a woman’s right to choose and same-sex marriage during the debate, which did make its rounds on social media (Figure 0-117; Figure 0-120) (Trudeau 2019c; 2019b).

In Canada’s 2019 English-Language Leader’s Debate the influence of social media is vigorous. The incorporation of *prosopopoeia* is observed in a variety of instances during the debate and on social media. We see *prosopopoeic* statements and visuals in the construction of an ideological divide between leaders. We see the incorporation of *prosopopoeia* in social media, in the performative elements of the debate, such as when leaders state and restate lines if they are not received appropriately and post a ‘do-over’ of their statement on social media. And we see *prosopopoeia* when leaders incorporate partners and families with the debate, performing a type-role, as a leader but also representatively a ‘father,’ or ‘partner,’ preparing for a debate.

As with *prosopopoeia*, we observe *ethopoeia* in several instances in the debate and on social media. We see *ethopoeia* in curating favourable leader posts by ‘cherry picking’ traditional media to provide an illusion of truth. We observe *ethopoeia* being used in debating contentious issues through social media, such as when the Liberal Party depicted the Conservative Party of speaking untruths. And we see the use of *ethopoeia* in emotional appeals in leaders’ visual performances, such as Trudeau transferring some of the ethotic force from the

classic imagery of a boxer—strength, agility, power—to himself as a politician. This influence of social media on political leaders' debates is significant. For Scheer, it may have contributed to his election loss in 2019 and the subsequent relinquishing of his position as leader of the Conservative Party. For Trudeau, the mixed *prosopopoeic* and *ethopoeic* messaging may have contributed to Trudeau's win of a minority government, and his second term as Prime Minister of Canada.

5. Comparison Analysis: Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate Compared to Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

“You have gone from someone who used to believe in an immigration system that was fair, orderly, and compassionate, and now you are making your policy based on – trying to get likes and retweets – from the darkest parts of Twitter.”

- Conservative Leader, Andrew Scheer

[directed at People's Party Leader, Maxime Bernier]

Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

To begin the comparison analysis of Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate to Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate, it may be helpful to briefly review what was presented in the previous chapters. In Chapter One, the rhetorical concepts *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* were introduced, where *prosopopoeia* is the framing of oneself in terms of others (including categories, roles, objects, abstractions, and so on), while *ethopoeia* is the framing of others in terms of social and personal values (best understood in terms of the Aristotelian ethotic qualities of *arete*, *phronesis*, and *eunoia*). These concepts can also be combined. ‘*Prosopopoeic ethopoeia*’ is the adopting of voices, mannerisms, words, etc., to frame others, and ‘*ethopoeic prosopopoeia*’ is the framing of others in terms of their masks, such as in accusations of hypocrisy. We notice that these are fundamental aspects of human communication, but for the purposes of this dissertation, we attend only to their tactical deployment.

Chapter Two provided a synopsis for each of the two debates. Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate was a two-hour debate broadcasted live on four Rogers television networks. It was also live-streamed on Rogers' radio and television station websites, as well as Macleans.ca, Facebook, and YouTube. It was accessible in six languages and focused on four topics, where each topic was provided 30-minutes, broken down into two parts. The debate hosted four of the five political leaders, incumbent Prime Minister and Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada

Stephen Harper, Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada Justin Trudeau, Leader of Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP) Thomas Mulcair, and Leader of the Green Party of Canada Elizabeth May. Paul Wells was the moderator.

Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate was a two-hour debate broadcasted live on all major television networks. On digital media, the debate streamed on more than a dozen online platforms, as well as on Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube. It was accessible in eleven languages, and focused on five topics, where each topic was provided 22-minutes, broken down into four parts. The debate hosted six political leaders, incumbent Prime Minister and Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada Justin Trudeau, Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada Andrew Scheer, Leader of Canada's New Democratic Party (NDP) Jagmeet Singh, Leader of the Green Party of Canada Elizabeth May, Leader of the Bloc Québécois (BQ) Yves-François Blanchet, and Leader of the People's Party of Canada (PPC) Maxime Bernier. There was a countdown timer on the viewing screen for debate viewers to see, and leaders were more limited in their time to respond to questions, interrupted if they reached the end of their prescribed time allotment. These structural differences in the 2019 Debate (1) were motivated in large part by the demands of social media and (2) affected the 2019 Debate with a greater incidence in crosstalk, zingers, talking points, and 'do overs.'

In Chapter Three, six main themes related to Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate were identified, and the top debate-related posts from leaders' and parties' Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts were analyzed.

Chapter Four identified six separate themes related to Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate, and the top debate-related posts from leaders' and parties' Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts were analyzed.

In this chapter, I use the six debate-related themes identified from Chapter Three and the 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate, and the six debate-related themes identified from Chapter Four and the 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate, to assess the implications of Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, on the televised political leaders' debates over time. I look at the affordances and constraints of each social medium and examine how social media fosters *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*.

Since the ancient times of the progymnasmata boys' schools, there has always been careful preparation for a debate. And *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* are ancient rhetorical techniques that were used in those debates. Creating a persona for oneself or one's opponent is not new; it is likely as old as human symbolic activity, certainly as old as our symbolic records. The Homeric bards spoke for their gods and heroes. Plato spoke for Socrates and Gorgias. Since the emergence of mass media, there has likely never been a leaders' debate without media interference or influence. Even Neil Postman's golden age of the 1858 U.S. Lincoln-Douglas debates made allowances for press, with one speech being delayed so that a reporter who was late could get to his place before the speech began (Reilly 1978; 1979). But the difference today with the growing popularity of social media—a playground of persona-creation and -curation—is that leaders' debates are transforming to become less about debate, less about the specific event, and more about the reach the leaders' performance in the debate has. Leaders' debates have become structured to feed social media, with leaders performing in the debate for the social media platforms. Social media pressures parties and leaders to deploy *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* in their debate speech, refracting *phronesis*, *arete*, and *eunoia* in ways Aristotle would not have anticipated. There is a move away from Aristotle's view of *entechnic ethos*—constructing character in an oration with a balance of *phronesis*, *arete*, and *eunoia*—to

condensed fragments of those qualities in debates, both in self representation and in the representation of others. *Prosopopoeia* comes into play through adopting a specific ethotic role, or through the incorporation of features of another's *ethos*, in tools ranging from venerated allusion to outright mockery, but not excluding theft of ideas and even words. *Ethopoeia* comes into play in the lenses a rhetor holds up to refract the image of another rhetor—in the electoral realm, these other rhetors are overwhelmingly rivals. Both *prosopopoeic* and *ethopoeic* moves increased in the 2019 Debate compared to the 2015 Debate. Social media is fostering *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* to become more important through its affordances and constraints, which is transforming political debate, and concurrently, politics and democracy.

5.1. Facebook: Affordances and Constraints Fostering *Prosopopoeia* and *Ethopoeia* in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate Compared to Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

Facebook perpetuates the refraction of *ethos* through its form and its function. At its core, “social media extends the relationships that naturally fade throughout a lifetime [...] by allowing a connection across time and space—windows that put us back into the everyday lives of these people” (Persuit 2013, 9). For organizations, it extends their presence into an individual's cyberspace (Persuit 2013, 9). It works by blurring the line between private life and public life. Individuals and organizations create online personae through the platform and ‘friends’ and followers build opinions of them through what they observe on the platform, in combination with interpersonal interactions and experienced performance through their real-life interactions. But this gets more complicated with political figures, who are individuals, not organizations, but who are heavily directed in their appearance, gestures, voice, words, policies, and so on, by an organization—their respective political parties.

During the 2015 and 2019 Debates, Facebook was used by all political parties and leaders to share debate-related content and digitally engage with followers. In 2019, viewership on parties' and leaders' Facebook pages increased, with additional Facebook followers and page likes. However, one notable difference between the 2015 Debate and the 2019 Debate was that there was a remarkable increase in page likes and followers for Trudeau's Facebook account in comparison to other parties' and leaders' accounts. In 2019, Trudeau had 6,894,905 followers (and 6,755,489 likes) on Facebook, compared to 406,868 in 2015, which is almost 17-times more followers (a 1,560 per cent increase). To put Trudeau's popularity into perspective, the Liberal Party, having the second-largest following in 2019 on Facebook with 339,642 page likes (338,251 followers), increased their page followers 2.75 times (or 174 per cent) compared to 2015.⁴⁶ This comparison of Facebook page likes and followers for political parties' and leaders' from 2015 to 2019 demonstrates the increase in digital "eyeballs" (Lanham 2006, 7–8; Losh 2009, 69) on parties and leaders through digital social media platforms, and helps to explain why parties and leaders are pressured to manage their leaders' personae online, populating Facebook with click-worthy content. As Trudeau's digital reach through Facebook far exceeds other political parties' or leaders' influence, it is especially important for the Trudeau Liberals' messages to be fashioned for this platform, where Facebook algorithms promote posts and reward users that garner the most attention. The more engagement parties' or leaders' Facebook posts receive with likes, shares, and comments, the more people are exposed to the message through the newsfeed algorithms. This push for more engaging, likeable, and sharable content is

⁴⁶ In 2015, the Liberal Party's Facebook page had 123,739 likes, whereas in 2019, the Liberal Party's Facebook page had 339,642 likes. Scheer gained 19 per cent more page likes over what Harper received in 2015, while the Conservative Party gained 147 per cent more page likes in 2019. Singh gained 122 per cent more page likes in 2019 than Mulcair had in 2015, and the NDP had a modest 16 per cent increase in page likes in 2019 compared to 2015. May gained 39 per cent more page likes in 2019, with the Green Party gaining 59 per cent more page likes. Only those political parties and leaders in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate are included for consideration.

changing politics and the scope of debate, as the more sensational material published by political parties and leaders often propagates further on the medium.

5.1.1. Recirculating Edited Versions of Leaders' Closing Remarks: 2015

Compared to 2019

Leaders' closing remarks recirculated on the parties' and leaders' Facebook accounts following the 2015 Debate. Trudeau enacted a party-leader *prosopopoeia*, performing the Liberal Party's positive "real change" *ethos*, with his "Real Change // Changer ensemble" video post, the second most shared debate-related post (2015i) (Figure 0-9), and his "A Better Canada is Always Possible," the third most shared debate-related Facebook post (2015t) (Figure 0-10) (and top retweeted Twitter post) (Trudeau 2015u) (Figure 0-36). The Conservative Party used *ethopoeia* in constructing a softer Harper image, editing out the fear-inducing comments from Harper's closing statement, and leaving in his more reassuring positive statements. It was the sixth most shared debate-related post (2015c) (Figure 0-2). And Mulcair's post of his own closing statement (2015a) (Figure 0-18), and the Green Party's post of May's closing statement (2015c) (Figure 0-22), provided both leaders with ethotic capital. In 2015, Facebook gave leaders visual salience by providing parties and leaders the ability to have their highly rehearsed and recorded 2015 Debate closing statements viewed in isolation, liked and distributed widely by their Facebook followers. The medium of Facebook allowed the message to be detached from the context of the debate, to stand alone on the parties' or leaders' social media platform.

However, in stark contrast to the highly *prosopopoeic* 2015 Debate closing remarks, where leaders were provided two minutes of uninterrupted speaking time, in the 2019 Debate, leaders spoke their closing remarks within an open debate format, that allowed for crosstalk, which had the effect of tarnishing leaders' curational moments. What is significant about this

change in the debate form for 2019, is that the leaders' closing remarks were not reshared through parties' and leaders' social media. There were no usable clips from the open debate.

Over time, political parties and leaders have developed their image on and through Facebook, and carefully designed and produced a credible *ethos*, so when crosstalk ensues, or an adversary questions one's authenticity or character, the remarks become unusable by the party or leader on their social media accounts. Being able to select and share the best texts, images, and videos, promoting how one wants to be perceived by others, is one of the principal affordances of Facebook. Posts that support the parties' and leaders' curated brand are shared for propagation on the platform. Texts, images, and videos that do not conform to the parties' or leaders' prescribed persona are typically discarded.

One discarded scene from the final moments of the 2019 open debate, where closing remarks incorporated *ethopoeic prosopopoeia*, framing others in terms of their masks, occurred in a significant and pointed exchange between Scheer and Bernier, both accusing the other of hypocrisy, "pretending" to be someone that they are not, adopting a mask. During the debate, Bernier had an opportunity to ask another leader a question and pressed Scheer saying:

Andrew – you are, you are calling yourself a Conservative, but you don't want to balance the budget in two years. You will have \$70 billion on our debt. You support the cartel in mill, dairy, and poultry, knowing that the Canadian family is paying more than \$400 a year for that. Andrew, are you a real Conservative? No. I think you are a Liberal. Why are you pretending to be something that you're not? (2019i)

Ethopoeia clearly breeds *ethopoeia*, where if someone praises or insults another's character, the other is more likely to praise or insult their character back. Similarly, *prosopopoeia* may breed *prosopopoeia*, or at least some types. This is observed in my article, "Democratic *Prosopopoeia*: The Rhetorical Influence of the I-Will-Vote Image Filter on Social Media Profile Pictures during the 2015 Canadian Federal Election" (Kampherm 2019, 80–81), where if an image filter is used,

and the observer of the image filter has similar sentiments, they too, may be encouraged to put up an image filter as well.

In response to Bernier, before launching into his pseudo-closing remarks of election soundbites and policy promises, Scheer directly faces Bernier and pummels him with *epanaphoric erotema*:

You want to talk about pretending to be something that you're not. I'm not sure which Maxime Bernier I'm debating tonight. Was it the Maxime Bernier from the 1990s who was a separatist? Was it the Maxime Bernier who was minister responsible for handing out corporate welfare? Was it the Maxime Bernier who defended supply management when it suited him? (2019g)

Bernier, rattled, responded only by blurring all distinctions into a talking point: "I am the Maxime Bernier who is there for Canadians" (2019i), while in crosstalk, Scheer declares, "You are the Maxime Bernier that said things on Twitter that you never ever said before in your life" (2019g). During the beginning of the debate, Scheer along the same line of argument said to Bernier (with crosstalk from Bernier intertwined):

You have gone from someone who used to believe in an immigration system that was fair, orderly, and compassionate, and now you are making your policy based on – trying to get likes and retweets – from the darkest parts of Twitter. (2019g)

Both leaders are wanting voters see that there is an ideological division between them, Bernier as the People's Party of Canada leader; Scheer, as the Conservative Party of Canada leader.

Bernier's move in saying to Scheer, "I think you are a Liberal," is *ethopoeia* by clear categorization. Saying that marks a category difference: Scheer is a Liberal, not a Conservative; worse, he's a hypocrite for putting on the mask of a Conservative. Bernier in this move is attempting to connect Scheer's Conservative policy plans with Trudeau's Liberal policies, and to portray a greater ideological division between the Scheer Conservatives and the Bernier PPCs. But by doing so, Bernier, inadvertently, is also subtly highlighting that Scheer is

prosopopoeically adopting a mask of the Conservative Party and a more Liberal-leaning policy directive, to obscure Scheer's own more social-conservative values, in attempt to attract a wider small-c Conservative voting audience.

Following Bernier's comment, Scheer reacts using *ethopoeic prosopopoeia* in suggesting Bernier was once authentic, and now is wearing a mask, "pretending" to uphold the values of the People's Party of Canada. Scheer is accusing Bernier of (bad) *arete*. In questioning which Bernier he is speaking to, Scheer exposes Bernier's use of *prosopopoeia* in wearing the mask of the People's Party of Canada, promoting populist values on social media, while insinuating that Bernier is a hypocrite, and that voters should question the extreme right-wing values that he is expounding on social media, as Scheer has "never ever" (2019g) heard Bernier speak the way he does on Twitter in his life. One must remember that Scheer and Bernier held high-level positions together in the Conservative government under Stephen Harper. Bernier held highly respected cabinet positions, one being the Minister of Foreign Affairs (2007-2008). Before defecting to lead the People's Party of Canada, Bernier was close to becoming the next Conservative Party leader, placing a near second to Scheer in the 2017 Conservative Party of Canada leadership election. This brings Bernier's statements on Twitter about immigration reform into question, and presupposes the likelihood of Bernier's anti-immigration rhetoric on social media being purely for attention, to create a greater ideological division between the PPC and the Conservative Party, and acquire more "eyeballs" (Lanham 2006, 7-8; Losh 2009, 69) on his social media posts.

Unlike the 2015 Debate, the 2019 Debate did not have formal closing statements, as the 2015 Debate did, and with the final moments being an open debate, no clean and clear messages were available for promotion on social media. Causal relations are never clear in such

circumstances, but the open debate format, after a raucous two hours, featured more animosity than the 2015 closing statements, more negative *ethopoeia*. Those final moments were full of accusations of hypocrisy. Bernier used *ethopoeic prosopopoeia* in questioning if Scheer is a “real” Conservative, accusing him of being “a Liberal,” and “pretending” (2019i) to be a Conservative, which could have the effect of placing doubt in the minds of right-leaning Conservatives looking for a viable alternative to the Trudeau Liberals. Scheer, too, uses *ethopoeic prosopopoeia* when accusing Bernier of “pretending” to adopt the party-mask of the PPC in his communication of more extreme, right-wing, populist policies, to get likes from the “darkest parts of Twitter” (2019g). This is *ethopoeia* of (bad/fake) *eunoia* (in attempting to please the denizens of the dark corners, with the motivation being self-serving). It also puts doubt in the minds of right-leaning PPC populist voters to question if Bernier is faithful to the radical statements he professes. But one of the constraints of Facebook is the pressure for perfection and clarity in posts. Scheer’s and Bernier’s imperfect video clips of the leaders’ closing remarks in an open debate format were not shareworthy material by Facebook norms in 2019, therefore this verbal debate exchange was rejected from the digital museum of the Scheer Conservatives and the Bernier PPCs social media accounts, unseen by voters on these platforms, instead replaced by other on-brand debate-related digitally recorded memories for repeated viewing through their social media accounts.

5.1.2. Asserting a Party’s Leader “Wins” the Debate: 2015 Compared to 2019

In 2015 and again in 2019, the debate-related Facebook posts receiving the most shares were from the Conservative Party, and identically, enacted *ethopoeia* in constructing their leaders’ *ethos* in an [insert leader here] “wins” debate promotional message. In 2015, the Conservative Party claimed, “Prime Minister Stephen Harper Wins First Debate” and the image

post was shared 2,945 times (2015a) (Figure 0-1). Four years later in 2019, the Conservative Party posted, “Andrew Scheer Wins Debate” and the image post was shared 3,451 times (2019a) (Figure 0-67). This rhetorical move gained traction on social media for the Harper Conservatives in 2015, and it gained traction and attention again for the Scheer Conservatives in 2019. This copycat Facebook post by the Conservative Party uses the affordances of Facebook and the rhetorical figure *ethopoeia* to promote their leader as a “winner,” *whomever* the Conservative leader is at the time of the debate. The Conservative Party leader is exchangeable in the eyes of the party—Harper or Scheer—it does not matter. The Conservative Party is the constant factor. And winning confers *phronesis* automatically, if not the full range of the ethotic dimensions. It is the Conservative Party leader that “wins” the debate with the message shared on Facebook that propagates widely. The promotion of information by a credible political party through Facebook provides the illusion of fact to viewers, but one of the characteristics of Facebook is the platform allows for statements without substantiation, making it impossible for receivers of the message to decipher fact from opinion, which can lead to misinformation. This characteristic, in other words, is an affordance for anyone seeking to advance unsubstantiated claims, but an obstacle, if not a constraint to users, who care about making fact-based evaluations. Thus, the Conservative Party’s use of Facebook, in asserting that their [insert leader here] “wins” debate, was a successful move in receiving the greatest number shares on the platform for debate-related posts. But the promotion of these types of unsubstantiated opinion-based messages, shared by a reputable governmental organization through Facebook, has the potential to perpetuate misinformation.

5.1.3. Constructing an Ideological and Rhetorical Divide Between Parties and Leaders: 2019 Compared to 2015

In 2019, debate-related Facebook posts were overt in constructing an ideological and rhetorical divide between parties and leaders. In 2019, the Bloc Québécois identified a difference in treatment between French-speaking people in English Canada compared to English-speaking people in Québec (2019a) (Figure 0-92). The Liberal Party created a division between themselves and the Conservatives through a leader silhouette word cloud, depicting Scheer's *ethos* with the words within Scheer's blue silhouette, and depicting Trudeau's *ethos* with the language within Trudeau's red silhouette (2019b) (Figure 0-76). In 2019 on Facebook we see a post of Scheer's *ethopoeic prosopopoeia* blast from his opening remarks where he chastises Trudeau for (bad) *arete* in not remembering "how many times he put blackface on because the fact of the matter is he is always wearing a mask" (2019g), a hypocrisy charge, concluding with, "Mr. Trudeau, you're a phoney and you're a fraud and you do not deserve to govern this country' – Andrew Scheer" (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2019b) (Figure 0-68), a statement which circulated widely. In the 2015 debate-related Facebook posts, parties and leaders were more tempered in using *ethopoeia* and *prosopopoeia* in pushing ideological and rhetorical divides.

In the most shared 2015 debate-related Facebook posts, the Harper Conservatives, Mulcair's NDP, and the May Greens, often promoted their own track record and policy plans, or criticized another party more generally, with fewer of the top shared Facebook posts directly critiquing other leaders' *ethos*. But Trudeau used Facebook differently than the other parties or leaders. In his top shared posts, Trudeau directly criticized Harper's character, not just his

policies. In 2015, Trudeau's posts also attracted the most attention and propagation on Facebook, promoting the ideological division between the Trudeau Liberals and the Harper Conservatives.

Two video posts of Trudeau's closing statement, "Real Change" (Trudeau 2015i) (Figure 0-9), which was the second most shared Facebook post, and "A Better Canada is Always Possible" (Trudeau 2015t) (Figure 0-10), which was the third most shared Facebook post (and top retweeted Twitter post) (Trudeau 2015u) (Figure 0-36), effectively demonstrates this direction. In these two posts, Trudeau's words were strategically selected to directly focus on contrasting the *ethos* of the Trudeau Liberal's "A Better Canada is Always Possible" message to the Harper Conservative's government focus on economic stability and maintaining the status quo; it brilliantly combines hopefulness and promise with a condemnation of what the Conservatives saw as their strong suit. It turns 'stability' into 'inertia' and plays well against the fear-inducing elements of the Harper campaign concerning such divisive proposals as the 'barbaric cultural practices,' where the Conservatives proposed a ban on face coverings during Canadian citizenship ceremonies. Trudeau closes the debate by using Harper's name specifically, and directly links Harper to the Conservative *ethopoeic* media assaults on his (lack of) ability for the role of Prime Minister, *ethopoeia* of *phronesis*, stating that "Mr. Harper has spent millions of dollars on attack ads trying to convince you that I'm not ready for this job" (Trudeau 2015i) (Figure 0-9). Trudeau's closing remarks in 2015 were in such stark contrast from traditional policy-driven closing statements in past debates that in the media scrum following the debate, Peter Kim of *Global News* said to Trudeau, "your closing remarks were [...] kind of horrible," asking him what message he was "trying to communicate with those closing remarks? Because they were markedly different from everyone else" ("Replay: Maclean's National Leaders' Debate" 2015). Trudeau responded by identifying that he was focused on communicating the

connection that he has with Canadians and discussing the “kind of future that we want to build” (“Replay: Maclean’s National Leaders’ Debate” 2015). Trudeau then uses *prosopopoeic ethopoeia* to render Harper for Kim in these terms, dividing Harper’s ‘vision’ from his own and amalgamating his own with all Canadians: “Mr. Harper’s vision for this country is one that says we should be grateful for what we have, and not aspire to any more. Well, I disagree with that, and I know Canadians disagree with that, and that’s exactly what I was happy to address in my close” (“Replay: Maclean’s National Leaders’ Debate” 2015). One of the most powerful marketing strategies for connecting with customers is aspiration (Aten 2021), and Trudeau promotes this in his communication. Trudeau is defining a Canada for voters that he aspires it to be, without talking about details of the policies that he will use to get it there. In contrast to most debate closing statements, Trudeau is selling an idea, not his policies.

The direct type of ethotic representation of Harper by Trudeau is also reinforced visually by the fourth most shared debate-related Facebook post in 2015, showing a red isosceles triangle dividing Trudeau from Harper on the debate stage, visually removing the other two leaders, with text addressing Harper, reading, “Trudeau to Harper: ‘Canadians know that you’ve let them down because you’ve chosen to give benefits and tax breaks to the wealthiest Canadians – Justin Trudeau’” (Trudeau 2015) (Figure 0-11). This *prosopopoeic ethopoeia* post, speaking *prosopopoeically* as a Canadian, *ethopoeically* saying that Harper has let them down, came from Trudeau’s account, and visually and textually identified Harper by stating his name. Trudeau did not state “the Conservative Party,” but rather chastised Harper directly in his message, creating a memorable and poignant engagement between the two adversaries for all to view on the social media platform.

While Trudeau's most shared posts in 2015 focused on differentiating Trudeau ethotically from Harper, often using *ethopoeia* to depict the other leaders' character, the other political parties and leaders did not use the affordances of Facebook to their full extent in 2015. Instead of having the *ethopoeic* contentious statements coming from the leaders' Facebook accounts, in 2015 political parties accounts more often shared those combative type of messages depicting the *ethos* of another leader or party. In one of the NDP's top shared Facebook posts, a rhetorical divide between the NDP and the Liberals was visually displayed. The ninth most shared debate-related post was an image showing a populated orange rectangle of the NDP's proposed \$15 minimum wage plan, where 100,000 low-income workers would receive a wage increase, contrasted beside an empty red rectangle showing no minimum wage raise increase under the Liberal plan (Canada's NDP/Le NPD du Canada 2015a) (Figure 0-14). But whereas Trudeau directly identified Harper by name in his Facebook posts, the NDP discussed "the Liberal plan," rather than identifying Trudeau specifically. It is unknown whether the NDP avoided identifying Trudeau because of his celebrated personal charisma or because of a principle to concentrate on platforms rather than people, but it can be said that the Liberals' *ethopoeic* strategy worked much better for them than the NDP's more abstract approach worked for them.

However, the NDP did not entirely avoid *ethopoeia*. In another, less widely shared post, the NDP amalgamated Trudeau with Harper ethotically, showing a video clip of Trudeau voting in line with Harper in favour of Bill C-51, the anti-terrorism act, and describing Trudeau as "naïve" and repeating the Conservative *ethopoeic* messaging about Trudeau: "When it comes to making the right decisions, Justin Trudeau isn't up to the job" (Canada's NDP/Le NPD du Canada 2015c) (Figure 0-15). But as this post came from the NDP's Facebook account, and not

Mulcair's Facebook account, it did not have the same ethotic weight that Trudeau's *mano-a-mano*-seeming Facebook *apostrophes* did in 'taking on' Harper directly through social media. And these posts were less widely shared through the platform.

The Conservatives more subtly differentiated Harper from Trudeau and Mulcair, promoting campaign messaging about "who has the proven experience to keep Canada safe and our economy strong" (Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada 2015c) (Figure 0-2). But, again, as the Conservative messaging did not directly identify Trudeau or Mulcair, and did not specifically say that these leaders would not be able to keep Canada safe and our economy strong, the effect of the Conservative Party's message was muted.

Facebook's affordances of providing a public platform that coaxed and promoted frequent "thought notes" where Trudeau could directly address Harper by name, was a tool the Liberal leader wielded effectively in 2015. Facebook blurs the lines between public and private conversations, so the affordances of the platform gave Trudeau the opportunity to use the medium to *ethopoeically* depict Harper's character, in what appeared to be a more personal way, than say the Liberal Party's organization attacking the Conservative Party's organization or vice versa. As followers of Trudeau had a framing that Trudeau was directly communicating through the social medium to Harper, which was done in a public way for all followers to see (i.e., it was *apostrophic*), the messages from Trudeau carried more impact than even the best Liberal Party directed advertisement about the Conservative Party could.

5.1.4. Curating Favourable Leader Posts by ‘Cherry-Picking’ Traditional Media: 2019 Compared to 2015

While in 2019 the incorporation of traditional media was used more regularly by parties and leaders in their curated statements on Facebook, promoting their respective leaders,⁴⁷ in 2015 utilizing traditional media on social media was novel, and many parties and leaders failed to use traditional media on social media to its fullest potential. But not the Trudeau Liberals. They were at the forefront of effectively incorporating traditional media into their Facebook posts in 2015, promoting the validity of Trudeau and his statements through the more trusted ‘fourth estate,’ constructing Trudeau’s *ethos*.

In 2015, Facebook began hosting content from prominent media outlets, expanding the reach of news coverage available through the platform. Clicking a news item on Facebook would not redirect the Facebook user to the news organization’s site, but instead a new page on Facebook’s site (Francoli, Greenberg, and Waddell 2016, 226). Even though this feature was not as actively employed in 2015, highly shared debate-related Liberal Party posts on Facebook included select content taken from traditional media in the promotion of their leader, Trudeau. In seventh place overall for Facebook’s most shared debate-related content, the Liberal Party *ethopoeically* promoted a quote from political pundit Craig Oliver stating, “this was prime time and Justin Trudeau was clearly ready” (2015b) (Figure 0-5), which flipped the Harper Conservative’s advertisement language (also endorsed by Mulcair’s NDP) which had been framing Trudeau as “just not ready” (Conservative — Conservateur 2015). Another highly

⁴⁷ References and figures for these media deployments are as follows: the Liberal Party (2019c; Slaughter 2019) (Figure 0-73 and Figure 0-74), the Conservative Party (2019c) (Figure 0-69), Canada’s NDP (2019d) (Figure 0-80), the Green Party (2019b) (Figure 0-86), Bloc’s Blanchet (2019c; Martineau 2019) (Figure 0-97 and Figure 0-98) and the People’s Party of Canada (2019f; Bronskill 2019) (Figure 0-100 and Figure 0-101).

shared Liberal Party post stated, “The reviews are in. Please share to show your support” (2015c; “The Reviews Are In: First Round Goes to Trudeau” 2015) (Figure 0-6) and linked to an article of 16 positive pundit comments *ethopoeically* depicting Trudeau’s debate performance (“The Reviews Are In: First Round Goes to Trudeau” 2015) (Figure 0-7). The “please share” dimension encouraged users to *prosopopoeically* join their *ethos* with Trudeau’s and align themselves with his success. Also highly shared was an image post of eight positive pundit comments on Trudeau’s debate performance presented by the Liberal Party through Facebook (2015a) (Figure 0-8), not only incorporating the credibility of traditional media sources, but also leveraging the strength-in-numbers ‘choral’ strategy of multiple voices.

Although other parties and leaders did attempt to include traditional media into their posts, Trudeau’s got more online traction. Mulcair awkwardly promoted himself through Facebook with three pundit quotes supporting his claim that he had won the debate, with an image post stating, “Tom Mulcair wins first leaders’ debate” (2015h) (Figure 0-17). This message on Facebook was the eighth most shared debate-related message. And on Twitter, the Conservative Party’s CPC Debate *ethopoeically* connected Harper’s leadership with a study conducted by the *Reputation Institute* that stated “Canada is the ‘most admired’ country with the ‘best reputation’ in the world [...] based on a variety of environmental, political, and economic factors” (CTV News 2015) (Figure 0-29). The Harper Conservatives *ethopoeically* connected this study to Harper’s leadership stating, “With @PMHarper Canada is the most admired country in the world: tinyurl.com/pvakmyk #elxn42 #macdebate” (CPC Debate 2015d) (Figure 0-28), with a link to the CTV News article. But in 2015, it was the Trudeau Liberals that excelled in their use of Facebook in constructing Trudeau’s ethotic capital with the *ethopoeic* corroboration of traditional media.

5.1.5. Implications of Facebook's Evolution on Political Leaders' Debates

Facebook's evolution is transforming the political landscape, and particularly leaders' debates, in four important ways. First, the Facebook platform supports voters in liking or following their preferred political leader or party, rather than liking or following *all* political parties and leaders. Of course people *can* follow all parties and leaders, but they do not *have* to; however poorly they are currently followed, this non-policy is in very distinct counterpoint to the traditional policy of legacy media for balanced political coverage.⁴⁸ This means that those who primarily get their political information from their favourite party and leader on Facebook, will rarely be getting equally comprehensive information from the various parties and leaders as they would if watching traditional news media, such as television or radio news, which historically promotes 'equal airtime' for all parties. Facebook does away with the 'equal airtime' constraint of traditional news media, instead promoting siloing of leaders' remarks. For example, someone who follows only the Conservative Party, and its leader, will predominantly receive information and viewpoints about the Liberal Party and its leader, or the NDP and its leader, *ethopoeically* framed by the Conservative Party. They will also receive information using *prosopopoeia* in self-promotion of their favoured leader and party. Leaders' debates are one of the few events where voters receive diverse information and perspectives from the various 'non-followed' political parties and leaders speaking about their platforms and policies. But if voters do not watch the leaders' debate, their perceptions of the debate will be entirely framed by the sources that they follow. Even voters who witness the event, will have their perception of the debate shaped by the subsequent social media curations. This preference in following one political leader or party,

⁴⁸ See, for instance, the CBC's *Journalistic Standards and Practices*, <https://cbc.radio-canada.ca/en/vision/governance/journalistic-standards-and-practices>

rather than many, is evident through Trudeau's over 6,894,961 followers on Facebook in 2019, compared to the second most liked Facebook page, the Conservative Party, with 456,579. The other parties' and leaders' Facebook page likes and followers are lower (Table 1). As the platform encourages becoming 'friends' with those you know and encourages people to 'like' or 'follow' a political party or political leader, it is unsurprising that users' media-consumption practices strongly favour parties and leaders that conform to their ideological viewpoints, and avoid following or liking the other parties' and leaders' social media account whose viewpoints do not conform. Friend networks themselves can further amplify this ideological siloing, in a feedback loop with the algorithm. Other people in one's network can see what posts one likes and who they follow, so users may not 'like' or 'follow' a particular party or leader with apprehension that 'friends' may evaluate them for paying attention to a party or leader with questionable ideological views, different from their own. For example, those who have 'liked' and 'followed' Trudeau and the Liberal Party, may not 'like' or 'follow' Bernier and the PPC. But by not 'liking' or 'following' the various Canadian parties and leaders through social media, voters are excluding themselves from being exposed to primary information on the various political parties' and leaders' ideas and policy shared through the platforms, instead receiving second-hand information on the party and leader, *ethopoeically* framed by the party and leader they do 'like' and 'follow.' The issue with receiving political and personal information through Facebook about one leader, rather than receiving content from all parties and leaders through Facebook, is the viewer is not receiving balanced information, but rather partisan information, entering an echo chamber, where messaging is one-sided, created, and regurgitated, in the corresponding party's or leader's favour. In addition, once a party or leader is followed, the voter is given additional access to the party or leader by being provided details about the leader that is

political, but also personal in nature, content related to their family, their partners, their children, their workouts, and their daily life activities, in the same way viewers would receive information on their newsfeed from their actual friends on Facebook. This additional personal information about the leader, shared through the medium, may evoke *pathos* and *ethos* in the viewer towards the ‘liked’ and ‘followed’ leader, building their trust, while in reality, the leader is displaying a produced and branded persona on the platform. This affects the *entechnic* ethotic element of the leaders’ debate, as the reputation that precedes the leaders’ performance disposes the audience to receive the performance more favourably. Trudeau, for example, would be known (and likely favoured) over Scheer or Singh, for the mere fact that he is ‘liked’ and ‘followed’ more on Facebook, and his posts appear in a greater number of social media users Facebook newsfeeds, among the comments, images, and video posts of their actual friends.

A second way Facebook is affecting leaders’ debates is the platform distorts the line between fact and opinion, and there is no vetting process in place on Facebook to ensure that the information being shared is factual. This gets more complicated because the information being shared on Facebook occurs through official political parties’ accounts and official political leaders’ accounts, indicated on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, with a blue checkmark, and could be perceived by viewers as communication material from the Canadian government. For instance, viewers may believe that Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, or Opposition Leader Andrew Scheer, is sharing only fact-based information and not opinion-based material through Facebook. But as the Facebook medium is open source, with algorithms giving preference to material that is shareworthy, often promoting more sensational content, parties and leaders that want their messages to be propagated, use the medium to share facts, but also opinions, with no reprisal for distributing misinformation. This affects political debates, as these outlandish messages stated

during the debate to garner attention are often received differently through social media, as the outlandish statement on Facebook stands in isolation, with none of the refutations from other leaders included in the post, as would be heard during a debate. These messages taken from the debate, broadcasted, and shared widely through the official parties' and official leaders' Facebook accounts, are placed without context, which fosters the statement to appear to have more authoritative and legitimate qualities than it may actually have. The government leaders and parties need to be more thoughtful of the implication in promoting sensational or questionable information, and most importantly misinformation, on social media for followers to view. Although social media may be a platform designed for entertainment purposes, Trudeau, Scheer, Singh, the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party, and all parties and leaders, have an elevated position of responsibility and duty of care to provide credible information to the public in all their communication, and should not get the same leeway as an average social media user, in the promotion of opinion over fact through their social media accounts.

Yet another way Facebook is affecting leaders' debates is that parties and leaders can promote themselves through *prosopopoeia* or disparage adversaries through *ethopoeia* on the platform without recourse. In a leaders' debate, one leader may promote themselves of having accomplished a policy promise through *prosopopoeia* or may attack another leaders' character or accuse them of a transgression through *ethopoeia*. Other leaders then can refute their claim or can respond to the accusation. On Facebook, however, there is no direct or effective way for opposing views to be communicated, or the indicted leader to defend themselves through the medium. In the event of a claim against another leader, the accusing leader's post can go viral within moments, leaving the accused leader wearing the other leaders' words (*ethopoeia*), and

unable to effectively counter the narrative described of them, once the statement, image, or video, has been published through the social media platform.

A fourth way that Facebook is affecting leaders' debates is that parties and leaders can include traditional media into their Facebook posts, using outside sources to corroborate their message. But parties and leaders can also misappropriate traditional media using inaccurate or incomplete statements from traditional media in their Facebook posts. A quote being used in a Facebook post may be taken out of context, be incomplete, or may have removed additional content or context that contradicts a parties' or leaders' Facebook claim. Links to the news articles can be provided to substantiate claims on Facebook, but do not need to be. Parties and leaders can simply use a quote from the news article that supports their leader or party and provide credit to the traditional news publication for the statement in their post. When a link is provided to the article, this has the illusion of providing support for their claim; however, the user needs to examine the authenticity of the linked article, which could be written as an opinion piece, rather than a news piece, which is a different genre in journalistic reporting. The news article could also have conflicting information in the article than what the political parties' or leaders' have drawn attention to in their post, leaving the social media reader responsible to complete their due diligence in assessing how 'true' the parties' or leaders' Facebook post message is.

5.2. Twitter: Affordances and Constraints Fostering *Prosopopoeia* and *Ethopoeia* in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate Compared to Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

Trudeau dominated Twitter with the most retweeted posts in 2015, whereas in 2019 Trudeau, Singh, and the Conservative Party, competed among the top spots for Twitter's most

retweeted debate-related posts. One reason for the lack of successful 2015 Harper Conservative debate-related posts on Twitter is that the political party and leader did not use the affordances of Twitter's platform effectively. Rather than hosting debate-related content through Harper's Twitter account, which had 920,434 followers in 2015, the greatest number of Twitter followers of any party or leader in 2015, or using the Conservative Party's Twitter account, which had 76,246 followers, the Harper Conservatives mistakenly created a new CPC Debate Twitter account to circulate debate-related posts (Table 2). In contrast to the large digital Twitter following accumulated over time for Harper and the Conservative Party, the recently created CPC Debate Twitter account gained only 684 followers. Twitter posts distributed on the CPC Debate account went virtually unseen, and the Harper Conservatives missed a golden opportunity to utilize Twitter's digital reach to the followers they already had accumulated, as their debate-related posts did not gain the retweet traction that their competitors, such as Trudeau, with 833,132 followers, did. The Conservative Party's error is one reason why Trudeau's Twitter posts succeeded in dominating most of the top shared debate-related spots in 2015. The core Conservative Party followers opted-in to receive Twitter posts from Harper, and to a lesser extent the Conservative Party, resulting in only one Harper debate-related post propagating widely on the platform through shares, tying in ninth place with Trudeau, with the remaining top spots for shared content secured by Trudeau's Twitter, with one post by the Liberal Party securing third place (Table 5).

5.2.1. Requesting Followers to “Agree” With and Share Parties’ and Leaders’

Debate-Related Posts: 2015 Compared to 2019

In 2015, requesting followers to “RT if you agree” (CPC Debate 2015c; NDP 2015a) (Figure 0-27; Figure 0-52), and “share if you agree” (Liberal Party 2015b) (Figure 0-33) was

used in some of the most retweeted debate-related posts, suggesting the requests worked. The retweet affordance on Twitter encourages users to *prosopopoeically* join their *ethos* with the political party and leader by retweeting the message to their own following network, aligning themselves with the leader's success. Similar requests were used in 2019 on Twitter as well, with the Conservative Party asking followers to, for instance, "SHARE this video if you think Justin Trudeau belongs in provincial politics #cdnpoli #elxn43" (2019d) (Figure 0-108) and Bernier promoting a new PPC advertisement asking followers to, "Watch and SHARE" (2019f) (Figure 0-145). Perhaps because of the general overuse of this strategy, however, by 2019 the simple request of asking followers to "agree," "RT," and "share" a post for the sake of sharing, without a compelling message in the Twitter post enticing the follower to want to share the political parties' or leaders' post, shows up less frequently within the most retweeted debate-related posts. Following networks were more willing to make these active ethotic investments in their parties and leaders in 2015, apparently, than in 2019. In 2019, viewers tend to retweet messages that resonate with them, rather than simply following direction. Research suggests that the most retweeted Twitter content typically originates with a celebrity or another influential user (Murthy 2018, 98), is part of a social movement (Murthy 2018, 134), or is simply interesting content. So, when political parties and leaders provide posts that are compelling, following networks share their content, *prosopopoeically* associating themselves with the message communicated in the post. This is demonstrated in 2019, with parties' and leaders' debate-related Twitter posts having approximately three times as many retweets compared to debate-related posts of 2015, without requesting users to "share" or "retweet" the post.

5.2.2. Reinforcing Leaders' Debate-Related Talking Points and Zingers: 2015

Compared to 2019

In 2015, Twitter helped to reinforce Trudeau's *ethopoeic* talking points depicting the character of his Conservative opponent when asserting, "Stephen Harper broke his promise never to appoint a single Senator. 59 times. #elxn42," (Trudeau 2015j) (Figure 0-37) and declaring with the image post text (prefaced "Trudeau to Harper:"), "'Canadians know that you've let them down because you've chosen to give benefits and tax breaks to the wealthiest Canadians.' – Justin Trudeau" (Trudeau 2015k) (Figure 0-39). Less widely shared, the NDP restated Mulcair's *ethopoeic* debate quips in Twitter image posts promoting, "'Honestly, Mr. Harper, we really can't afford another 4 years of you.' #Ready4Change #NDP #elxn42 #macdebate" (2015b) (Figure 0-50), "You're the only Prime Minister who when asked about recessions on his watch, has to ask: which one?" (2015c) (Figure 0-51), and "Taxpayers have spent \$1 billion on the corrupt Senate under Mr. Harper. Think of the child care spaces that could have been created instead" (2015a) (Figure 0-52). Parties and leaders worked with Twitter's constraint of a 140-character count limit (expanded to 280-characters by 2019), through image posts incorporating quotes, video posts, links to websites, and interesting visuals.

In 2019, political parties and leaders more vigorously utilized *ethopoeia* and the affordances of Twitter to reinforce debate-related talking points and zingers depicting the *ethos* of their opponents. The Conservative Party promoted a video clip from the debate of Scheer *ethopoeically* telling Trudeau he is "oddly obsessed with provincial politics" and to "go run for the leadership of that party, Mr. Trudeau" (2019d) (Figure 0-108). Other posts used text to depict their adversary. But rather than using the actual quote spoken in the leaders' debate, and sharing it on Twitter, posts are often edited before being posted online to provide a more perfected

version, eliminating crosstalk, and cleaning up the syntax of the leaders. When Trudeau, through crosstalk, addressed Bernier in the debate, we got this:

Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Bernier —
Hon. Maxime Bernier: Only six percent —
Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: — your role on this stage tonight seems to be —
Hon. Maxime Bernier: — only six perc—
Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: — to say publicly what Mr. Scheer thinks privately.

His statement gets a new, clearer, and more effective life, as “.@JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli ‘Mr. Bernier, your role on this stage right now seems to be to say publicly what Mr. Scheer believes privately. – Justin Trudeau’” (Trudeau 2019f) (Figure 0-119). On Twitter, Trudeau is *ethopoically* accusing Bernier of a ‘stealth’ *prosopopoeia* (Bernier is not just speaking for himself but speaking for Scheer) to *ethopoically* characterize the muted Scheer as indistinguishable from the candid Bernier—*ethopoic prosopopoeia*.

When in the debate Trudeau addressed Blanchet, we got this:

Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: I think by definition, a Quebecker can do anything a Canadian can do because a Quebecker is a Canadian —
Yves-François Blanchet: — that we can do ourselves (crosstalk) no less typical (crosstalk) —
Rt. Hon. Justin Trudeau: — and will remain a Canadian under my watch, Mr. Blanchet.
Yves-François Blanchet: — do our own thing.

But on Twitter, the statement is: “‘A Québecer is a Canadian and will remain a Canadian under my watch.’ - @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli” with an image post displaying “By definition, a Québecer can do anything a Canadian can do, because a Québecer is

a Canadian and will remain a Canadian under my watch. – Justin Trudeau” (Liberal Party 2019a) (Figure 0-113). One affordance of Twitter is that the political parties and leaders can isolate and publish augmented debate quote statements on Twitter, without the noise of the debate affecting their message. The statement is removed from the context of the debate and stands alone on social media. Whereas Trudeau’s statement to Blanchet may have been said at an inopportune time in the debate muted by crosstalk, on social media the interference disappears, allowing for Trudeau’s statement to shine. However, by sharing Trudeau’s debate message on social media with quote marks around the words, it implies providing a digital record of the leaders’ spoken words in the debate, when what is presented on Twitter, is actually an edited more eloquent account. Viewers may believe the shared tweets are a factual digital record of Trudeau’s debate statements, where in reality, it is not these seamless quotes, as the crosstalk with Bernier, and the crosstalk with Blanchet, are missing, and this crosstalk has an impact on the messages audiences heard during the debate, ruining leaders’ curational moments. But with Twitter reinforcing the leaders’ intended debate message online, a variation of reality, the actual spoken debate statements are now replaced with the edited, more perfected versions of the *ethopoeic* claims for all to see and remember.

5.2.3. Providing a Debate ‘Do-Over’ for Leaders: 2019 Compared to 2015

In 2019, the debate ‘do-over’ on Twitter benefitted many parties and leaders, and as Richard Lanham asserts, human memory “is immensely enhanced by the awesome search and retrieval powers of digital memory” (1993, 76). An example is Singh’s ‘representative’ *prosopopoeia* (Kampher 2019, 70) debate-related Twitter message, “A man has no place in a discussion of a woman’s right to choose #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn43,” which was said twice by Singh during the debate, with the second version curated as the most shared debate-related

tweet (2019c) (Figure 0-124). But this was not Singh's only post that benefited from the affordance of Twitter's digital do-over capabilities. As the sixth most retweeted message, Singh's Twitter post effectively condensed his disjointed debate statement from:

You do not need to choose between Mr. Delay and Mr. Deny. There is another option. (Laughter). There is another option out there. We are committed to a real plan that's going to take on the biggest polluters. It's going to take on the powerful interests because that's what we need to do. If we want to build a better future, it's going to mean taking on the powerful (Singh 2019i)

into Twitter's 280-character count with,

You don't have to choose between Mr. Delay (@JustinTrudeau) & Mr. Deny (@AndrewScheer). It's time to start fighting the climate crisis like we want to win by taking on the largest polluters & creating 300,000 new jobs in the clean energy economy of the future. #CanadaDebates2019. (2019h) (Figure 0-125)

In the seventh most shared debate-related Twitter post, Singh was able to restate,

What we have here is Mr. Trudeau, Mr. Scheer arguing about who's worse for Canada. Really, we should be, (audience laughter), we've got to start arguing, we got to start presenting who is going to be best for Canada (2019i)

into a unified, edited statement that read,

What we're seeing tonight is Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Scheer arguing over what is worse for Canada. I believe we need to be fighting for what will be best for Canada. We need to demand more – not be scared into settling for less. #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn43 (2019g) (Figure 0-126).

Twitter's affordances also provided Trudeau with a digital do-over. During crosstalk Trudeau questioned Scheer with, "Why the \$50,000 tax break for the wealthy?" But on Twitter, securing fifth place for most shares, Trudeau's question to Scheer appears seamless, more eloquent: "I asked you during the debate, @AndrewScheer and you still haven't answered: why are you offering millionaires a \$50,000 tax break and 17 billion dollars in cuts for everybody else? #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli" (2019e) (Figure 0-118). The Twitter debate digital do-

over in 2019 benefited the Scheer Conservatives, the Trudeau Liberals, Singh’s NDP, and the May Greens.⁴⁹ But in 2015, digital do-overs on Twitter predominantly benefited Trudeau.

In 2015, placing second for most debate-related retweets was Trudeau’s silent video, “Stephen Harper broke his promise never to appoint a single Senator. 59 times. #elxn42” (Trudeau 2015j) (Figure 0-37). Looking at Twitter it would not be evident, however, that during the debate it was Mulcair that first stated:

Mr. Harper promised solemnly to Canadians that he would never name an appointed senator. He’s gone on to break a record and name 59 of them. (2015f)

Trudeau, following Mulcair, then stated a strikingly similar message:

The fact is he made a solemn promise never to appoint a senator and he broke that promise on his very first day as Prime Minister by appointing Michael Fortier to the senator – to the Senate. And then he broke that promise 58 more times. (2015q)

At the segment’s end, during crosstalk Trudeau ensured that he stated, “You broke your promise 59 times” (Trudeau 2015q). On Twitter, however, Mulcair’s voice on the topic of Senators was eliminated and Trudeau claimed ownership of the silent, *logos* filled video about Harper naming 59 Senators (Trudeau 2015j) (Figure 0-37), even though in the debate, Mulcair had said it first. As Trudeau’s statement about Harper naming 59 Senators was stated during crosstalk, and the same statement was already made by Mulcair, Trudeau was using ‘stealth’ *prosopopoeia*, co-opting the voice of Mulcair, while performing authenticity, to *ethopoeically* reinforce his talking point—*prosopopoeic ethopoeia*. Trudeau took on the positions of others, Mulcair, and the Liberal Party, and ensured that the pre-recorded social media post publicized on social media appeared authentic.

⁴⁹ References and figures for these media deployments are as follows: the Conservative Party (2019d) (Figure 0-108), the Liberal Party [(2019a) (Figure 0-113); (2019b) (Figure 0-114)], Canada’s NDP [(2019a) (Figure 0-121); (2019b) (Figure 0-123)], and the Green Party [(2019b) (Figure 0-128); (2019c) (Figure 0-129)].

Similarly, on Twitter, with the fourth most shared post, Trudeau states, “On the environment, Stephen Harper trusts his ideology. Liberals will trust science. #elxn42” (Trudeau 2015h) (Figure 0-38). During the debate, Trudeau did not discuss Harper’s ideologies or science. It was Mulcair who challenged Harper on his environmental record of supporting pipelines. Mulcair addressed the viewers, and said that if he were Prime Minister:

I am taking the position that you can study these things – these projects. Ms. May takes the position that you can say no to them, all of them, in advance. Mr. Harper is taking the position that you can say yes to all of them in advance. We want a clear, thorough, credible process that the public can have confidence in. (2015f)

But Harper countered Mulcair’s claim, and responded that the Harper government retains scientific experts when assessing projects:

No, the position of the government is that we have a scientific expert evaluation of every project before we decide to proceed. That’s how the government – that’s how the government has handled these projects. Mr. Mulcair, by his own admission, has already ruled out a number of projects before they even went through the process and is – and is positioning himself to be against others as well. (2015c)

Trudeau responded to this segment on the environment promoting a price on carbon:

As was pointed out, 86 per cent of our economy have committed to put a price on carbon with the actions of four different provinces that have taken up the leadership that this government has simply not shown. – The Liberal Party is focused on working with those provinces to make sure we do reduce emissions because that’s what actually Canadians expect in order to be good players in the global economy. (Trudeau 2015q)

On Twitter however, in this statement, Trudeau again performs a ‘stealth’ *prosopopoeia*, adopting the voice of Mulcair, and the Liberal Party, in promoting science (*prosopopoeia*), while suggesting that Harper does not support science (*ethopoeia*)—*prosopopoeic ethopoeia*. This idea and statement were not explicitly said in the debate by Trudeau, nor does this tweet directly relate to the conversation being had in the debate at the time of the post, except for it being posted at the end of the segment on the environment. The affordance of Twitter permits parties

and leaders to have a ‘do-over,’ promoting messages that leaders may have blundered, replacing missed key arguments in statements with the appropriate assertions, providing leaders the opportunity to restate something said during crosstalk that may have gone unheard, or to state a comment intended to be said in the debate, but where the opportunity was missed to do so. In the above examples, Trudeau co-opted Mulcair’s voice, performing a ‘stealth’ *prosopopoeia*, to *ethopoeically* depict Harper’s *ethos*—*prosopopoeic ethopoeia*—with no external watchdog on Twitter to chastise Trudeau for doing it. Twitter fostered *prosopopoeic ethopoeia*, and in effect, altered the way viewers recall the debate based on what was presented on social media.

5.2.4. Affording Parties and Leaders with a Platform to Debate Contentious Issues: 2019 Compared to 2015

In 2019, Trudeau used Twitter to reignite his question to Scheer from the English-Language Debate about “offering millionaires a \$50,000 tax break” (Trudeau 2019e) (Figure 0-118), and the Liberal Party used the platform to answer a contentious housing tax question, asserting they would not put a “50% tax on the sale of your home” (Trudeau 2019j) (Figure 0-116). Raising contentious issues during the debate utilizing *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* and bringing them onto social media for all to see and discuss was not new for the Trudeau Liberals. In 2015, the Trudeau Liberals used social media to reintroduce contentious discussions from the 2015 Debate on Twitter, for all to view and participate in. Trudeau revived the debate topic of Québec separation from Canada on Twitter when declaring, “My number is 9. // Mon chiffre c’est 9. #elxn42” (Trudeau 2015p) (Figure 0-40), which was specified by Trudeau in the 2015 Debate during a heated exchange with Mulcair on the issue. A more comprehensive quote from Trudeau’s Twitter account followed, providing more context to the statement, “Trudeau to Mulcair: #elxn42 #macdebate ‘My number is nine. Nine supreme court justices said one vote is

not enough to break up this country and yet that is Mr. Mulcair’s position’ – Justin Trudeau” (Trudeau 2015s) (Figure 0-41). In this post, Trudeau used *prosopopoeia* in aligning himself with the nine supreme court justices who said one vote is not enough to break up the country, and also used *ethopoeia*, in insinuating to followers that Mr. Mulcair would allow one vote to break up the country—*prosopopoeic ethopoeia*. In another Twitter post, the Liberals show a clip from the debate, where Trudeau addresses Harper directly and states:

Mr. Harper has failed our veterans by nickel-and-diming them, by not giving them the service, the help that they need. And it’s something that we should all be ashamed of, that this government, that likes to wrap itself in the flag, is actually not caring for those people who have fought, injured themselves, and – in many cases, died – under that flag. (Trudeau 2015o) (Figure 0-42)

Trudeau’s statement posted by the Liberal Party *ethopoeically* depicts Harper as exploiting veterans and chastises the Conservative government for their ‘appearance’ of care for veterans, for adopting a mask of Canadian pride, while veterans are not being provided the services they require—*ethopoeic prosopopoeia*—an accusation of hypocrisy. In the debate, Harper denied Trudeau’s accusation asserting that “this government has made record investment in veterans” and is “spending 35 per cent more on the average veteran today directly than we were when we came to office” (2015c), but on Twitter, Trudeau’s statement stands alone for his followers to like, retweet, and comment on.

Twitter provides leaders the opportunity to bring conversations from the debate online, a platform that encourages followers to participate in the conversation and connects voters to a wider dialog on a topic through hashtags. In 2015, the Trudeau Liberals were the most effective at using the affordances of Twitter, which fostered the rhetorical figures *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, in promoting these contentious issues through social media.

5.2.5. Implications of Twitter's Evolution on Political Leaders' Debates

The implication of Twitter's evolution transpires in four important ways for political leaders' debates. First, Twitter's affordances and constraints are directing leaders' debates to become more about scripted talking points and prefabricated zingers, ripe with *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, than genuine debate between leaders on policy matters. The sound bite has steadily decreased from 43-seconds in 1968 to 8.9 seconds in 1988 (Hallin 1992, 6). With Twitter, publicized debate content is even more constrained. This is happening because Twitter's form and function promotes and encourages short, succinct, snappy, messages, videos, and images, those that fit within the parameters of 280-characters or less (140-characters or less in 2015), including links. If debate statements meet this prescribed character count, and viewers retweet their posts, the succinct debate message can easily propagate through the medium. But with Twitter's character count constraint and preference for concise messaging, even in image posts, statements by leaders during the debate are becoming more fractured to meet this requirement.

A second implication of Twitter on leaders' debates, is the statements during the debate are becoming more sensational, stated for attention, more so than for information, which fosters the use of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*. This occurs because what is said during the debate can feed the political parties' and leaders' social media accounts, increasing the currency of "eyeballs" (Lanham 2006, 7–8; Losh 2009, 69) on their debate message, as the more popular posts gain propagation through the medium by way of likes, retweets, and comments. In some instances, such as Trudeau's 2015 Debate message about Harper appointing 59 Senators, a pre-recorded video montage is ready and waiting for Trudeau to speak the prescribed message during the debate, so that the pre-recorded video can be shared through social media.

A third implication of Twitter on leaders' debates is content from the debate can be isolated, edited, molded, and presented in a beneficial form that favours the political party and leader on Twitter, if a good take is captured. Because of this, leaders take the opportunity to restate their message during the debate multiple times to ensure a usable image or video clip is garnered, so that the best version can be posted on social media. Leaders also blurt out scripted statements at inopportune times during the debate, which often does not fit into *microkairos* of the conversation, purely to ensure the statement is said within the prescribed debate theme, as the statement or clip will be presented in isolation on social media, and the debate will continue without the leaders being penalized for their digression. These digressions, of repeating the same message or blurting out scripted statements, is affecting the debate however, as the limited debate time is not being used to answer important questions or introduce new points for discussion, but rather is being misspent in delivering the party's campaign slogans, and surface level campaign promises, and in promoting sensational statements and zingers for reiteration on social media.

One further consequence of Twitter on leaders' debates, is that some voters believe that once they have seen the debate clips on social media, they have received the most important content and do not need to watch the leaders' debate. However, in actuality, what is viewed on a parties' or leaders' Twitter account related to the debate, is only that party's or leader's perspective of the leaders' debate. Twitter provides parties and leaders a platform to discuss what they wish without the requirement of having their information vetted by traditional media before being publicized. They can provide immediate and direct messaging from their Twitter account to followers, which addresses the topic of their choosing and states the information in the way they wish it to be presented, which can be shared widely through their following networks.

However, as the platform's structure is a newsfeed, it does not lend itself to easily having a two-way conversation, as a leaders' debate could. This means that when parties' or leaders' messages are stated with only one side illuminated to the voting population, it is more likely to be believed, as Twitter does not provide an effective system for an opposing party or leader to directly respond.

5.3. Instagram: Affordances and Constraints Fostering *Prosopopoeia* and *Ethopoeia* in Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate Compared to Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

In a digital environment change occurs quickly. In 2015, there were just two political leaders from the debate, Trudeau and Mulcair, who posted debate-related content on Instagram. Trudeau was part of Instagram's inception for Canadian political parties and political leaders. And as a widely known political influencer with international appeal, Trudeau grew with the platform, and in many ways, set a precedence for how other Canadian political leaders would use it too.⁵⁰

In 2019, all political parties and leaders, except for May, incorporated debate-related Instagram posts from the 2019 Debate. However, early Instagram adopter Trudeau, and to a lesser extent Singh, secured the highest reward in 2019 with the greatest number of Instagram followers over other parties or leaders. Trudeau's increase in followers on Instagram grew from 33,815 followers in 2015 to 3,264,210 followers in 2019, gaining over 96 times more followers (a 9,553 per cent increase). Mulcair had 7,633 followers in 2015, whereas Singh had 435,011 followers in 2019, an increase of almost 57 times more followers (a 5,599 per cent increase over

⁵⁰ Trudeau joined Instagram on 4 December 2012, a year following U.S. President Barack Obama, who joined on 3 January 2012. Harper, as Prime Minister, began using Instagram on 15 April 2013.

Mulcair's following). In 2019, Trudeau dominates Instagram with 7.5 times more followers than his closest Instagram rival, Singh (Table 9).

Instagram, with respect to parties' and leaders' debate-related posts, leads substantially with number of viewer engagements over Facebook and Twitter in 2019. Instagram's most liked debate-related Trudeau post in 2019 gained 181,464 likes (Table 9), the most engagement on any of the three platforms analyzed in this study. To put this number in perspective, the top debate-related shared Facebook post from the Conservative Party in 2019 gained 11,915 reactions, 10,517 likes, and 3,451 shares, while the top debate-related shared Twitter post by Singh in 2019 gained 22,720 likes and 4,206 retweets (Table 8). Instagram's viewer engagement for most likes of debate-related posts surpasses the engagement seen on Facebook by more than 15 times, and on Twitter by more than 8 times, demonstrating the digital reach and engagement of followers the platform has.

5.3.1. Providing Followers with a Behind-The-Scenes Intimate View of Leaders: 2015 Compared to 2019

Trudeau was an Instagram trailblazer in 2015, as one of only two Canadian political leaders posting debate-related visual content on the social media platform. Trudeau used Instagram in addition to Facebook and Twitter, to provide followers with a behind-the-scenes intimate view of himself in two widely liked debate-related images. But in 2019, Trudeau, Singh, Scheer, the Conservatives, the Green Party, Blanchet, Bernier, and the PPC,⁵¹ all used Instagram to provide followers with a behind-the-scenes glimpse of their debate day.

⁵¹ References and figures for these media deployments are as follows: Trudeau (Figure 0-162; Figure 0-163), Singh (Figure 0-166; Figure 0-167), Scheer (Figure 0-158), the Conservatives (Figure 0-157), the Greens (Figure 0-168), Blanchet (Figure 0-173), Bernier (Figure 0-178), and the People's Party of Canada (Figure 0-175),

For Trudeau, his top two 2015 debate-related posts were similar in their use of *prosopopoeia* to his top two 2019 most liked debate-related posts. In the same manner as Trudeau being captured on a phone call walking across a Toronto street after the debate, with intimate details provided to viewers of Trudeau being on a call with his “top advisor” wife, Sophie (Trudeau 2015b) (Figure 0-62), Trudeau’s Instagram post in 2019 posted an intimate off-centered selfie image, smiling into the camera, with two of his youngest children, with a caption stating, “The best kind of debate prep: walking these two to school this morning! CA La meilleure préparation pour un débat : aller les reconduire à l’école ce matin! (Trudeau 2019h) (Figure 0-162). This intimate selfie view of Trudeau, accompanied by his children, provides viewers with a seemingly more personal version of Trudeau. This image gained the most attention in likes compared to any other debate-related post on the platform and played to the affordances of the platform, incorporating himself in an Instagram selfie. Mark Borkowski states, “a selfie has to be ‘the real you.’ It works if you can give people a manageable piece of reality which is who you really are” (Day 2013). However, “the paradox at the heart of the selfie is that it masquerades as a ‘candid’ shot,” when in reality, it may be carefully posed and edited with all the right filters (Day 2013). This selfie image of Trudeau used identification to connect with his viewers who were also accustomed to including the selfie image in their own Instagram posts, while providing a persona of normality, *prosopopoeically* wearing the ‘mask’ of fatherhood, connecting walking his children to school to “debate prep.”

The second most liked 2019 Instagram post was also from Trudeau’s Instagram account and was reminiscent of his 2015 Instagram boxing image. Trudeau is back in the boxing ring in 2019 wearing black boxing gloves in a close-up image with a caption that reads, “Préparation pour le débat. Debate prep” (Trudeau 2019a) (Figure 0-163). Like his popular Instagram image

in 2015, this updated 2019 *prosopopoeic* boxing image of Trudeau evoked a comparable sexual appeal and physical appeal that is common on the Instagram platform, as well as an interesting artistic visual quality with the image. However, compared to 2015 when the boxing image was of a Canadian Liberal *leader* vying for the position of Prime Minister, which was novel itself, now followers see an image of a Canadian *Prime Minister*, showing his brawn in a boxing ring, connecting the mask of a boxer with “debate prep,” and again garnering attention internationally. The nature of visual symbols adds drama and interest in the “dramatization function” of visual politics (Schill 2012, 126), which is something that Trudeau encapsulates well through the Instagram platform.

While Trudeau dominated Instagram with the greatest number of likes on his two 2019 image posts, Singh’s seven-image carousel Instagram post showing images accompanied by his wife, adjusting his tie, and displaying cameras and reporters encircling him, also received a significant number of likes, coming in as the fourth most liked debate-related Instagram post.

The caption read:

Debate night is a wrap! I love every opportunity I get to share the stories of the people I've met across Canada – and offer our plan to make life easier for people, instead of protecting the interests of the rich & powerful. #elxn43
#CanadaDebates2019 CA C'est fini pour le débat de ce soir! C'est très important pour moi de saisir chaque occasion pour partager les histoires des gens que je rencontre à travers le Canada et présenter notre plan pour rendre votre vie plus facile, pas celle des plus riches. (Singh 2019d) (Figure 0-167)

Singh used the affordances of Instagram’s carousel feature to provide an “image bite” to his followers, which are “brief visual shots or video clips where candidates are shown but not heard” (Schill 2012, 120). Image bites, “can convey evidence for verbal arguments, provide heuristic cues for cognitive elaboration, or serve as arguments via association, connotation, and juxtaposition” (Schill 2012, 120). Singh in this instance is *prosopopoeically* adopting the partner-

mask and party-leader mask, and is demonstrating his readiness to debate, as well as his readiness to be Prime Minister.

The increased number of leader posts and behind-the-scene images that leaders' are sharing on Instagram in 2019 compared to 2015, shows the platform's growth in four years, and its rise in becoming one of the main social media platforms populated by parties and leaders in 2019. Leaders are using the platform to provide viewers with additional visual information into their lives, a contrived "transparency" of select images that visually and *prosopopoeically* depict a holistic *ethos* of not just a political leader, but a political leader who is a partner, a father, a friend, and so on, a leader with Instagramable "influencer" qualities.

5.3.2. Curating Information and Visuals in Favour of a Particular Leader: 2015 Compared to 2019

In 2015, Mulcair's Instagram post showed a cropped image of himself and his wife waving to a small gathering of NDP supporters, using *prosopopoeic ethopoeia* to suggest that "Canadians are #Ready4Change" in favour of a change towards a Mulcair NDP government (Mulcair 2015c) (Figure 0-64). In 2019, Bernier constructed information and visuals to appear as a protector of free speech and the elderly. In the ninth most liked debate-related Instagram post in 2019, Bernier shows an image of himself and his wife, Letarte, with an elderly couple, Brian and Dorothy, who had made media news headlines with a video surfacing of the couple crossing a street to attend a Bernier speaking event at Mohawk College in Ontario. While crossing the street to attend the event, angry protesters against Bernier's rally accosted and blocked the elderly woman and her walking device from crossing the street, with the video showing protesters chanting "off our streets Nazi scum" in her face (Clarke 2019). Bernier's post following the 2019 Debate stated, "I needed to make one last stop before turning in for tonight.

We need more people like Dorothy in Canada. Je devais faire un dernier arrêt avant de me coucher ce soir. Nous avons besoin plus de gens comme Dorothy au Canada” (Bernier 2019g) (Figure 0-177). In this Instagram image post, Bernier was using *prosopopoeia* to position the image of Dorothy, who was verbally attacked and shouted at by the protesters for attending his speaking event, as a victim, and align himself with the elderly woman by saying “we need more people like Dorothy in Canada” (Bernier 2019g) (Figure 0-177). With media coverage and video evidence showing protesters shouting at the couple, this image of Bernier after the debate with Dorothy (and her walking device visible), attempts to reframe Bernier’s speaking event, which was thought to promote hateful rhetoric, on making the protesters look bad, for verbally mistreating an elderly couple for attending. He repositions himself as caring for the elderly and encouraging free speech in a democracy. In this instance, Bernier *prosopopoeically* used the recent news coverage of protesters attacking Dorothy from his speaking event to support his own free speech political agenda.

5.3.3. Associating Leaders’ Partners and Family with the Debate: 2019 Compared to 2015

In 2019, leaders’ connections with partners and family were strongly illustrated and depicted on Instagram in the top liked posts, with the Conservative Party, Scheer, Trudeau, Singh, Blanchet, and Bernier, all showing images of their partners or family.⁵² Posts related to the 2015 Debate were more moderate in using *ethopoeia* and *prosopopoeia* in associating leaders’ partners and family with the debate on Instagram. In 2015, Trudeau’s image associated

⁵² References and figures for these media deployments are as follows: Conservative Party (2019a) (Figure 0-157); Andrew Scheer (2019f) (Figure 0-158); (2019j) (Figure 0-159); Justin Trudeau (2019h) (Figure 0-162); Jagmeet Singh (2019d) (Figure 0-167); Yves-François Blanchet (2019f) (Figure 0-173); and Maxime Bernier (2019g) (Figure 0-177); (2019d)(Figure 0-179)

with family is a single image of Trudeau, walking across a Toronto street with a phone held to his ear. He is not photographed with his wife, Sophie. Instead, viewers are invited to imagine Trudeau on the phone with his wife based on the words posted alongside the image, “Called my top advisor. Thank you Sophie. // Un appel avec ma conseillère la plus importante. Merci Sophie. #macdebate #cdnpoli #polcan #elxn42” (Trudeau 2015b) (Figure 0-62). Trudeau is framing himself as a loving partner, including his wife Sophie with his debate success.

Incorporating the political and debate-related hashtags into his Instagram image post, works as a visual *apostrophe*, an image of him talking to someone who is not present, and embedding this version of himself into the online debate conversation and community (Kampherm 2019, 79–80).

And rather than Mulcair showing a front view of himself holding hands with his wife with the crowd in the background, the image is reversed, with the viewer instead seeing the back view of the couple, waving at the crowd of supporters, with the supporters’ faces and NDP signs the focus of the image. The *prosopopoeic ethopoeia* text associated with the image stated, “Canadians are #Ready4Change. We are too. #NDP #macdebate #elxn42” (Mulcair 2015c) (Figure 0-64). The less blatant, more creative way of using imagery in these Instagram image posts in 2015 lends to the quality of images that are expected on the Instagram platform, ones that are more designed and artistic in nature, allowing for the audience to imagine the context surrounding the image, rather than being explicitly told what to think when viewing the image.

For Trudeau, Instagram is helping to “build and reinforce his legitimacy and credibility as an international spokesperson” with his Instagram feed “used mostly for mass broadcasting purposes as well as to offer and reinforce a positive image of the politician and his government” (Lalancette and Raynauld 2019, 917). Trudeau had a grip on Instagram from its inception, using its affordances to provide voters with additional personal and private information in a visually

creative way, effectively using *prosopopoeia* to create and promote his brand, with other parties and leaders continuously playing catch-up.

5.3.4. Incorporating Emotional Appeals in Leaders' Visual Performances: 2019

Compared to 2015

In 2019, leaders incorporated emotional appeals in their visual performances on the Instagram platform, with Trudeau's 2019 boxing ring image (2019a) (Figure 0-163), a replica of his 2015 boxing ring post (2015e) (Figure 0-63), and Singh's "it's been a long day when the ears are out" humour, to entertain his more youthful audience following (2019a) (Figure 0-83). In 2015, Trudeau and Mulcair also incorporated emotional appeals in their visual performance, differentiating themselves from those leaders who did not embrace Instagram for the debate. With the limited exposure leaders had with Instagram in 2015, Trudeau's use of *prosopopoeia* in thanking his wife, Sophie, in a call after the debate gained 3,706 likes and 276 comments from followers, including remarks such as "GOALS" and "AHHH THEY'RE SO CUTE" referring to Trudeau *prosopopoeically* performing the partner role on Instagram (2015b) (Figure 0-62). And sharing an image of his "Morning boxing session in Toronto. // Entraînement de boxe à Toronto ce matin. #elxn42" (Trudeau 2015e) (Figure 0-63) the day of the debate, Trudeau *prosopopoeically* connected the classic boxing metaphor with the leaders' debate. Trudeau gained more attention in his Instagram posts than Mulcair did with his, capturing audiences in Canada and internationally, adopting the various masks on the platform, and subsequently becoming the "first Prime Minister of the Instagram age" (Raynauld and Lalancette 2018).

5.3.5. Implications of Instagram's Evolution on Political Leaders' Debates

Instagram's growth is influencing political leaders' debates in four important ways. First, Instagram is providing viewers with added information about the debate with behind-the-scenes

content and additional information prior to the leaders going on the debate stage and after the leaders have left the debate stage. This information on political leaders humanizes them, to be not only the Liberal leader or Conservative leader, but a father, co-worker, advocate, ‘friend,’ and creates a persona for the individual that lives online, which can be viewed at any moment, by anyone, whether the leader is on a debate stage or not. This access to visual images of a political leader, videos of their family, personal events, quiet moments, and the comings and goings from the daily life of a politician, is something that was not easily accessible through traditional news media and is transforming how viewers and voters view the leaders during the debate. But as Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson suggest, in online presentation “the ‘I’ of reference is constructed and situated, and not identical with its flesh-and-blood maker” (2014, 71). This perceived intimacy provided to viewers in revealing the ‘true’ or ‘real’ leader through Instagram posts, is changing the perception of the political leader on the debate stage, to not only be an individual vying for leadership, but positioned as the viewer’s ‘friend’ vying for support in their goals.

Although *all* delivery is performative in some way, certain acts, including speech acts, may be less mediated or designed than others, generated more directly by internal states, or habit, but they are still ‘acts,’ and are performed, such as kissing your child on the forehead goodnight. In rhetorical terms though, authenticity and inauthenticity are perceptual. The audience perceives one act or another to be more or less mediated, more or less designed; the less design they perceive the more authentic they view the act. Online authenticity is an effect, not an essence, and rather than revealing the ‘true’ essence of the leader through the posted visual images, videos, and text, parties and leaders use the Instagram platform to promote a constructed reality, but one that appears to be less feigned or simulated, when in fact, the content shared is heavily

produced. We don't know, for instance, if Sophie really is on the other 'end' of the phone, or, if she is, what they are really talking about. Maybe Trudeau is talking to someone else, or about something else, or just posing with a phone held up to his ear. But it all looks very natural. Jeff Pooley suggests, "authenticity today is more accurately described as 'calculated authenticity'—... stage management. The best way to sell yourself is not to appear to be selling yourself" (Rosenbloom 2011).

A second implication of Instagram's evolution on political leaders' debates is that information can be visually modified to favour a particular leader through the affordances of the platform. Images may not be depicting reality in its entirety. They may be cropped, altered, enhanced, or improved, using one of the many Instagram filters, in promoting only the aspects of the event that the party or leader would like to focus on. The image can be shown with or without context by a political party or leader. The image can be strategically shared at a particular time to promote an agenda or support for an occasion, event, or cause, that the party wishes to embed themselves with. Hashtags, strategically used and timed can be placed to gain traction on the platform, embedding themselves within a larger conversation, to win over the viewers approval in hopes of securing their vote. These visual impressions afforded by Instagram, however, can lead to misinformation, where what appears in the image may be taken out of context, and not be showing the entire truth of the event. Repeatedly, empirical studies find that people believe what they see more than what they read or hear, and when visual and verbal messages are in conflict, the verbal information is what viewers often forget (Schill 2012, 122). Also, visual messages override other messages when processed simultaneously (Schill 2012, 122). So, when visual images are posted on Instagram, these images will have the most recall resonance, more so than a moment they heard from the two-hour debate.

A third implication of Instagram's evolution on political leaders' debates is that the leaders are including their partners, children, and family members into the voters' view, and thus may be evaluated based on these relationships. Smith and Watson suggest "online lives are fundamentally relational or refracted through engagement with the lives of their significant others: the lives presented are often interactive; they are co-constructed; they are linked to others—family, friends, employers, causes, and affiliations" (2014, 70–71). Including family members (or not including them) is a strategic move used to identify with the viewers, and curate a particular image of themselves in a partner-relationship, or parent-relationship. For Trudeau, images with his children on Instagram gained a strong response. For Scheer, showing himself with his partner, without his five children, had a strong response. Each leader is directing their images to appeal to a particular audience, which is an affordance that the platform supports.

A final implication of Instagram's evolution on political debate is that the platform affords incorporating emotional appeals in leaders' visual performance. Marketing techniques using sex or humour to sell a product is not new. What is new, however, is that political leaders are becoming a part of this marketing technique through Instagram, with a *Prime Minister*, Trudeau, using his sex appeal to gain attention on the platform, showing his brawn in two boxing images, and a *federal party leader*, Singh, using humour, to establish likability and authenticity. To gain attention and have their image posts propagate on the platform, parties and leaders are assuming some of the customs that the platform promotes, and users are accustomed to, in order to gain traction and exposure for their debate-related posts.

5.4. Chapter Summation

Social media's affordances and constraints increasingly foster *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* in politics generally, and debates specifically, quite moderately in 2015 and more fully

in 2019. This pressure on leaders to perform and evaluate *ethos* in securing attention on debate statements for propagation on social media platforms reveals a change in the form and structure of debate.

When parties and leaders spend a considerable amount of time preparing for a leaders' debate, positioning themselves to demonstrate "leadership strength [=*eunoia*], understanding of the issues [=*phronesis*], and overall personal evaluation [aligned with *arete*]" (Turcotte 2016, 256), it is understandable why social media would be used to extend the life of the debate through the sharing of images, videos, and posts related to content from the debate that display those qualities, or undermine them with respect to their opponents. But we can see a transition from 2015 to 2019 in the form and content of leaders' debates. Rather than debate content moving out *onto* social media, which was more prominent in 2015, we can see debate content being shaped *for* social media in 2019. A few examples from the debate include stating messages out of context, expressing outlandish zingers about the character of another leader, and promoting branded messaging. Debate organizers, too, are amplifying this transformation of positioning the debate to be more accessible for social media with reduced speaking time for leaders, encouraging conflict among leaders, and removing lengthier elements, like opening and closing statements. Debate organizers, parties, and leaders are providing a disservice to the debate viewers and voting public, who do not receive a broad view of the leaders or a comprehensive, thought-provoking discussion on debate topics, which would facilitate making an informed decision come election day. Instead, social media coaxes a performative persona on the platforms, which fosters the rhetorical figures *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*. This illusion of leaders showcased on social media, depicted as more transparent and open, but without blunders

or opposing viewpoints impeding their messages, is essentially restricting voters from political knowledge, and is transforming leaders' debates, politics, and democracy.

6. Conclusion: Canada's (Re)shaped Federal Leaders' Debates

“A man has no place in a discussion of a woman's right to choose.”

- NDP Leader, Jagmeet Singh

Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate

This dissertation rhetorically studied the effect of social media, *prosopopoeia*, and *ethopoeia*, on televised political leaders' debates through two case studies, Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate. It identified how social media is influencing political leaders' debates and how the *ethos* of political parties and political leaders has shifted under the pressures of participatory media. Two ethotic strategies are used, *prosopopoeia*, and *ethopoeia*, to compare the social media entanglements from each of the 2015 and 2019 Canadian federal election debates. It was discovered that the use of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* were used more frequently in 2019, compared to 2015, however Trudeau masterfully used the rhetorical techniques in 2015 as well as 2019. This chapter summarizes the previous chapters, discusses the key findings of this research, its contribution to the study of rhetoric, indicates the limitations, and presents opportunities for future research.

6.1. Chapter Summaries

Chapter One discusses that while all media are tools of incorporation and depiction and affect political debate, the reach of social media is distinct, as it has increased pressure on political parties and political leaders to alter political debates to serve this media, which is changing the structure and performance of debate, and ultimately (re)shaping democracy. We see this in leaders' debates and on social media with an increase in political leaders including the incorporation of others' *ethos* into their performance (*prosopopoeia*) and depicting others' *ethos* through their performance (*ethopoeia*).

The method used for examining the effect of social media on political leaders' debates centres on *ethos*, examined through the lens of two rhetorical figures, *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*. The various treatments each figure has received in the rhetorical tradition is addressed, and from this survey, a more precise definition for the rhetorical figures is conveyed. As this study concerns the *tactical* deployment of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, illustrated in the 2015 and 2019 Canadian federal election debates, *prosopopoeia* is defined as 'the incorporation of rhetorical features (style, delivery, invention, arrangement) associated with another person (i.e., someone other than the presenting rhetor), stereotype, object, or abstraction,' while *ethopoeia* is defined as, 'the depiction of rhetorical features (style, delivery, invention, arrangement) associated with a person (other than the presenting rhetor) or the personification of a stereotype, object, or abstraction.'

The sampling procedure is reviewed, where all debate-related social media posts from the official Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts of Canada's federal political leaders and their respective parties who participated in the 2015 and 2019 leaders' debates was collected, and then from traffic statistics, separated out into the top three posts for each political party and leader, with a top 10 list of debate-related posts from Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram also assembled. Limitations to this study were also discussed, which included the fluidity of user engagement, deleted accounts, and complex algorithms which influence which posts are viewable. A brief overview of the forthcoming chapters and appendices was also provided.

In Chapter Two, descriptive synopses of Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate were presented to provide context in situating the analysis of the 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate in Chapter Three, the analysis of the 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate in Chapter Four, and the analysis and comparison of the two

debates in Chapter Five. The synopsis of the 2015 Debate focused on four main topics: The Economy; Energy and the Environment; The State of Canada's Democracy; and Foreign Policy and Security. The 2019 Debates synopsis discussed five topics: Leadership in Canada and the World; Polarization, Human Rights, and Immigration; Indigenous Issues; Affordability and Income Security; and Environment and Energy.

Chapter Three examined how social media had moderately influenced Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate by examining the use of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, instruments of incorporation and depiction, in the social media posts related to the debate. Six major debate-related themes were identified within the posts of parties' and leaders' social media accounts. In the 2015 Debate, it is apparent that Trudeau used *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* more effectively in his debate-related posts compared to his adversaries.

Chapter Four discusses the 2019 Debate, where it can be observed that social media is more vigorously influencing political parties and leaders to incorporate a *prosopopoeia* mask, and/or *ethopoeically* caricaturize or depict others. Six main debate-related themes were identified and explored within political parties' and political leaders' social media accounts. It is evident that Trudeau continues to lead in digital reach through social media platforms, but it is also evident that other leaders and parties are also using the rhetorical figures more effectively in their debate-related social media posts as well, capturing audience engagement.

In Chapter Five, a comparison of the two debates is conducted. The debate themes identified in the 2015 Debate (Chapter Three), and the 2019 Debate (Chapter Four) are assessed and the effect of social media on political debates over time is studied, with a focus on the incidences of *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*. This chapter shows how social media fostered

prosopopoeia and *ethopoeia* to become more important through social media's affordances and constraints, transforming political debate, and in effect, politics and democracy.

6.2. Key Findings and Contributions

The growing popularity of social media is transforming leaders' debates to be less about debate or the specific event, and more about the reach the leaders' performance in the debate has. Leaders are performing in the debate for the social media platforms, including the rhetorical figures *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* into their debate speech and online through their social media posts. They are refracting *phronesis*, *arete*, and *eunoia* away from Aristotle's view of *ethos*, to fragments of those qualities in debates, both in self-representation and in the representation of others. *Prosopopoeia* is seen when rhetors adopt a specific ethotic role or perform using the features of another's *ethos*. *Ethopoeia* is seen in the way a rhetor refracts the image of another rhetor. Both *prosopopoeic* and *ethopoeic* moves increased in the 2019 Debate compared to the 2015 Debate.

Especially in 2019, there is an increase in the use of '*ethopoeic prosopopoeia*,' the framing of others in terms of their masks, most commonly seen in accusations of hypocrisy. Accusations of hypocrisy was especially prominent in the 2019 Debate, and debate-related social media content directed towards Trudeau, but also in reference to Scheer, Bernier, and even Singh. Opponents of Trudeau were adamant during the 2019 Debate that Trudeau "has said a lot of nice things" but appealed to viewers to "look at what he's done" (Singh 2019i). Scheer accused Trudeau of "always wearing a mask" (2019g) and May in the debate, turned to Trudeau

and pleaded, “Please God you don’t get a majority this time around because – you won’t keep your promises” (2019g).⁵³

In addition to leaders’ signaling viewers to be aware of Trudeau’s hypocrisy, leaders were also accusing Bernier and Singh of hypocrisy. Scheer called out Bernier’s hypocrisy, declaring, “You are the Maxime Bernier that said things on Twitter that you never ever said before in your life” (2019g). And Singh was also caught in a web of hypocrisy, calling out Trudeau and Scheer for their discussion over a women’s right to choose in the debate, when Singh was discussing women’s rights, as a man, with May (the only woman on stage) being spoken over in crosstalk and one-upping among the male debaters.

Ethopoeia breeds *ethopoeia*, where if one party insults another’s character, the other leader is more likely to praise or insult their character. Similarly, *prosopopoeia* may breed *prosopopoeia*, or at least some types. This was seen with respect to image filters on social media profile pictures, discussed in my article, “Democratic *Prosopopoeia*: The Rhetorical Influence of the I-Will-Vote Image Filter on Social Media Profile Pictures during the 2015 Canadian Federal Election” (Kampher 2019, 80–81). Social media is fostering *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* to become more important through its affordances and constraints, transforming political debate, and in effect, politics, and democracy. This research provides Canadian government policy makers, media organizations, independent regulatory election agencies, and polling companies the tools to rhetorically identify the suasive methods social media retains in affecting debate and influencing voters.

⁵³ For a discussion of hypocrisy in the 2019 election, centred on the darkface scandal and Singh’s reaction to it, see R. A. Harris (2021).

6.3. Limitations

As with every scholarly study, there are limitations. One limitation with social media studies generally, because of its immense and dynamic volume, is the trade-off between breadth and depth. This project has opted for depth, or at least more depth than would have been possible with a wider spectrum study. By anchoring the analysis on two representative debates, we have been able to isolate a manageable data set, allowing us to examine—in considerable detail—the ethotic currents of two electoral events occurring four years apart. In this way we could provide more depth of analysis, supporting a more precise comparison. But that also entailed notable losses of coverage. Trudeau, for instance, had a massive, ethotically driven presence during the 2019 election because of the images and videos that ‘surfaced’ of him in dark brown make-up and orientalist costuming and in blackface caricaturing a rapper. Jagmeet Singh, too, had a much greater social-media footprint than we have been able to explore largely because of his reaction to the Trudeau darkface scandal, as well as other recorded instances of him dealing with racist episodes. Singh’s successful use of TikTok, a youth-centric social media platform just beginning to burgeon, also garnered him a very substantial presence in the social-media feeds of the 2019 election, which highlights another limitation. In 2015, Instagram was growing its political reach, which further expanded in 2019. Trudeau was an early political adopter, much to his benefit. But in 2019, TikTok was emerging and now Trudeau was behind the curve. We can only speculate about how many voters sought out that platform for political content, but TikTok videos were beginning to populate Twitter and Facebook feeds, hence the viewership for Singh’s TikTok. Social media is not only massive in volume and dynamic in both form and content, the modes and platforms shift very quickly as well.

A more specific limitation of this study is the fluidity of user engagement, which was exacerbated in this case by the delay in data collection during the 2015 Canadian federal election, meaning that the number of likes, shares, and comments from 2015 may have increased or decreased by the time of collection. Likes, shares, and comments may be absent from the posts, through deletion of posts, removal of likes, shares, comments by the users, or the termination of the users' accounts. Engagement with posts may also have increased in the time following 2015 through new likes, shares, and comments on these older social media posts. Another challenge is that once a social media user account is deleted, such as the Conservative Party's 2015 Twitter debate account @cpcdebate, or when a post, video, or photo, is removed from the leaders' or political parties' account, it may not be possible to recover the content completely, or at all, meaning some of the images or videos may not display, or may not display correctly, and complete data on user engagement may not be wholly available. As well, complex algorithms used on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, can sometimes decide what is seen on each platform, and user-enabled privacy restrictions may have influence on which posts are viewable for select audiences. For this study, all 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate related posts, photos, and videos, from Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, were recorded from the live accounts of the political parties represented and the leaders who participated. For the Conservative Party's deleted Twitter debate account, @cpcdebate, archived data was recorded. Social reach and social performance are important indicators of success on social media platforms. From the data collected, each of the debating parties' and leaders' top three shared debate-related posts on Facebook and Twitter, and the top two liked debate-related posts on Instagram were assessed.⁵⁴ Capturing the political parties' and political leaders' top three posts

⁵⁴ The Instagram platform does not have a share function.

on Facebook and Twitter, and top two liked posts on Instagram related to the 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and arranging the posts into a top 10 list of shared Facebook posts (Table 4), a top 10 list of retweeted Twitter posts (Table 5), and a top four list of liked Instagram posts (Table 6), was the main focus to control data for further analysis.⁵⁵ In examining user engagement to determine the top shared posts on Facebook and Twitter and the top liked posts on Instagram, all posts, photos, and videos were considered on the day of the *Maclean's* debate, 6 August 2015, with *Maclean's* leaders' debate related posts, photos, and videos considered during the 78-day election campaign, from 2 August 2015 to 19 October 2015.

6.4. Future Research

The general objective of this research was to rhetorically assess and better understand the ways in which social media is affecting televised political leaders' debates. Social media is affecting debate through the reshaping of *ethos*, the projected character of the rhetor. Under the pressure of participatory media, the deployment of two rhetorical strategies, *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, which are fundamental to political campaigns and debates, have markedly shifted. In studying Canada's 2015 *Maclean's* Leaders' Debate and Canada's 2019 English-Language Leaders' Debate, it is evident that the rhetorical figures *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia* are being fostered through social media. While appearing transparent, political leaders are including the incorporation of others' *ethos* into their performance (*prosopopoeia*) and depicting others' *ethos* through their performance (*ethopoeia*). Through the wearing of masks and placing masks on others in the debate and through their debate-related social media posts, constituents are

⁵⁵ In 2015, parties and leaders had few posts on Instagram, with only two debate-related Instagram posts available for study for Trudeau and Mulcair. Elizabeth May, the Conservative Party, and the Liberal Party did not have Instagram accounts, while Stephen Harper, the NDP, and the Green Party did not have debate related posts.

disadvantaged, by not being afforded sufficient knowledge to make an informed decision on the leaders or their parties, as the authentic character of the politician is often concealed.

This study could be further developed by continuing the exploration of the effect of social media on debates into Canada's 2021 English-Language Debate (Sanford 2021) and beyond. For future investigation, it is evident with the 2021 Debate that the influence of social media is continuing. The debate format primarily allowed time for delivering rehearsed talking points and zingers to be stated, but lacked the opportunity for leaders to rebut each other, or even the time to explain policy plans to voters. The role of the debate moderator could also be investigated. In the 2021 debate, moderator Sachi Kurl often prohibited discussion between leaders, cutting short the opportunities for leaders to respond to accusations. This was especially pronounced with Trudeau taking on the role of a "pin cushion" (Bryden 2021) with Kurl curtailing Trudeau's chance to rebut the assertions of his opponents. On several occasions, Kurl acted more as a journalist than a moderator by overstepping her role and interrupting the leaders. Blanchet even accused Kurl of bias, when Kurl asked Blanchet "[...] why your party also supports these discriminatory laws" (Sanford 2021), referring to Bill-96, an Act promoting the use of French language in business, the official and common language of Québec, and Bill-21, a Bill that prohibits Québec citizens who work in public service from wearing religious symbols while fulfilling their civic duties. Blanchet responded, "The question seems to imply the answer you want. Those laws are not about discrimination, they are about the values of Québec" (Sanford 2021). The debate format in 2021 (and 2019) may be effective for short video clips ready for publication on social media, but for an average voter turning in to be informed on leaders' views on important social, political, and policy issues, the substance and "debate" between leaders was lacking. A voter would not know more after the 2021 Debate than they would by looking at the

party's platforms in an internet search or viewing the parties' and leaders' social media accounts. This situation builds on the issues encountered in the 2019 Debate, where there was limited time, a countdown timer, and one of five moderators interjecting, silencing the leaders, the moment the clock reached zero, often leaving leaders unable to respond to the question asked.

Another area where this research could be advanced is with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) technology, which, combined with rhetorical data, can help researchers understand social media and its influence on real-world action even more. One AI system of particular interest, which could be useful in further study of upcoming Canadian federal leaders' debates, is Polly™, an artificial intelligence system “designed to understand how people's online behaviour and connections predict their real-world actions” (“Advanced Symbolics Inc. | An Artificial Intelligence Company” 2020). The Polly™ AI technology of Advanced Symbolics Inc. was used in the analysis of the 2022 Ontario Leaders' Debate (CPAC 2022) and translated what voters were talking about through social media engagement, such as who was the winner of the debate, with Polly™ suggesting Ontario Conservative Party Leader Doug Ford won, and which moments in the debate generated the most conversation on social media (The Agenda with Steve Paikin 2022). It also translated loss of support for parties and identified the leader who came out on top on certain topics of discussion, such as the economy, education, and health care. One element that is of particular interest to rhetoricians is the ability for Polly™ to decipher emotion (*pathos*) through conversation, where in the 2022 debate, the more argumentative leaders were not as well received, such as Ontario Liberal Party Leader Steven Del Duca, and Ontario NDP Leader Andrea Horwath, with Ontario Green Party Leader Mike Schreiner gaining support (The Agenda with Steve Paikin 2022).

6.5. Conclusion

Richard Lanham observed that there was a shift in “cultural decorum, and hence self and society,” which occurred in printed books, newspapers, even railroads when, “newspapers had to decide whether they were in the information business or only the newspaper business” (1993, 8). He goes on to say that “most who chose the newspaper business are no longer in it” (Lanham 1993, 8). When society shifts in where they get their information, from print, to radio, to television, to digital media, to social media, and so on, official government communication must shift too. It is apparent that the Leaders’ Debate Commission formed in 2018 with the mandate for debates to be “as accessible as possible, on a variety of platforms” and to “encourage the use of new media, and reach to new audiences” (2019) is working with the increase in viewership through a variety of digital platforms, including social media (2022). However, what this also means is that debate content is being shaped *for* social media, coaxing a performative personae for leaders, fostering the use of the rhetorical figures, *prosopopoeia* and *ethopoeia*, encouraging leaders to adopt a mask using *prosopopoeia* in their promotion, and caricaturize or depict others through *ethopoeia*. But one must remember that social media is an entertainment platform. It is fundamentally designed based on algorithms that work to promote engaging content. Thus, for a political party or political leader to be successful on the platform, the content they provide requires likes, shares, and comments. To receive this engagement, supporters may not be receiving good quality information and data from their governmental parties and leaders, but rather infotainment. With more voters engaging with political parties and leaders through social media platforms, and debates becoming a part of this spectacle, Postman’s concern with television pales in comparison to the effect social media is having on democracy. Leaders’ debates that were once a pivotal pillar to democracy, are being (re)shaped in real time through

social media, which is distorting information for voters, affecting the consciousness of political leaders, and disrupting the platform on which our democracy is built.

Bibliography




- “Advanced Symbolics Inc. | An Artificial Intelligence Company.” 2020. ASI. 2020.
<https://advancedsymbolics.com/about-our-ai/>.
- Ammer, Christine. 1997. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Idioms*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin. <http://library.wbi.ac.id/repository/293.pdf>.
- Aristotle. 350BCa. *Rhetoric*. Translated by John Henry Freese. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press; William Heinemann, Ltd.
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0060%3ABook%3D2>.
- . 350BCb. “Rhetoric.” Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. The Internet Classics Archive. 350BC. <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.1.i.html>.
- . 2001. “Rhetoric.” In *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, edited by Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, 2nd. ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s.
- Armstrong, Nancy, and Leonard Tennenhouse. 1989. “Introduction: Representing Violence, or ‘How the West Was Won.’” In *The Violence of Representation: Literature and the History of Violence*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- aschmidt. 2017. “The Right Video Length for Each Platform.” 2060 Digital. August 23, 2017. <https://2060digital.com/blog/right-video-length-platform/>.
- Aten, Jason. 2021. “Steve Jobs Stole His Best Idea Ever From Nike’s Brilliant 2-Word Marketing Strategy | Inc.Com.” Inc. October 2, 2021. <https://www.inc.com/jason-aten/steve-jobs-stole-his-best-idea-ever-from-nikes-brilliant-2-word-marketing-strategy.html>.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press. <https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/2027/heb.09354>.
- . 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Ball, James. 2017. *Post-Truth: How Bullshit Conquered the World*. Book, Whole. London: Biteback Publishing.
[https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/\[SITE_ID\]/detail.action?docID=4856701](https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/[SITE_ID]/detail.action?docID=4856701).
- Barthes, Roland. 1973. *Mythologies*. London: Paladin.
- . 1977. *Image, Music, Text*. Translated by Stephen Heath. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
- . 2010. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
- Barton, Rosemary. 2019. “Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript.” *Maclean’s*, October 8, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- Bay, Julianne. 2015. “The Top 5 Knockout Moments in Political Debates in Canada.” *Ottawa Sun*. August 5, 2015. <https://ottawasun.com/2015/08/05/the-top-5-knockout-moments-in-political-debates-in-canada>.
- Bernays, Edward L. 1928. *Propaganda*. New York, New York: Ig Publishing.
- Bernier, Maxime. 2019a. “The PPC Is the Only Major Party with Policies Different than the Others on: -Immigration -Multiculturalism -Equalization -Tax Cuts -Balancing the Budget -Climate Alarmism -Corporate Welfare -Foreign Aid -UN Globalism -Defunding

- CBC -Supply Management -Health Care -Veterans Pension -Interprovincial Barriers - Free Speech -Respecting the Constitution -Etc. If the Leaders' Debates Commission Announces Tomorrow That I Am Not Invited to the Leaders' Debates, IT WILL DENY THE DEMOCRATIC RIGHT OF CANADIANS TO HEAR ALL THE OPTIONS." Post. Facebook. September 15, 2019.
<https://www.facebook.com/hon.maximebernier/posts/10157502404598703>.
- . 2019b. "Received the Good News from the @debates_can as I'm about to Board My Plane for Saint John!" Video Post. Twitter. September 16, 2019.
<https://twitter.com/maximebernier/status/1173659868059832320>.
- . 2019c. "It's Sad to See @theJagmeetSingh Repeat the Lies and Slanders of the Far Left Antifa Crowd and Call for Censorship. I Don't Hate Anyone. I Love My Country. And Millions of Canadians Agrees with PPC Policies. Is He That Afraid Many More Will Find out during the Debates?" Post. Twitter. September 18, 2019.
<https://twitter.com/maximebernier/status/1174308008542838784>.
- . 2019d. "Catherine et Johanne Ont Détourné Mon Instagram. Voyons Quoi d'autre Qu'elles Afficheront Ce Soir. Catherine and Johanne Have Hijacked My Instagram. Let's See What Else They Post Tonight. #elxn43 #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI." Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3VTY9oAccr/>.
- . 2019e. "Final Bit of Pre-Debate Preparation. How Do You Guys Think Max Is Doing This Far? #elxn43 #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI." Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019.
<https://www.instagram.com/p/B3VfoQcg5Xi/>.
- . 2019f. "Here's the People's Party of Canada Ad That Will Air in the Coming Days on the CTV Network. Watch and SHARE!" Video Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019.
<https://twitter.com/maximebernier/status/1181242504668221447>.
- . 2019g. "I Needed to Make One Last Stop before Turning in for Tonight. We Need More People like Dorothy in Canada. Je Devais Faire Un Dernier Arrêt Avant de Me Coucher Ce Soir. Nous Avons Besoin plus de Gens Comme Dorothy Au Canada." Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3V33rMg1Vq/>.
- . 2019h. "Aside from Curbing Immigration, the Party Wants to Eliminate the Deficit in 2 Years, End Subsidies to Corporations, Cut Funding to Multiculturalism Programs, Make It Easier to Build Pipelines, Scrap the Carbon Tax and Phase out Supply Management for Agricultural Products." Link Post. Facebook. October 8, 2019.
<https://www.facebook.com/hon.maximebernier/posts/10157563208358703>.
- . 2019i. "Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript." *Macleans's*, October 8, 2019.
<https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- . 2019j. "Seems like Canadians Were Interested in What I Had to Say at the Leaders' Debate Last Night. ----- On Dirait Que Les Canadiens Étaient Intéressés Par Ce Que j'avais à Dire Au Débat Des Chefs Hier Soir." Photo Post. Facebook. October 8, 2019.
<https://www.facebook.com/hon.maximebernier/photos/a.10150908219903703/10157563609008703/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019k. "Scheer at the Debate: PPC Supporters Come from 'the Darkest Parts of Twitter.' He Said This after Paying His Hired Mudslinger Kinsella to Fabricate This Story and Manipulate the Media. Scheer and Trudeau Practice the Same Kind of DIRTY POLITICS. #LibConCorruption." Post. Twitter. October 19, 2019.
<https://twitter.com/maximebernier/status/1185546957823053824>.

- Bitzer, Lloyd F. 1968. "The Rhetorical Situation." In *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 1:1–14. [http://www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/~raha/309CWeb/Bitzer\(1968\).pdf](http://www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/~raha/309CWeb/Bitzer(1968).pdf).
- Blanchet, Yves-F. 2019a. "À 2 jours du débat anglais, pourquoi suis-je le seul à revendiquer ce qui devrait être un hymne des fédéralistes et une indication que leur fédération marche? La nation québécoise envisage un pays mais est aussi sœur de tous les Français d'Amérique. Partagez... au Canada! 🌸☀️" (Translated from French by Google) At 2 days of the English debate, why am I the only one to claim what should be a hymn of federalists and an indication that their federation is working? The Quebec nation envisions a country but is also the sister of all the French people in America. Share ... in Canada!" Photo Post. Twitter. October 5, 2019. <https://twitter.com/yfblanchet/status/1180661132912136192>.
- . 2019b. "Troublant. Sa question était indigne, comme son tweet mercredi dernier. (Translated from French by Google) Disturbing. His question was unworthy, like his tweet last Wednesday." Link Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/yfblanchet/status/1181398691581706240>.
- . 2019c. "Est-il étrange que le thème central de la campagne fédérale soit une loi déjà adoptée par une législature « provinciale»? Ou juste révélateur de la coexistence forcée de deux nations, l'une conquérante, l'autre conquise. Trudeau se range avec le Canada. (Translated from French by Google) Is it strange that the central theme of the federal campaign is a law already adopted by a 'provincial' legislature? Or just revealing the forced coexistence of two nations, one conqueror, the other conquered. Trudeau ranks with Canada." Link Post. Twitter. October 8, 2019. <https://twitter.com/yfblanchet/status/1181561331842990080>.
- Blanchet, Yves-François. 2019a. "À deux jours du débat en anglais, je me demande pourquoi je suis le seul à revendiquer ce qui devrait être un hymne pour les fédéralistes et un début d'indication que leur fédération fonctionne. Nous sommes de la nation québécoise en quête d'un pays mais aussi frères et sœurs de tous les Français d'Amérique. Partagez... au Canada! 🌸☀️ -- Je souhaite juste que les francophones du Canada et les Acadiens aient le même traitement que les anglophones du Québec. (Translated by Google) Two days before the debate in English, I wonder why I am the only one to claim what should be a hymn for the federalists and a beginning of indication that their federation is working. We are from the Quebec nation in search of a country but also brothers and sisters of all French people in America. Share ... in Canada! -- I just want Francophones in Canada and Acadians to have the same treatment as Anglophones in Quebec." Photo Post. Instagram. October 5, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3QjmqJHXXK-/>.
- . 2019b. "À deux jours du débat en anglais, je me demande pourquoi je suis le seul à revendiquer ce qui devrait être un hymne pour les fédéralistes et un début d'indication que leur fédération fonctionne. Nous sommes de la nation québécoise en quête d'un pays mais aussi frères et sœurs de tous les Français d'Amérique. Partagez... au Canada! 🌸☀️😄." Photo Post. Facebook. October 5, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/364797800592456/photos/a.369322960139940/702883036783929/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019c. "En nous attaquant et traitant de tous les noms, en se la jouant paternalistes qui au mieux tolèrent notre nation, nos langue, valeurs et intérêts, les adversaires ont provoqué un ressac qui invite les Québécois à se demander ce qu'ils veulent. Ou pas. 🌸 By attacking us and dealing with all names, playing paternalistic that at best tolerate our

- nation, our language, values and interests, opponents have caused a surf that invites quebecers to wonder what they want. Or not. 🌸.” Link Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=703872223351677&id=364797800592456.
- . 2019d. “Publicité Le Québec C’est Nous.” Video Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/364797800592456/videos/436787017186593/>.
- . 2019e. “Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript.” *Maclean’s*, October 8, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- . 2019f. “À la veille du débat final, avec une brise au parfum de nation et d’espoirs, je veux remercier les gens qui multiplient les messages de confiance. Je ne sais pas si je serai à la hauteur de vos vœux, mais ce petit homme, fils de ma fille, sera mon inspiration. Merci! 💙🌸🌸 (Translated by Google) On the eve of the final debate, with a nation-breeze and hopes, I want to thank the people who multiply the messages of trust. I do not know if I will live up to your wishes, but this little man, son of my daughter, will be my inspiration.” Photo Post. Instagram. October 9, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3apwQaH9RP/>.
- Blankfield, Bryan. 2022. “The Rhetoric of Prosopopoeia: Persuading in Others’ Voices.” In *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Persuasion*, edited by Randy Allen Harris and Jeanne D. Fahnestock. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Blatchford, Andy. 2019. “Canada’s Top 1 per Cent Saw Fastest Income Acceleration, Overall Decrease in Taxes.” CTVNews. September 25, 2019. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/canada-s-top-1-per-cent-saw-fastest-income-acceleration-overall-decrease-in-taxes-1.4609196>.
- Bloc Québécois. 2019a. “À la veille du débat en anglais, tenons-nous debout pour le Québec, pour les Franco-Canadiens et pour les Acadiens. (Translated) On the eve of the debate in English, let’s stand up for Quebec, for Franco-Canadians and for Acadiens.” Photo Post. Facebook. October 6, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/blocquebecois/photos/a.565035510197157/2695467000487320/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019b. “À jeudi! (Translated) See you Thursday!” Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/blocquebecois/photos/a.565035510197157/2698537263513627/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019c. “#Débatdeschefs En Anglais: J’ai Hâte d’entendre Ces Messieurs Nous Dire La Même Chose Qu’ils Nous Ont Dit Ce Soir Lors Du Débat En Français Jeudi. - @yfblanchet #polcan #elx43 #LeadersDebate2019 (Translated from French by Google) #Débatdeschefs in English: I Look Forward to Hearing These Gentlemen Tell Us the Same Thing They Told Us Tonight during the Debate in French Thursday. - @yfblanchet #polcan #elx43 #LeadersDebate2019.” Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/blocquebecois/status/1181374824633049088>.
- . 2019d. “Justin Trudeau va plus Loin En Anglais Qu’en Français. Il Laisse Entendre Qu’il va Contester La #Loi21 Adoptée Par l’Assemblée Nationale et Appuyée Par 70% Des Québécois et Québécoises. #polcan #débatdeschefs #elxn43 #leadersdebate2019 (Translated from French by Google) Justin Trudeau Goes Further in English than in French. He Hints That He Will Challenge Bill 21 Adopted by the National Assembly and Supported by 70% of Quebeckers. #polcan #débatdeschefs #elxn43 #leadersdebate2019.”

- Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019.
<https://twitter.com/blocquebecois/status/1181353118665203713>.
- . 2019e. “Les Premières Nations Sont Des Nations. Le Canada Est Une Nation. Le Québec Est Une Nation. Et Une Nation Ne Laisse Pas Sa Culture Entre Les Mains d’une Autre Nation. #ÉgalÀÉgal #polcan #débatdeschefs #elxn43 #leadersdebate2019 (Translated from French by Google) First Nations Are Nations. Canada Is a Nation. Quebec Is a Nation. And One Nation Does Not Leave Its Culture in the Hands of Another Nation. #ÉgalÀÉgal #polcan #débatdeschefs #elxn43 #leadersdebate2019.” Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/blocquebecois/status/1181359331750625284>.
- . 2019f. “Petit rappel 📌 (Translated) Little reminder 📌.” Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019.
<https://www.facebook.com/blocquebecois/photos/a.565035510197157/2698390626861624/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019g. “🌸 #BlocQC #polcan #polqc.” Photo Post. Instagram. October 8, 2019.
<https://www.instagram.com/p/B3XCuXln4iJ/>.
- “Blog: 2019 Canadian Election Leaders’ Debate.” 2019. Global News. October 7, 2019.
<https://globalnews.ca/news/6001339/live-blog-english-federal-leaders-debate/>.
- Blow, Charles M. 2020. “We Don’t Need Debates.” *The New York Times*, September 27, 2020, sec. Opinion. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/27/opinion/trump-debates-2020.html>.
- Bolter, Jay David. 2019. “Social Media Are Ruining Political Discourse.” *The Atlantic*. May 19, 2019. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2019/05/why-social-media-ruining-political-discourse/589108/>.
- Booth, Wayne C. 1983. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Second edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2001. “From Modern Dogma and the Rhetoric of Assent.” In *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, edited by Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, 2nd. ed., 1491–1519. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s.
- Bronskill, Jim. 2019. “Bernier Paints Himself as Genuine Crusading Conservative in Leaders Debate.” *Ottawa Citizen - The Canadian Press*, October 8, 2019.
<https://nationalpost.com/pmn/news-pmn/canada-news-pmn/bernier-paints-himself-as-genuine-crusading-conservative-in-leaders-debate>.
- Bronstein, Jenny. 2013. “Like Me! Analyzing the 2012 Presidential Candidates’ Facebook Pages.” *Online Information Review; Bradford* 37 (2): 173–92.
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1108/OIR-01-2013-0002>.
- Bryden, Joan. 2021. “Leaders’ Debates Commission under Fire after Controversial English Debate.” CP24. September 10, 2021. <https://www.cp24.com/news/leaders-debates-commission-under-fire-after-controversial-english-debate-1.5581148>.
- Bryden, Joan, and The Canadian Press. 2015. “Did Trudeau Unfairly Smear Small Business Owners as Tax Dodgers?” *Macleans.Ca* (blog). September 10, 2015.
<https://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/did-trudeau-unfairly-smear-small-business-owners-as-tax-dodgers/>.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1938. “Semantic and Poetic Meaning.” *The Southern Review* 4 (January): 501–23. <http://www.proquest.com/docview/1291660350/citation/1737750BC5EC4876PQ/1>.
- . 1941a. “Four Master Tropes.” *The Kenyon Review* 3 (4): 421–38.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4332286>.

- . 1941b. *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. Rev. ed., Abridged by the author. Vintage Books. New York: Vintage Books.
- . 1950. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- . 1951. “Rhetoric—Old and New.” *The Journal of General Education* 5 (3): 202–9. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27795349>.
- . 1966. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- . 1969. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- . 1984a. “On Human Behavior Considered ‘Dramatistically.’” In *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*, 3rd ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- . 1984b. *Attitudes Toward History*. 3rd. ed., With a New Afterword. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Butler, Judith. 2010. “Performative Agency.” *Journal of Cultural Economy* 3 (2): 147–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2010.494117>.
- Canada Health. 2019. “A Prescription for Canada: Achieving Pharmacare for All - Final Report of the Advisory Council on the Implementation of National Pharmacare.” A Prescription for Canada: Achieving Pharmacare for All. June 2019. <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/corporate/about-health-canada/public-engagement/external-advisory-bodies/implementation-national-pharmacare/final-report.html>.
- Canada Revenue Agency. 2007a. “Pension Income Splitting.” Service description. Government of Canada. August 30, 2007. <https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/tax/individuals/topics/pension-income-splitting.html>.
- . 2007b. “Registered Retirement Income Fund (RRIF).” Service description. Government of Canada. August 30, 2007. <https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/tax/individuals/topics/registered-retirement-income-fund-rrif.html>.
- Canada’s NDP / Le NPD du Canada. 2019a. “There Are Just Two Weeks to Go until Election Day – and Our Team Is out Connecting with People in Communities across Canada. Be a Part of the Campaign – Volunteer Today!  Ndp.ca/Volunteer.” Photo Link Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/NDP.NPD/photos/a.482158681820342/2447142528655271/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019b. “This Weekend, Jagmeet Visited Grassy Narrows, Where the Devastating Impacts of Mercury Contamination Have Impacted 3 Generations. We Can Make Sure Every Community Has Access to Clean Water. We Just Have to Make It a Priority.” Video Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/NDP.NPD/videos/846935679041281/>.
- . 2019c. “Last Night, Jagmeet Stood up for Everyday People and Showed How He’ll Make Life Better for Families – and the Response Has Been Incredible. Here’s What They’re Saying about Jagmeet’s Performance at Last Night’s Debate.  .
- ” Video Post. Facebook. October 8, 2019.
- <https://www.facebook.com/NDP.NPD/videos/1141612632698499/>
- .
- . 2019d. “Leaders Debate: What They’re Saying...” Video Post. Facebook. October 8, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/NDP.NPD/videos/1141612632698499/>.

- Canada's NDP // NDP du Canada. 2019a. "Flashback to the #firstdebate Where Jagmeet Went Toe-to-Toe with Justin Trudeau on the Climate Crisis and Called Him out for Always Siding with His Mega Rich Friends over Everyday People. #InItForYou #elxn43 #cdnpoli #fbf." Instagram. September 20, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B2qGw9ag3YQ/>.
- . 2019b. "Canvassing Blitz with Our Candidates and Their Local Teams! . Melissa Jean-Baptiste Vajda, NDP Candidate for University– Rosedale Mark Cherrington, NDP Candidate for Edmonton Griesbach Allison Brown, NDP Candidate for Dufferin-Caledon Barrington Walker, NDP Candidate for Kington and the Islands Audrey Redman, NDP Candidate for Edmonton Riverbend . Sign up Now to Give a Few Hours of Your Time and Be Part of the Campaign Team! Link in Bio. #InItForYou #elxn43#cdnpoli." Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3VYnhOAVrO/>.
- Canada's NDP/Le NPD du Canada. 2015a. "100,000 More Reasons That Canadians Are Putting Their Trust in Tom Mulcair to Bring Change to Ottawa." Photo. Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/NDP.NPD/photos/a.482158681820342/894857723883767/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2015b. "Calls for Change Are Growing Louder-and It Isn't Difficult to See Why." Photo. Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/NDP.NPD/photos/a.482158681820342/894766547226218/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2015c. "When It Comes to Making the Right Decisions, Justin Trudeau Isn't up to the Job." Video. Facebook. August 11, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/NDP.NPD/videos/897309983638541/>.
- Canadian Security Intelligence Service. 2019. "Canadian Security Intelligence Service." Government of Canada. April 10, 2019. <https://www.canada.ca/en/security-intelligence-service.html>.
- CBC News*. 2019. "What Would Happen If Justin Trudeau Resigned Mid-Campaign?," September 20, 2019, sec. Politics. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canada-votes-2019-trudeau-blackface-brownface-cbc-explains-1.5290664>.
- Chase, Cynthia. 1986. *Decomposing Figures: Rhetorical Readings in the Romantic Tradition*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Church, Scott Haden. 2018. "Remix, Sunyata and Prosopopoeia: Projecting Voice in the Digital Age." In *Ancient Rhetorics and Digital Networks*, edited by Michele Kennerly and Damien Smith Pfister, 229–51. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
- Cialdini, Robert B. 1984. *Influence: How and Why People Agree to Things*. New York, NY: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- . 2001. "Harnessing the Science of Persuasion." *Harvard Business Review*, October 1, 2001. <http://www.coachfinder.club/downloads/Influence%20by%20Cialdini.pdf>.
- . 2009. *Influence: Science and Practice*. Fifth Edition. Boston, Mass.: Pearson Education Inc.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. 2014. *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*. Translated by Harry Caplan. Loeb Classical Library; 403. Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press. https://ocul-wtl.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/discovery/fulldisplay?docid=alma999986594304605162&context=L&vid=01OCUL_WTL:WTL_DEFAULT&lang=en&search_scope=MyInst_and_CI&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&tab=Everything&query=any,contains,%5Bci

- cero%5D%20rhetorica%20ad%20herennium%20harry%20caplan&offset=0&pcAvailability=true.
- Clark, Campbell. 2015. "Cautious Mulcair, Pugnacious Trudeau Jockey to Be Harper's Main Foe." *The Globe and Mail*. August 6, 2015.
<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/cautious-mulcair-pugnacious-trudeau-jockey-to-be-harpers-main-foe/article25871327/>.
- Clarke, Katrina. 2019. "Woman in Viral Video 'disgusted' by Attack on Free Speech at Maxime Bernier Event in Hamilton." *The Hamilton Spectator*, October 3, 2019, sec. Hamilton Region. <https://www.thespec.com/news/hamilton-region/2019/10/03/woman-in-viral-video-disgusted-by-attack-on-free-speech-at-maxime-bernier-event-in-hamilton.html>.
- Coleman, Stephen. 2000. "Meaningful Political Debate in the Age of the Soundbite." In *Televised Election Debates: International Perspectives*, edited by Stephen Coleman. Hampshire and London: MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Conservative — Conservateur, dir. 2015. *The Interview*. Video. YouTube.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c86-9HitWg0>.
- Conservative Party. 2019a. ".@JustinTrudeau and @TOAdamVaughan Have a Secret Plan to Tax the Sale of Your Home at 50%. This Is Trudeau's Hidden Agenda: Tax Hikes to Pay for His Massive Deficits. You Work Hard, You Increase the Value of Your Home, and Liberals Take 50%. How Is That Fair? #NotAsAdvertised." Photo Post. Twitter. September 12, 2019. https://twitter.com/cpc_hq/status/1172231218378747904.
- . 2019b. "It's Already Been Confirmed by the Media That Justin Trudeau Lowered Taxes for Millionaires. You Can't Trust Anything Trudeau Says. #NotAsAdvertised <https://Globalnews.ca/News/5948487/Canadas-Wealthiest-1-Saw-Fastest-Income-Growth-in-2017/> #cdnpoli #elxn43 #Leadersdebate2019." Tweet. *Twitter* (blog). October 7, 2019. https://twitter.com/CPC_HQ/status/1181350636086018048.
- . 2019c. "Tonight's Debate Made One Thing Clear: Andrew Scheer Is the Only Leader That Can Be Trusted to Help You and Your Family Get Ahead. #cdnpoli #elxn43." Photo Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. https://twitter.com/cpc_hq/status/1181373719354249216.
- . 2019d. "SHARE This Video If You Think Justin Trudeau Belongs in Provincial Politics. #cdnpoli #elxn43." Video Post. *Twitter* (blog). October 8, 2019. https://twitter.com/cpc_hq/status/1181645436249092096.
- . 2019e. "Justin Trudeau Is a Compulsive Liar. #NotAsAdvertised #Elxn43 #cdnpoli #LeadersDebate2019." Photo Post. Twitter. October 10, 2019. https://twitter.com/cpc_hq/status/1182455375876034563.
- Conservative Party of Canada. 2019a. "Repost @andrewjscheer · · · Let's Do This. It's Time for You to Get Ahead! #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 CA Allons-y! Plus. Pour Vous. Dès Maintenant! #DébatDesChefs2019 #elxn43." Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3Vfa1AIP0/>.
- . 2019b. "Tonight's Debate Made One Thing Clear: @andrewjscheer Is the Only Leader That Can Be Trusted to Help You and Your Family Get Ahead." Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3VxFiRAvu-/>.
- Conservative Party of Canada - Parti conservateur du Canada. 2015a. "Stephen Harper Shows #ProvenLeadership and Wins First Debate! SHARE If You Agree #elxn42 #macdebate." Facebook. August 6, 2015.
<https://www.facebook.com/cpcpcc/photos/a.10150215051769204/10153541003469204/?type=3&theater>.

- . 2015b. “This Election Is about Leadership.” Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/cpcpcc/photos/a.10150215051769204/10153540887454204/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2015c. “Prime Minister Stephen Harper Made the Choice Clear Last Night. Canadians Need Proven Leadership to Keep Canada Safe, and Our Economy Strong. #elxn42.” Facebook. August 7, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/cpcpcc/videos/10153542212764204/>.
- . 2019a. “Tonight’s Debate Made One Thing Clear: Andrew Scheer Is the Only Leader That Can Be Trusted to Help You and Your Family Get Ahead.” Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/cpcpcc/photos/a.10150215051769204/10157564977039204/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019b. “Canadians Are Tired of Justin Trudeau’s Weak Leadership. It’s Time to Elect a Strong Conservative Government That Will Help You Get Ahead.” Facebook. October 9, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/cpcpcc/photos/a.10150215051769204/10157567930259204/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019c. “Justin Trudeau Has No Record to Run on and Has No Plan for Canada’s Future. The Debate on Monday Made One Thing Very Clear: Andrew Scheer Is the Best Choice for Canada.” Facebook. October 10, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/cpcpcc/photos/a.10150215051769204/10157570362434204/?type=3&theater>.
- Corcoran, Terence. 2019. “Terence Corcoran: The Case Is Clear for Andrew Scheer.” *Financial Post*, October 9, 2019, sec. FP Comment. <https://financialpost.com/news/election-2019/terence-corcoran-the-case-is-clear-for-andrew-scheer>.
- Counter, Rosemary. 2019. “Where to Watch Tonight’s Leaders Debate (and All Your Other Questions, Too).” *Macleans*, October 7, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/where-to-watch-tonights-leaders-debate-and-all-your-other-questions-too/>.
- CPAC, dir. 2022. *Ontario Leaders’ Debate - May 16, 2022*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FkO1IDa21vM>.
- CPC Debate. 2015a. “Conservative Support for Ukraine #elxn42 #macdebate.” Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <http://oldweb.today/chrome/20150829155106/twitter.com/cpcdebate>.
- . 2015b. “FACT: #LPC Cut Health Care. #CPC Fund Health Care #elxn42 #macdebate.” Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <http://oldweb.today/chrome/20150829155106/twitter.com/cpcdebate>.
- . 2015c. “.@pmharper Shows #ProvenLeadership and Wins First Debate! RT If You Agree #elxn42 #macdebate #cdnpoli.” Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <http://oldweb.today/chrome/20150829155106/twitter.com/cpcdebate>.
- . 2015d. “With @PMHarper Canada Is the Most Admired Country in the World: Tinyurl.Com/Pvakmyk #elxn42 #macdebate.” Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <http://oldweb.today/chrome/20150829155106/twitter.com/cpcdebate>.
- “CPD: October 21, 1984 Debate Transcript.” 1984. The Commission on Presidential Debates. October 21, 1984. <https://www.debates.org/voter-education/debate-transcripts/october-21-1984-debate-transcript/>.
- Crawford, Craig. 2006. *Attack the Messenger: How Politicians Turn You Against the Media*. Lanham; Boulder; New York; Toronto; Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

- CTV News. 2015. "Canada Ranked as 'Most Admired' Country in the World: Report," July 15, 2015. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/canada-ranked-as-most-admired-country-in-the-world-report-1.2470040>.
- Das, Enny, Maryna Galekh, and Charlotte Vonkeman. 2015. "Is Sexy Better than Funny? Disentangling the Persuasive Effects of Pleasure and Arousal across Sex and Humour Appeals." *International Journal of Advertising* 34 (3): 406–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2014.997423>.
- Davis, Diane. 2010. *Inessential Solidarity: Rhetoric and Foreigner Relations*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Day, Elizabeth. 2013. "How Selfies Became a Global Phenomenon." *The Observer*, July 13, 2013, sec. Technology. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2013/jul/14/how-selfies-became-a-global-phenomenon>.
- De Temmerman, Koen. 2010. "Ancient Rhetoric as a Hermeneutical Tool for the Analysis of Characterization in Narrative Literature." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 28 (1): 23–51. <https://doi.org/10.1525/rh.2010.28.1.23>.
- Degenhard, J. 2021. "Twitter Users in Canada from 2017 to 2025." Statista. February 10, 2021. <http://www.statista.com/forecasts/1145272/twitter-users-in-canada>.
- Delacourt, Susan. 2016. *Shopping for Votes: How Politicians Choose Us and We Choose Them*. Madeira Park, British Columbia: Douglas and McIntyre.
- Demetrius. 1902. *On Style: The Greek Text of Demetrius De Elocutione*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. London, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uva.x000336218&view=1up&seq=211>.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. 100AD. *The Ancient Orators I. Lysias*. Translated by Jeffrey Henderson. Loeb Classical Library; 18. Harvard University Press. http://www.loebclassics.com/view/dionysius_halicarnassus-lyusias/1974/pb_LCL465.59.xml?mainRsKey=Hsk0qr.
- "Donald Trump Mocks Disabled Reporter." 2017. Politico. January 9, 2017. <http://politi.co/2zIDLF4>.
- Doyle, Christopher. 2015. "The 2015 #yearontwitter in Canada." Twitter Blog. December 7, 2015. https://blog.twitter.com/official/en_ca/a/2015/the-2015-yearontwitter-in-canada.html.
- Durant, Alan. 2010. *Meaning in the Media: Discourse, Controversy and Debate*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dutt, Aruna. 2019. "Meet the Meme Mastermind Behind Jagmeet Singh." CBC Comedy. November 6, 2019. <https://www.cbc.ca/comedy/meet-the-meme-mastermind-behind-jagmeet-singh-1.5349646>.
- "Election 2015: NDP Leads, but CPC's Base Is Most Solid." 2015. *Angus Reid Institute* (blog). August 26, 2015. <https://angusreid.org/federal-election-2015-august26/>.
- Employment and Social Development Canada. 2014. "Employment Insurance." Program descriptions. Government of Canada. September 25, 2014. <https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/programs/ei/ei-list/reports/monitoring2012/chapter2-4.html>.
- . 2015a. "Canada Pension Plan." Program descriptions. Government of Canada. October 8, 2015. <https://www.canada.ca/en/services/benefits/publicpensions/cpp.html>.
- . 2015b. "Guaranteed Income Supplement." Program descriptions. Government of Canada. October 28, 2015.

- <https://www.canada.ca/en/services/benefits/publicpensions/cpp/old-age-security/guaranteed-income-supplement.html>.
- . 2015c. “Old Age Security.” Program descriptions. Government of Canada. October 29, 2015. <https://www.canada.ca/en/services/benefits/publicpensions/cpp/old-age-security.html>.
- Emporius The Orator. 1973. “Emporius The Orator: Concerning Ethopoeia.” In *Readings In Medieval Rhetoric*, edited by Joseph M. Miller, Michael H. Prosser, and Thomas W. Benson, translated by Joseph M. Miller. Indiana University Press: Bloomington and London. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001650404>.
- “Ethopoeia, n.” 2022. In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/64838>.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1999. *Rhetorical Figures in Science*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://books-scholarsportal-info.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/en/read?id=/ebooks/ebooks0/oxford/2009-11-30/2/0195117506>.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Fazio, Lisa K., David G. Rand, and Gordon Pennycook. 2019. “Repetition Increases Perceived Truth Equally for Plausible and Implausible Statements.” *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 26 (5): 1705–10. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-019-01651-4>.
- Federal Candidates Debate Housing Issues*. 2019. Vote 2019 Special. Ottawa: CPAC. <https://www.cpac.ca/episode?id=78767666-d24e-4709-ba8e-37f35a1dcf32>.
- Fish, Stanley. 2016. *Winning Arguments: What Works and Doesn't Work in Politics, The Bedroom, The Courtroom, and The Classroom*. Book, Whole. HarperCollins. <http://lib.myilibrary.com?ID=937621>.
- Fishman, Ezra. 2016. “How Long Should Your Next Video Be?” Wistia. July 5, 2016. <https://wistia.com/learn/marketing/optimal-video-length>.
- Foley, Megan. 2010. “Voicing Terri Schiavo: Prosopopeic Citizenship in the Democratic Aporia between Sovereignty and Biopower.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 7 (4): 381–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2010.523433>.
- Fontanier, Pierre. 1968. *Les Figures du Discours*. Edited by Gérard Genette. Paris: Flammarion.
- Foot, Richard. 2019. “Senate of Canada.” The Canadian Encyclopedia. February 25, 2019. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/senate>.
- Foreign Affairs Trade and Development Canada. 2019. “Canada and the G7.” Government of Canada. April 5, 2019. https://international.gc.ca/world-monde/international_relations_relations_internationales/g7/index.aspx?lang=eng.
- Foss, Sonja K. 1989. *Rhetorical Criticism*. 2nd Edition. Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.
- Francoli, Mary, Josh Greenberg, and Christopher Waddell. 2016. “Like, Share, Vote: The CTV/Facebook Partnership and the 2015 Canadian Election.” In *The Canadian Federal Election of 2015*, edited by Jon H Pammett and Christopher Dornan. Dundurn Press.
- Freelon, Deen, and David Karpf. 2015. “Of Big Birds and Bayonets: Hybrid Twitter Interactivity in the 2012 Presidential Debates.” *Information, Communication & Society* 18 (4): 390–406. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.952659>.
- Friesen, Dawna. 2019. “Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript.” *Maclean's*, October 8, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- Galloway, Scott. 2017. *The Four: The Hidden DNA of Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google*. New York, NY: Portfolio/Penguin.

- Ganz, Marshall Louis. 2009. "What Is Public Narrative: Self, Us & Now." <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/30760283>.
- Global News, dir. 2015. *Federal Election 2015: "Sunny Ways, Sunny Ways" Justin Trudeau Celebrates Victory*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yjk1P4wEK9c>.
- Gollom, Mark. 2019. "What You Need to Know about the SNC-Lavalin Affair | CBC News." *CBC*, February 14, 2019. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/trudeau-wilson-raybould-attorney-general-snc-lavalin-1.5014271>.
- Goodale, Ralph. 2013. "Harper's Growth Record Is the Worst Since R.B. Bennett." *HuffPost Canada*. September 6, 2013. https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/ralph-goodale/harper-g20-economy_b_3882589.html.
- Government of Canada. 2019. "Registered Education Savings Plans." Program descriptions. May 3, 2019. <https://www.canada.ca/en/services/benefits/education/education-savings/resp.html>.
- . 2020. "Net-Zero Emissions by 2050." *Canada's Climate Plan*. November 19, 2020. <https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/net-zero-emissions-2050.html>.
- Government of Canada - Canada Revenue Agency. 2020. "Canada Child Benefit (CCB)." *Child and Family Benefits*. September 29, 2020. <https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/child-family-benefits/canada-child-benefit-overview.html>.
- Government of Canada - Department of Finance. 2020. "Fiscal Updates." Not available. Government of Canada. November 30, 2020. <https://www.canada.ca/en/departement-finance/services/publications/fall-economic-statement.html>.
- Government of Canada - Environment and Climate Change. 2020. "Greenhouse Gas Emissions." *Research. Environmental Indicators*. April 15, 2020. <https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/environmental-indicators/greenhouse-gas-emissions.html>.
- Government of Canada - Global Affairs. 2019. "Canada's Participation at the 2019 G20 Summit." *Global Affairs Canada*. February 27, 2019. <https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/campaign-campagne/g20/index.aspx?lang=eng>.
- Government of Canada - Statistics Canada. 2019. "The Daily — Effective Tax Rates and High Income Canadians, 2017." September 24, 2019. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/190924/dq190924b-eng.htm>.
- Green Party Canada. 2015a. "Impressed by @ElizabethMay in the #macdebate? Join the Movement Today." Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/CanadianGreens/status/629469748854587392>.
- . 2015b. "We Need to Put Power Back Where It Belongs - in the Hands of Canadians #macdebate #elxn42 #gpc Green.ca/Ov." Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/CanadianGreens/status/629456994626224128>.
- . 2015c. "Our Policy on #C51 Is Simple. Repeal It! #macdebate @ElizabethMay." Video. Twitter. August 10, 2015. <https://twitter.com/CanadianGreens/status/630882135419719680>.
- . 2019a. "Pipelines Won't Solve Climate Change 🙄 #LeadersDebate #elxn43 #cdnpoli." Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/CanadianGreens/status/1181370474590326784>.
- . 2019b. "Tired of the Divisive Politics You've Seen This Election? Blame First Past the Post. @ElizabethMay: 'It Makes Each Party a Rival of the Other.' We Need Solutions,

- Not Bickering. Greens Fight for Proportional Representation. #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli.” Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019.
<https://twitter.com/canadiangreens/status/1181355121869033473>.
- . 2019c. “‘You Bought a Pipeline. You Can’t Be a Climate Leader and Buy a Pipeline.’ - @ElizabethMay Trudeau’s Targets Are a Commitment to Failure. #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli.” Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019.
<https://twitter.com/canadiangreens/status/1181361207955087360>.
- Green Party of Canada. 2019a. “👍👍👍👍 Tired of the Divisive Politics You’ve Seen This Election? Blame First Past the Post. @ElizabethMay: ‘It Makes Each Party a Rival of the Other.’ We Need Solutions, Not Bickering. Greens Fight for Proportional Representation #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli.” Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019.
<https://www.instagram.com/p/B3VsmxrBQjX/>.
- . 2019b. “At the Debate Tonight, Elizabeth Explained Why Scheer’s Brand of Selfish Policies Are Stopping Us from Lifting Everyone out of Poverty.” Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019.
<https://www.facebook.com/GreenPartyofCanada/photos/a.10153548566937244/10157757681432244/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019c. “Debate Night! The Only Female Leader, Elizabeth Has Been an MP for 8 Years and Devoted Her Life to Defending the 🌍. She’s 🎯 Sure to Make a Splash, Laying down Some Hard Facts and Honest, Ethical, Caring Leadership. 🚀 Buckle up, Boys! Watch at Cbcnews.Ca.” Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019.
<https://www.instagram.com/p/B3UzutNBnu-/>.
- . 2019d. “It’s Debate Night! The Only Female Leader, Elizabeth Has Been Head of the Greens for 13 Years, an MP for 8, and She’s Devoted Her Whole Life to Defending People + 🌍. To the Other Leaders: Buckle up, Boys! Pass This on to Wish Her Luck!” Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019.
<https://www.facebook.com/GreenPartyofCanada/photos/a.10150200617027244/10157756689407244/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019e. “Andrew Scheer Will Never Be Prime Minister. He’s Proven He’s Not Trustworthy. His Climate Non-Plan Ignores Science. And He’s Been Dog Whistling to the Far Right. People in Canada Are so Much Better than That. Vote for What You Believe In.” Photo Post. Facebook. October 8, 2019.
<https://www.facebook.com/GreenPartyofCanada/photos/a.10150200617027244/10157759484592244/?type=3&theater>.
- Green Party of Canada - Parti vert du Canada. 2015a. “After Last Night’s Performance in the Maclean’s Debate, It Is Clear Elizabeth May Belongs in All the Debates. Sign-on Today to Demand She Be Included in the Remaining Leaders’ Debates: Green.ca/QUF.” Photo Post. Facebook. August 7, 2015.
<https://www.facebook.com/GreenPartyofCanada/photos/p.10153569505547244/10153569505547244/?type=1&theater>.
- . 2015b. “It Has Been Our Hallmark for Generations That We Can Disagree w/o Being Disagreeable.” Facebook. August 7, 2015.
<https://www.facebook.com/GreenPartyofCanada/videos/10153569850962244/>.
- . 2015c. “Reasons to Debate Demand That Elizabeth May Be Included in the Remaining Debates Here: Green.ca/QUF.” Facebook. August 8, 2015.

- <https://www.facebook.com/GreenPartyofCanada/videos/vb.6954922243/10153571770367244/?type=2&theater>.
- Hallin, Daniel C. 1992. "Sound Bite News: Television Coverage of Elections, 1968–1988." *Journal of Communication* 42 (2): 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1992.tb00775.x>.
- Harper, Stephen. 2015a. "I Am Sure If You Have Teenagers You'll Agree with Me - These Two Are Well-Practiced Debaters!" Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/RtHonStephenHarper/photos/a.410445882109/10153424843152110/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2015b. "I Am Sure If You Have Teenagers You'll Agree with Me - These Two Are Well-Practiced Debaters! #elxn42 #macdebate." Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/stephenharper/status/629397638413062146>.
- . 2015c. "Tale of the Tape: Read a Full Transcript of Maclean's Debate." *Maclean's*, August 7, 2015. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/tale-of-the-tape-read-a-full-transcript-of-macleans-debate/>.
- Harris, Randy Allen. 1988. "Bakhtin, Phaedrus, and the Geometry of Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 6 (2): 168–76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/465932>.
- . 2019. "The Fourth Master Trope, Antithesis." *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 22 (1): 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15362426.2019.1569412>.
- . 2021. "Jagmeet's Kairotic Challenge: Darkface, Turbans, and Hypocrisy Upwards." *Rhetoric, Politics & Culture* 1 (2): 161–93. <https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/869731>.
- . 2022. "Chiastic Iconicity: Refiguring Symmetry." In *Iconicity in Cognition and Across Semiotic Systems. Iconicity in Language and Literature 18*, edited by Sara Lenninger, Olga Fischer, Christina Ljungberg, and Elzbieta Tabakowska, 103–34. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hemsley, Jeff. 2019. "Followers Retweet! The Influence of Middle-Level Gatekeepers on the Spread of Political Information on Twitter." *Policy & Internet* 11 (3): 280–304. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.202>.
- Hudson, Sandy. 2019. "You Know What Would Be Better than All the White Leaders Congratulating @theJagmeetSingh on Dealing w/ Racism in the Campaign? Actually Coming up w/ a Plan to Deal with Racism/White Supremacy in Their Platforms. #elxn43 #CanadaDebates2019 #cdnpoli #leadersdebate2019." Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/sandela/status/1181352224326205440>.
- Hutchins, Aaron. 2015. "The Numbers Are in — and Millions Watched #macdebate." August 12, 2015. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/the-numbers-are-in-and-millions-watched-the-macleans-debate/>.
- Instagram. 2019. "We Want Your Friends to Focus on the Photos and Videos You Share, Not How Many Likes They Get. You Can Still See Your Own Likes by Tapping on the List of People Who've Liked It, but Your Friends Will Not Be Able to See How Many Likes Your Post Has Received." Post. *Twitter* (blog). July 17, 2019. <https://twitter.com/instagram/status/1151605660150194176>.
- "Instagram Demographics in 2021: Important User Stats for Marketers." 2021. *Social Media Marketing & Management Dashboard* (blog). January 27, 2021. <https://blog.hootsuite.com/instagram-demographics/>.
- "Internet Archive: Wayback Machine." 2015. December 31, 2015. <https://archive.org/web/>.

- “IPCC — Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.” 2020. IPCC. January 17, 2020.
<https://www.ipcc.ch/>.
- Isidore Of Seville. 1973. “Isidore Of Seville: The Etymologies, II. 1-15: ‘Concerning Rhetoric.’”
 In *Readings In Medieval Rhetoric*, edited by Joseph M. Miller, Michael H. Prosser, and
 Thomas W. Benson, translated by Dorothy V. Cerino. Indiana University Press:
 Bloomington and London. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001650404>.
- Jamieson, Kathleen Hall, and David S. Birdsell. 1988. *Presidential Debates: The Challenge of
 Creating An Informed Electorate*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kampher, Monique. 2019. “Democratic Prosopopeia: The Rhetorical Influence of the I-Will-
 Vote Image Filter on Social Media Profile Pictures during the 2015 Canadian Federal
 Election.” *Rhetor: The Journal of the Society for the Study of Rhetoric* 8: 59–98.
rhetcanada.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Rhetor-Kampher-4.pdf.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. 1957. *The King’s Two Bodies; A Study In Mediaeval Political
 Theology*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.b5068007>.
- Katula, Richard A., and James J. Murphy. 2003. “The Sophists and Rhetorical Consciousness.”
 In *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*, Third Edition. Mahwah, New Jersey and
 London: Hermagoras Press.
- Katz, Jackson. 2020. “Boxing Metaphors and the Importance of Gender in the Trump-Biden
 Debate.” *Ms. Magazine*. September 30, 2020.
<https://msmagazine.com/2020/09/30/sports-metaphors-and-the-importance-of-gender-in-the-trump-biden-debate/>.
- Kennedy, George Alexander, trans. 2003. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose
 Composition and Rhetoric*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
<https://hdl.handle.net/2027/fulcrum.5138jf267>.
- Kennedy, Mark. 2015. *Here’s What You Need to Know Before the First Leaders’ Election
 Debate*. Photograph. <https://ottawacitizen.com/news/politics/heres-what-you-need-to-know-before-the-first-leaders-election-debate>.
- Krashinsky, Susan. 2015. “The Ad Agency behind Trudeau’s Winning Campaign; From the
 Escalator to ‘Ready,’ Toronto-Based Bensimon Byrne Helped the Campaign Respond to
 Criticisms without Resorting to Personal Attacks.” *The Globe and Mail (Breaking News)*,
 October 22, 2015, sec. Business.
[http://global.factiva.com/redirect/default.aspx?P=sa&an=GMBN000020151022ebam003xp
 &cat=a&ep=ASE](http://global.factiva.com/redirect/default.aspx?P=sa&an=GMBN000020151022ebam003xp&cat=a&ep=ASE).
- Ladurantaye, Steve. 2015. “Looking Back on the #elxn42 Campaign on Twitter.” October 15,
 2015. https://blog.twitter.com/en_ca/a/2015/looking-back-on-the-elxn42-campaign-on-twitter.html.
- LaFlamme, Lisa. 2019. “Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript.” *Maclean’s*, October 8,
 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- Lalancette, Mireille, and Vincent Raynauld. 2019. “The Power of Political Image: Justin
 Trudeau, Instagram, and Celebrity Politics.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 63 (7): 888–
 924. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764217744838>.
- Landtsheer, Christ’l De, Philippe De Vries, and Dieter Vertessen. 2008. “Political Impression
 Management: How Metaphors, Sound Bites, Appearance Effectiveness, and Personality
 Traits Can Win Elections.” *Journal of Political Marketing* 7 (3–4): 217–38.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15377850802005083>.

- Lanham, Richard A. 1991. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. 2nd ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- . 1993. *The Electric World: Democracy, Technology, and the Arts*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 2006. *The Economics of Attention: Style and Substance in the Age of Information*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Edited by David E. Orton and Dean Anderson. Translated by Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton. Leiden and Boston and Koln: Brill.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015066089726>.
- “Leaders’ Debates Commission.” 2022. Leaders’ Debates Commission. May 10, 2022.
<https://www.debates-debats.ca/en/>.
- Liberal Party. 2015a. “(2/2) Harper Blames It on Sluggish Growth around the World, but That’s Obviously Not the Case.” Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015.
https://twitter.com/liberal_party/status/629448609126289408.
- . 2015b. “He Did Us Proud. Share If You Agree. #elxn42 #cdnpoli.” Photo. Twitter. August 7, 2015. https://twitter.com/liberal_party/status/629710186509398016.
- . 2015c. “The Contradictions Speak for Themselves. Why Does Tom Mulcair Keep Changing His Position on Debates? #NDP.” Video. Twitter. August 9, 2015.
https://twitter.com/liberal_party/status/630532086609227776.
- . 2019a. “‘A Québecer Is a Canadian and Will Remain a Canadian under My Watch.’ - @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli.” Photo Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. https://twitter.com/liberal_party/status/1181372284235370496.
- . 2019b. “We’ve Invested \$2.7 Billion since 2016 to Strengthen First Nations Water and Wastewater Systems. Since Then, 87 Long-Term Drinking Water Advisories Have Been Lifted, and We Will End the Rest by 2021. @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli.” Photo Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019.
https://twitter.com/liberal_party/status/1181359762035892224.
- . 2019c. “Are We Really Surprised That the Conservatives Have Been Caught Lying to Canadians - Again?” Link Post. Twitter. October 9, 2019.
https://twitter.com/liberal_party/status/1182076373193625602.
- Liberal Party of Canada. 2019. “In the Past Week, Liberal Volunteers across the Country Made over 2 MILLION Knocks & Calls - a New Record! Congrats to @lockhartalaina, @genevievehinse, @marcomendicino, @amarjeet_sohi, @sukhdhaliwal_mp, @richard.Hebertlsj, and Their Awesome Teams for Being the Top Teams across the Country This Week. To All Liberal Teams Working Hard to Reach More Canadians than Ever before - Keep up the Great Work! — Au Cours de La Dernière Semaine, Les Bénévoles Libéraux d’un Bout à l’autre Du Pays Ont Fait plus de 2 MILLIONS d’appels et de Visites - Un Nouveau Record! Cette Semaine, @lockhartalaina, @genevievehinse, @marcomendicino, @amarjeet_sohi, @sukhdhaliwal_mp, @richard.Hebertlsj et Leurs Fabuleuses Équipes Se Sont Les plus Démarqués Parmi Toutes Les Équipes de Partout à Travers Le Pays. Félicitations! Et à Toutes Les Autres Équipes Qui Travaillent sans Relâche Pour Interagir Avec plus de Canadiens Que Jamais Auparavant - Continuez Votre Superbe Travail, Vous Êtes Indispensables!” Photo Post. Instagram. October 8, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3X2x7IgOw0/>.

- Liberal Party of Canada | Parti libéral du Canada. 2015a. "The Pundits Agree!" Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/LiberalCA/photos/p.10152934715412007/10152934715412007/?type=1&theater>.
- . 2015b. "He Did Us Proud. Share If You Agree." Photo. Facebook. August 7, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/LiberalCA/photos/a.108461847006/10152935645557007/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2015c. "The Reviews Are in. Please Share to Show Your Support." Facebook. August 8, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/LiberalCA/posts/10152935735147007>.
- . 2019a. "Cuts to Education, Healthcare, and Environmental Protection - for Our Kids' Sake, We Can't Afford for Andrew Scheer to Do to Canada What Doug Ford Has Done to Ontario." Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/LiberalCA/photos/a.108461847006/10156366473277007/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019b. "Who Has the Positive Plan? Their Words from the Debate Last Night Speak for Themselves." Photo Post. Facebook. October 8, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/LiberalCA/posts/10156370391482007>.
- . 2019c. "Are We Really Surprised That the Conservatives Have Been Caught Lying to Canadians - Again?" Link Post. Facebook. October 9, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/LiberalCA/posts/10156372560567007>.
- Lincoln, Abraham, and Stephen Arnold Douglas. 1895. *Political Speeches and Debates of Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas, 1854-1861*. Edited by Alonzo Trévier Jones. Battle Creek, MI: International Tract Society.
- "Lincoln-Douglas Debates." 1994. Video. C-Span. August 1994. <https://www.c-span.org/series/?LincolnDouglas>.
- Lindell, Rebecca. 2013. "Trudeau Changes Channel on Attack Ads." Global News. April 24, 2013. <https://globalnews.ca/news/506944/trudeau-changes-channel-on-attack-ads/>.
- Lomborg, Stine. 2014. *Social Media, Social Genres: Making Sense of the Ordinary*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Losh, Elizabeth. 2009. *Virtualpolitik*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Luntz, Frank. 2007. *Words That Work: It's Not What You Say, It's What People Hear*. Hachette Books.
- MacCharles, Tonda, and Bruce Champion-Smith. 2019. "Six-Way Fight Ends with No Clear Winner in Leaders' Debate." The Toronto Star. October 7, 2019. <https://www.thestar.com/politics/federal/2019/10/07/canada-leaders-debate-was-a-six-way-fight-with-no-clear-winner.html>.
- Machin, David, and Andrea Mayr. 2012. *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction*. London: SAGE Publications.
- MacKinnon, Mark, and Omar El Akkad. 2015. "The World Welcomes Justin Trudeau, Canada's 'Super Hot New Leader.'" *The Globe and Mail*, October 20, 2015. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/the-world-welcomes-canadas-super-hot-new-leader/article26883867/>.
- Maclean's*. 2015. "Tale of the Tape: Read a Full Transcript of Maclean's Debate," August 7, 2015. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/tale-of-the-tape-read-a-full-transcript-of-macleans-debate/>.

- . 2019a. “Federal Election Leaders Debate 2019: Full Replay,” October 7, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-election-leaders-debate-2019-live-video/>.
- , dir. 2019b. “Federal Election Leaders Debate 2019: Full Video.” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_2S8UUSKSDM.
- . 2019c. “Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript,” October 8, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- “Maclean’s Leaders’ Debate.” 2015. CPAC.Ca. August 6, 2015. http://live.cpac.ca/Event/Macleans_Leaders_Debate?Page=0.
- Maclean’s Magazine. 2019. “.@theJagmeetSingh on His Climate Plan: ‘You Do Not Need to Choose between Mr. Delay and Mr. Deny. There Is Another Option.’ #elx43 #leadersdebate2019.” Video Post. *Twitter* (blog). October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/macleans/status/1181361250007158784>.
- Madore, Marjolaine. 2009. “Myspace to Your Space: How Celebrity Politics and the Internet Are Transforming Political Communication Among American Youth.” *American Communication Journal* 11 (1).
- Maher, Stephen. 2015. “Stephen Maher: Mulcair’s Change from Angry Tom to Smiling Tom Left Opening for Trudeau in Debate.” *National Post*, August 7, 2015. <https://nationalpost.com/opinion/stephen-maher-mulcairs-change-from-angry-tom-to-smiling-tom-left-opening-for-trudeau-in-debate>.
- . 2019. “A Leaders Debate for Our Messy Politics.” *Maclean’s*, October 7, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/opinion/a-leaders-debate-worthy-of-our-messy-politics/>.
- Man, Paul de. 1984. “Autobiography As De-Facement.” In *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*, 67–81. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mandel, Charles. 2015. “Justin Trudeau’s Fight for the Top.” *Canada’s National Observer*. August 25, 2015. <https://www.nationalobserver.com/2015/08/25/news/justin-trudeaus-fight-top>.
- Marland, Alex. 2016. *Brand Command: Canadian Politics and Democracy in the Age of Message Control*. Vancouver: UBC Press. [https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/\[SITE_ID\]/detail.action?docID=4749884](https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/[SITE_ID]/detail.action?docID=4749884).
- Martineau, Richard. 2019. “Mon vote.” Opinion. *Le Journal de Montréal*. October 7, 2019. <https://www.journaldemontreal.com/2019/10/07/mon-vote>.
- May, Elizabeth. 2015a. “Tune in Tomorrow! Elizabeth May Joins the Maclean’s National Leaders Debate Tomorrow Night, August 6, Starting at 8 Pm EDT.” Facebook. August 5, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/ElizabethMayGreenLeader/photos/a.10150151954943345/10154142326148345/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2015b. “Calling All Elizabeth May Supporters!” Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/ElizabethMayGreenLeader/photos/a.10150151954943345/10154144458748345/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2015c. “Invite Elizabeth | Green Party of Canada.” Post. Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/ElizabethMayGreenLeader/posts/10154148056798345>.
- . 2015d. “Tale of the Tape: Read a Full Transcript of Maclean’s Debate.” *Maclean’s*, August 7, 2015. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/tale-of-the-tape-read-a-full-transcript-of-macleans-debate/>.

- . 2015e. “@bethevoteca @UniforTheUnion I Tried in the Debate. We Must Address Crushing Student Debt!” Text. Twitter. August 11, 2015. <https://twitter.com/ElizabethMay/status/631132285706735616>.
- . 2015f. “@Tintie4 @christellar His Excuse Was Absurd. #GPC Is National Party w Elected MP. That Has Always Been the Requirement for Debates.” Text. Twitter. August 11, 2015. <https://twitter.com/ElizabethMay/status/631235112798031872>.
- . 2015g. “Q of the Day: In the #Macdebate Harper Said C51 Includes Oversight by Judges. Does It Really? #QPGPC #elxn42 #cdnpoli.” Photo. Twitter. August 29, 2015. <https://twitter.com/ElizabethMay/status/637764131269963776>.
- . 2019a. “I Was Unfairly Excluded from Tonight’s French Language Debate, Which Means I Didn’t Get to Offer French Canadians My Plan or My Perspective. But Don’t Worry, the Green Momentum Won’t Be Stopped - and I’ll Be There to Hold Them to Account in the next One. Tune in Monday.” Photo Post. Facebook. October 2, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/ElizabethMayGreenLeader/photos/a.10158740499318345/10158984299903345/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019b. “In Canada, All Parties Represented in Parliament Should Be Included in Debates. By Excluding a Green Voice, TVA Fails to Offer the Full Picture That Voters Are Facing at the Polls This Election. <https://www.macleans.ca/opinion/the-green-party-wont-be-silenced-by-tva/>.” Link Post. Twitter. October 2, 2019. <https://twitter.com/elizabethmay/status/1179514205898235904>.
- . 2019c. “The Green Party Won’t Be Silenced by TVA.” *Macleans*, October 2, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/opinion/the-green-party-wont-be-silenced-by-tva/>.
- . 2019d. “Green Party Exclusive Middle Seat in Economy Fully Loaded! My Husband @kiddjohn and I Are off to Ottawa for My Preparations for #leadersdebate2019. Watch as I Try to Add Peace and Loving Kindness to 5 Angry Men. :) #GPC.” Photo Post. Twitter. October 6, 2019. <https://twitter.com/elizabethmay/status/1180920779745087488>.
- . 2019e. “If I Become PM, I Will Encourage Global Philanthropy to Support Canadian NGOs Pushing for a Clean Energy Economy and Healthy Biodiversity. We Will Protect the Rights of Civil Society Org’s to Comment on Settled Science under Canada’s Election and Charitable Laws. #GPC #climate.” Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/elizabethmay/status/1181242159661555712>.
- . 2019f. “The Debate Tonight Made One Thing Blatantly Clear: We Need Proportional Representation. We Can’t Solve the Problems of Our Time without Working Together.” Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/ElizabethMayGreenLeader/photos/a.10158740499318345/10159001579553345/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019g. “Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript.” *Macleans*, October 8, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- . 2019h. “So - after All the Debates Are over - the Conservatives Will Release Their Platform. This Is a New Low in Respect for Voters. #GPC #respect.” Post. Twitter. October 10, 2019. <https://twitter.com/elizabethmay/status/1182355766856040448>.
- . 2019i. “Happy Thanksgiving! From Our Happy Family to Yours! Counting My Blessings. #love.” Photo Post. Instagram. October 14, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3lJnilrmE/>.
- . 2019j. “40 Days of Green Party Leader Elizabeth May’s Campaign in 40 Seconds. #CanadaElection2019 #CanadaVotes #elxn43.” Video Post. Facebook. October 21, 2019.

- <https://www.facebook.com/thenational/videos/524689674931577/UzpfSTIwNjQ3NDI4MzQ0OjEwMTU5MDUwOTc0NjY4MzQ1/>.
- Mayoral, José Antonio. 2001. "Ethopoeia." In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, edited by Thomas O. Sloane, translated by A. Ballesteros, 263. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- McDonald, Janet. 2016. "Who Did Your Ink?: Justin Trudeau's Haida-Inspired Tattoo Is Tied to His Past." *The Georgia Straight*. July 1, 2016. <https://www.straight.com/blogra/729001/who-did-your-ink-justin-trudeaus-haida-inspired-tattoo-tied-his-past>.
- Meffert, Michael F., Sascha Huber, Thomas Gschwend, and Franz Urban Pappi. 2011. "More than Wishful Thinking: Causes and Consequences of Voters' Electoral Expectations about Parties and Coalitions." *Electoral Studies* 30 (4): 804–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2011.08.001>.
- Miller, Carolyn R. 2003. "Writing in a Culture of Simulation: Ethos Online." In *Towards a Rhetoric of Everyday Life: New Directions in Research on Writing, Text, and Discourse*, edited by Martin Nystrand and John Duffy, 58–83. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- . 2018. "Genre in Ancient and Networked Media." In *Ancient Rhetorics and Digital Networks*, edited by Michele Kennerly and Damien Smith Pfister. Rhetoric, Culture, and Social Critique. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press. [https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/\[SITE_ID\]/detail.action?docID=5252856](https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/[SITE_ID]/detail.action?docID=5252856).
- Mulcair, Tom. 2015a. "Canadians Are #Ready4Change. We Are Too." Video. Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/TomMulcair/videos/865162943571579/>.
- . 2015b. "Canadians Are #Ready4Change. We Are Too. #NDP #macdebate #elxn42." Video. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/ThomasMulcair/status/629475625502314496>.
- . 2015c. "Canadians Are #Ready4Change. We Are Too. #NDP #macdebate #elxn42." Photo. Instagram. August 6, 2015. <https://www.instagram.com/p/6EMv2cCh1l/>.
- . 2015d. "This Election Is a Choice—between Four More Years of Stephen Harper or This Extraordinary Team. #Ready4Change #NDP." Video. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/ThomasMulcair/status/629342144168263680>.
- . 2015e. "This Election Is about a Choice – a Choice between Four More Years of Stephen Harper or This Extraordinary Team of Women and Men Dedicated to Bringing Positive Change to Ottawa. – Tom Mulcair in Toronto #Ready4Change #NDP #Toronto #elxn4." Photo. Instagram. August 6, 2015. <https://www.instagram.com/p/6DJKYzCh83/>.
- . 2015f. "Tale of the Tape: Read a Full Transcript of Maclean's Debate." *Maclean's*, August 7, 2015. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/tale-of-the-tape-read-a-full-transcript-of-macleans-debate/>.
- . 2015g. "The Reviews Are in — Tom Was 'Strong', 'Prime Ministerial', and the 'Victor' in Last Night's Debate. #NDP #macdebate." Photo. Twitter. August 7, 2015. <https://twitter.com/ThomasMulcair/status/629733458437275652>.
- . 2015h. "Tom Mulcair Wins First Leaders Debate." Facebook. August 7, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/TomMulcair/photos/a.187109341376946/865486016872605/?type=3&theater>.
- Murthy, Dhiraj. 2018. *Twitter: Social Communication in the Twitter Age*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

- Nass, Clifford, Jonathan Steuer, Lisa Henriksen, and D. Christopher Dryer. 1994. "Machines, Social Attributions, and Ethopoeia: Performance Assessments of Computers Subsequent to 'Self-' or 'Other-' Evaluations." *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 40 (3): 543–59. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ijhc.1994.1025>.
- Nass, Clifford, Jonathan Steuer, Ellen Tauber, and Heidi Reeder. 1993. "Anthropomorphism, Agency, and Ethopoeia: Computers as Social Actors." In *INTERACT '93 and CHI '93 Conference Companion on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 111–12. CHI '93. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/259964.260137>.
- NDP. 2015a. "Governing Is about Setting Priorities. RT If You Agree w/ @ThomasMulcair's Focus on Affordable Childcare. #macdebate." Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/NDP/status/629462578423402496>.
- . 2015b. "Honestly, Mr Harper, We Really Can't Afford Another 4 Years of You." #Ready4Change #NDP #elxn42 #macdebate." Video. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/NDP/status/629449363832463360>.
- . 2015c. ".@ThomasMulcair Challenges Stephen Harper on His Failed Plan for Canada's Economy. #Ready4Change #macdebate." Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/NDP/status/629449525673852928>.
- . 2019a. "Don't Want Mr. Delay OR Mr. Deny? You Don't Have to Settle for Either Guy. If You Want Someone Who Will Do Something To Fight Climate Change, Just Pick Jagmeet Singh! #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn43." Photo Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/ndp/status/1181387407079460864>.
- . 2019b. "Justin Trudeau Did Everything He Could to Keep SNC-Lavalin out of Court – but He Spent Nearly a Million Dollars Fighting Indigenous Kids. What Kind of Leader Chooses to Fight Kids in Court Instead of Help Them? #CanadaDebates2019." Video Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/ndp/status/1181358147493138432>.
- . 2019c. "This Weekend, Jagmeet Visited Grassy Narrows, Where the Devastating Impacts of Mercury Contamination Have Impacted 3 Generations. We Can Make Sure Every Community Has Access to Clean Water. We Just Have to Make It a Priority. #InItForYou #elxn43 #cdnpoli." Video Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/ndp/status/1181201149799620609>.
- "Oldweb.Today." 2019. May 15, 2019. <http://oldweb.today/>.
- O'Neil, Lauren. 2019. "Nobody Really Won Last Night's Federal Leaders' Election Debate." BlogTO. October 8, 2019. <https://www.blogto.com/city/2019/10/nobody-won-last-night-federal-leaders-election-debate-canada/>.
- Ong, Walter J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Paas-Lang, Christian. 2019. "Viewership up, but Format Questions Remain for Leaders' Debates." Federal Election 2019. October 8, 2019. <https://election.ctvnews.ca/viewership-up-but-format-questions-remain-for-leaders-debates-1.4630063>.
- Pack, Mark. 2010. "Obama: The Marketing Lessons." *Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice* 12 (1): 2–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/dddmp.2010.17>.
- Palkin, Steve. 2019. "Why Andrew Scheer Had No Choice but To Go." TVO.Org. December 13, 2019. <https://www.tvo.org/article/why-andrew-scheer-had-no-choice-but-to-go>.

- Parliament of Canada. 2014. "Fair Elections Act C-23 (41-2)." LEGISinfo. June 19, 2014. <http://www.parl.ca/LegisInfo/BillDetails.aspx?Language=E&billId=6398775>.
- . 2015. "House Government Bill C-51 (41-2)." LEGISinfo. June 18, 2015. <https://www.parl.ca/legisinfo/BillDetails.aspx?billId=6842344&Language=E>.
- Parsons, Stephen D. 2005. *Rational Choice and Politics*. London; New York: Continuum.
- Paxson, James J. 1994. *The Poetics of Personification*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1017/CBO9780511552830>.
- Peachum, Henry. 1577. *The Garden of Eloquence*. London, United Kingdom: H. Jackson. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.03.0096:part=Schemate s%20Rhetorical:subpart=The%20third%20order:section=Amplification&highlight=proso popoeia>.
- People's Party of Canada. 2019a. "Maxime Bernier WILL Be in the Leaders' Debates Commission Debates! #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI #elxn43." Photo Post. Facebook. September 16, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/peoplespca/posts/2317278855037649>.
- . 2019b. "Maxime Bernier WILL Be in the Leaders' Debates Commission Debates! #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI #elxn43." Photo Post. Instagram. September 16, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B2fIJzOgObQ/>.
- . 2019c. "Received the Good News from the Leaders' Debates Commission as I'm about to Board My Plane for Saint John!" Video Post. Facebook. September 16, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/peoplespca/posts/2317095571722644>.
- . 2019d. "The HQ Team Is Watching the Debates from the Government Funded Trailers Outside the Debate Venue. How Do You Think Max Is Doing? #elxn43 #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI." Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019. https://www.instagram.com/p/B3Vlr_yghpR/.
- . 2019e. "We're Less than 90 Minutes Away from a Landmark Moment in Canadian History. #elxn43 #PPC2019 #CDNPOLI #canadadebates2019." Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3VRdbTgbVq/>.
- . 2019f. "Aside from Curbing Immigration, the Party Wants to Eliminate the Deficit in 2 Years, End Subsidies to Corporations, Cut Funding to Multiculturalism Programs, Make It Easier to Build Pipelines, Scrap the Carbon Tax and Phase out Supply Management for Agricultural Products." Link Post. Facebook. October 8, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/peoplespca/posts/2357399547692246>.
- Perelman, Chaïm, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. 1969. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise On Argumentation*. Translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Persuit, Jeanne M. 2013. *Social Media and Integrated Marketing Communication: A Rhetorical Approach*. Plymouth, United Kingdom: Lexington Books.
- Postman, Neil. 1985. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. 20th Anniversary Edition. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- PPC HQ - People's Party of Canada. 2019a. "It's Happening!" GIF Post. Twitter. September 16, 2019. <https://twitter.com/peoplespca/status/1173650869600079872>.
- . 2019b. "@mmccdenier @TVAreseau @munkdebate @MaximeBernier We Need to Hear All Voices. That's What Democracy Is about. #PutMaximeBernierIn." Reply Post. Twitter. September 16, 2019. <https://twitter.com/peoplespca/status/1173765242096115717>.

- . 2019c. “Oh Yeah. It’s All Coming Together.” GIF Reply Post. Twitter. September 16, 2019. <https://twitter.com/peoplespca/status/1173658083752628230>.
- “Prosopopoeia, n.” 2022. In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. <https://www-oed-com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/view/Entry/153015?redirectedFrom=prosopopoeia>.
- Quintilian. 2001a. *Institutio Oratoria The Orator’s Education: Books 9-10*. Edited and translated by Donald Russell. Vol. 4. Cambridge, MA; London, England: Harvard University Press. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106016735398>.
- . 2001b. *Institutio Oratoria The Orator’s Education: Books 11-12*. Edited and translated by Donald A. Russell. Vol. 5. Cambridge, MA; London, England: Harvard University Press. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106016735406>.
- Rabson, Mia. 2019. “‘You’Ll Just Bring Her on the Plane’: Baby on Board during Scheer’s Campaign.” *Global News*. September 21, 2019. <https://globalnews.ca/news/5934428/scheer-baby-kenzie-potter-campaign-family/>.
- Raj, Althia. 2019. “Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript.” *Maclean’s*, October 8, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- Raynauld, Vincent, and Mireille Lalancette. 2018. “Justin Trudeau, Instagram and Political Image-Making.” *Policy Options*. April 9, 2018. <https://policyoptions.irpp.org/fr/magazines/april-2018/instagram-justin-trudeau-and-political-image-making/>.
- Reilly, Tom. 1978. “The Press and the Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858.” August 1978. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED159708>.
- . 1979. “Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858 Forced New Role on the Press.” *Journalism Quarterly* 56 (4): 734–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769907905600405>.
- “Replay: Maclean’s National Leaders’ Debate.” 2015. *Maclean’s YouTube*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hSf2__qpeGA&fbclid=IwAR3M8i25dhsGORHvoZ0D9eSh2JSRVSlagyG67rRNIGN0RdWCyzqkbqTi5cc.
- Riffaterre, Michael. 1985. “Prosopopoeia.” *Yale French Studies*, The Lesson of Paul de Man, , no. 69: 107–23. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2929928>.
- Robitaille, Antoine. 2019. “Trudeau, Capitaine Canada contre la loi 21.” *Le Journal de Québec*. October 8, 2019. <https://www.journaldequebec.com/2019/10/08/trudeau-capitaine-canada-contre-la-loi-21-1>.
- Rosenbloom, Stephanie. 2011. “Authentic? Get Real.” *The New York Times*, September 9, 2011, sec. Fashion. <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/11/fashion/for-only-the-authentic-cultural-studies.html>.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police. 2019. “National Home Page | Royal Canadian Mounted Police.” Government of Canada. April 8, 2019. <http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/about-ausujet/index-eng.htm>.
- Royal Society for Public Health Vision, Voice and Practice (RSPH). 2017. “#StatusofMind.” May 2017. <https://www.rsph.org.uk/our-work/campaigns/status-of-mind.html>.
- Ruest, Nick, and Ian Milligan. 2016. “An Open-Source Strategy for Documenting Events: The Case Study of the 42nd Canadian Federal Election on Twitter.” *The Code4Lib Journal*, no. 32 (April). <http://journal.code4lib.org/articles/11358>.
- Ruffin, John Demosthenes N. 1920. *Forms of Oratorical Expression and Their Delivery: Or, Logic and Eloquence Illustrated*. London, United Kingdom: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent. <http://archive.org/details/formsoforatorica00ruffrich>.

- Sanford, Claire. 2021. "Canada Federal Leaders Debate Justin Trudeau: 2021 Transcript." *Rev* (blog). September 9, 2021. <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/canada-federal-leaders-debate-justin-trudeau-2021-transcript>.
- Scheer, Andrew. 2019a. "Another Week in the Books! Momentum Is Building as More and More Canadians Show Their Support for Our Plan to Help You Get Ahead. Join Me, and Let's Make Life More Affordable for Everyone!" Video Post. Facebook. October 6, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/AndrewScheerMP/videos/1155289751335284/>.
- . 2019b. "Another Week in the Books! Momentum Is Building as More and More Canadians Show Their Support for Our Plan to Help You Get Ahead. Join Me, and Let's Make Life More Affordable for Everyone!" Video Post. Twitter. October 6, 2019. <https://twitter.com/andrewscheer/status/1181020655078313984>.
- . 2019c. "I Kicked off National Newspaper Week with Copies of the Fort Times, from My Local Community in Saskatchewan, and the @OttawaCitizen, Where My Dad Worked as a Librarian. Local Papers Are Our Communities' Lifelines for Keeping up with the News. #NewspapersMatter. ca J'ai Donné Le Coup d'envoi de La Semaine Nationale de La Presse Avec Des Exemplaires Du Fort Times, de Chez Moi En Saskatchewan, et Du @OttawaCitizen, Où Travaillait Mon Père Comme Bibliothécaire. Les Journaux Locaux Sont Vitaux Pour Que Nous Restions à l'affût de l'actualité. #LesJournauxComptent . . . #Canada #polcan #cdnpoli #elxn43." Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3U7ZOTgaPc/>.
- . 2019d. "Let's Do This. It's Time for You to Get Ahead! #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43." Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/AndrewScheerMP/photos/a.182719685095125/2979344122099320/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019e. "Let's Do This. It's Time for You to Get Ahead! #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43." Photo Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/andrewscheer/status/1181341268787507205>.
- . 2019f. "Let's Do This. It's Time for You to Get Ahead! #LeadersDebate2019 #elxn43 ca Allons-y! Plus. Pour Vous. Dès Maintenant! #DébatDesChefs2019 #elxn43." Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3VZwqRgQ8E/>.
- . 2019g. "Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript." *Maclean's*, October 8, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- . 2019h. "As Prime Minister, I Will Work to Make Your Commute Shorter and More Affordable. Under Justin Trudeau, Critical Projects That Will Reduce Your Commute Times Aren't Getting Built. It's Time for You to Get Ahead." Video Post. Facebook. October 9, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/AndrewScheerMP/videos/700631593776646/>.
- . 2019i. "As Prime Minister, I Will Work to Make Your Commute Shorter and More Affordable. Under Justin Trudeau, Critical Projects That Will Reduce Your Commute Times Aren't Getting Built. It's Time for You to Get Ahead." Video Post. Twitter. October 9, 2019. <https://twitter.com/andrewscheer/status/1181913394754011137>.
- . 2019j. "Heading into the Debate with My Better Half on Thursday. ca En Arrivant Au Débat Jeudi Avec Ma Douce Moitié. #Latergram #Canada #bestwife #family #cdnpoli #polcan #elxn43 #meilleureépouse #famille." Instagram. October 13, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3lCiHxAtJm/>.

- Schill, Dan. 2012. "The Visual Image and the Political Image: A Review of Visual Communication Research in the Field of Political Communication." *Review of Communication* 12 (2): 118–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2011.653504>.
- Sherry, Richard. 1550. *A Treatise of Schemes [and] Tropes Very Profytable for the Better Vnderstanding of Good Authors, Gathered out of the Best Grammarians [and] Oratours by Rychard Sherry Londoner. Whervnto Is Added a Declamacion, That Chyldren Euen Strapt Fro[m] Their Infancie Should Be Well and Gently Broughte vp in Learnynge. Written Fyrst in Latin by the Most Excellent and Famous Clarke, Erasmus of Roterodame.* London, England: By Iohn Day dwellinge ouer Aldersgate, beneth saint Martyns. And are to be sold at his shop by the litle conduit in Chepesyde at the sygne of the Resurrection. <http://www.proquest.com/eebo/docview/2240902860/citation/D450A82A1F66403EPQ/1>
- “Singh Criticizes Greens on Abortion.” 2019. CTV News. October 4, 2019. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/video?clipId=1797097&playlistId=1.4624621&binId=1.810401&playlistPageNum=1&binPageNum=1?autoplay=true>.
- Singh, Jagmeet. 2019a. “You Know It’s Been a Long Day When the Ears Are out 🤦‍♂️ #elxn43.” Photo Post. Facebook. October 6, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/jagmeetndp/photos/a.180283742019214/2445534548827444/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019b. “You Know It’s Been a Long Day When the Ears Are out 😓 #elxn43.” Photo Post. Instagram. October 6, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3SuMvzHb8v/>.
- . 2019c. “A Man Has No Place in a Discussion of a Woman’s Right to Choose. #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn43.” Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/thejagmeetsingh/status/1181369055929929728>.
- . 2019d. “Debate Night Is a Wrap! I Love Every Opportunity I Get to Share the Stories of the People I’ve Met across Canada – and Offer Our Plan to Make Life Easier for People, Instead of Protecting the Interests of the Rich & Powerful. #elxn43 #CanadaDebates2019 ca C’est Fini Pour Le Débat de Ce Soir! C’est Très Important Pour Moi de Saisir Chaque Occasion Pour Partager Les Histoires Des Gens Que Je Rencontre à Travers Le Canada et Présenter Notre Plan Pour Rendre Votre Vie plus Facile, Pas Celle Des plus Riches.” Photo Post. Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3VupQTHfO-/>.
- . 2019e. “Debate Night Is a Wrap! I Love Every Opportunity I Get to Share the Stories of the People I’ve Met across Canada – and Offer Our Plan to Make Life Easier for People, Not the Rich & Powerful. ca C’est Fini Pour Le Débat de Ce Soir! C’est Très Important Pour Moi de Saisir Chaque Occasion Pour Partager Les Histoires Des Gens Que Je Rencontre à Travers Le Canada et Présenter Notre Plan Pour Rendre Votre Vie plus Facile, Pas Celle Des plus Riches.” Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/jagmeetndp/posts/2447730488607850>.
- . 2019f. “We’re Here & Ready to Go 🇨🇦 Arrivé et Prêt à Passer à l’action. #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43.” Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/jagmeetndp/photos/a.180283742019214/2447335108647388/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019g. “What We’re Seeing Tonight Is Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Scheer Arguing over What Is Worse for Canada. I Believe We Need to Be Fighting for What Will Be Best for Canada. We Need to Demand More – Not Be Scared into Settling for Less.

- #CanadaDebates2019 #elxn43.” Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/thejagmeetsingh/status/1181356724541968385>.
- . 2019h. “You Don’t Have to Choose between Mr. Delay (@JustinTrudeau) & Mr. Deny (@AndrewScheer). It’s Time to Start Fighting the Climate Crisis like We Want to Win by Taking on the Largest Polluters & Creating 300,000 New Jobs in the Clean Energy Economy of the Future. #CanadaDebates2019.” Post. Twitter. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/thejagmeetsingh/status/1181361700412493826>.
- . 2019i. “Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript.” *Maclean’s*, October 8, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- Slaughter, Graham. 2019. “Truth Tracker: Conservatives Falsely Claim Trudeau Lowered Taxes for Millionaires.” CTV News Federal Election 2019. October 8, 2019. <https://election.ctvnews.ca/truth-tracker-conservatives-falsely-claim-trudeau-lowered-taxes-for-millionaires-1.4629774>.
- Smith, John. 1657. *The Myserie of Rhetorique Unvail’d, Wherein above 130 of the Tropes and Figures Are Severally Derived from the Greek into English, Together with Lively Definitions and Variety of Latin, English, Scriptural, Examples, Pertinent to Each of Them Apart ...* London: Printed by E. Cotes for George Eversden. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/101803676>.
- Smith, Sidonie, and Julia Watson. 2014. “Virtually Me: A Toolbox about Online Self-Presentation.” In *Identity Technologies: Constructing the Self Online*, edited by Anna Poletti and Julie Rak, 70–95. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. 1992. “Dis-Covering the Subject of the ‘Great Constitutional Discussion,’ 1786-1789.” *The Journal of American History*, Discovering America: A Special Issue, 79 (3): 841–73. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2080790>.
- Spears, Russell, and Martin Lea. 1992. “Social Influence and the Influence of the ‘Social’ in Computer-Mediated Communication.” In *Contexts of Computer-Mediated Communication*, edited by Martin Lea. Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Spurr, Ben. 2015. “Social Media Activity Measured after Leaders’ Debate.” *The Toronto Star*. August 9, 2015. <https://www.thestar.com/news/federal-election/2015/08/09/social-media-activity-measured-after-leaders-debate.html>.
- Stacy, Robert H. 1977. *Defamiliarization in Language and Literature*. 1st ed. Book, Whole. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.
- Statista Research Department. 2015a. “Canada: Facebook User Penetration 2015.” Statista. January 6, 2015. <http://www.statista.com/statistics/437354/facebook-penetration-rate-by-age-canada/>.
- . 2015b. “Canada: Instagram Usage Penetration Language 2015.” Statista. January 6, 2015. <http://www.statista.com/statistics/437843/instagram-penetration-rate-canada-language/>.
- Statistics Canada - Government of Canada. 2015. “The Daily — Canada’s Population Estimates: Age and Sex, July 1, 2015.” September 29, 2015. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/150929/dq150929b-eng.htm>.
- Stillar, Glenn F. 1998. *Analyzing Everyday Texts: Discourse, Rhetoric, and Social Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.

- Stokes, Kisha. 2019. "2019 Edelman Trust Barometer: Annual Global Study," 28. https://www.edelman.ca/sites/g/files/aatuss376/files/2019-10/2019%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer_ENG.pdf.
- "Swinging Young Bachelor." 1968. *The Sun*. April 8, 1968. <https://news.google.com/newspapers?id=UJplAAAIBAJ&dq=swinging%20young%20bachelor&pg=1398%2C2894663>.
- Tankovska, H. 2021a. "Canada: Number of Facebook Users from 2017 to 2025." Statista. January 25, 2021. <http://www.statista.com/statistics/282364/number-of-facebook-users-in-canada/>.
- . 2021b. "Instagram Users in Canada from 2018 to 2023." Statista. January 25, 2021. <http://www.statista.com/statistics/557495/number-instagram-users-canada/>.
- . 2021c. "Twitter: Number of Users in Canada from 2012 to 2021." Statista. January 25, 2021. <http://www.statista.com/statistics/303875/number-of-twitter-users-canada/>.
- Tasker, John Paul. 2019. "Clashes Over Values, Snc-Lavalin and Role of the Bloc at 1st French-Language Debate." *CBC*. October 3, 2019. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/key-moments-french-language-debate-1.5306941>.
- The Agenda with Steve Paikin, dir. 2022. *Ontario Reacts to the Leaders' Debate*. The Agenda. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T8HXuDmItLQ>.
- The Canadian Press. 2015. "Trudeau Will Exceed Expectations 'If He Comes on Stage with His Pants on': Harper Spokesperson on Debate." *National Post*, August 5, 2015. <https://nationalpost.com/news/politics/trudeau-will-exceed-expectations-if-he-comes-on-stage-with-his-pants-on>.
- . 2019. "Singh Brushes off Green Complaint about Abortion-Related Social Media Posts." *CBC News*. October 4, 2019. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/ndp-jagmeet-singh-green-party-abortion-social-media-1.5309861>.
- "The Clarity Act (Bill C-20)." 2013. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica Canada. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/the-clarity-act-bill-c-20>.
- "The Leaders' Debates Commission." 2019. Democratic Institutions. Government of Canada. June 12, 2019. <https://www.canada.ca/en/democratic-institutions/news/2018/10/the-leaders-debates-commission.html>.
- "The Reviews Are In: First Round Goes to Trudeau." 2015. *Liberal Party of Canada* (blog). August 7, 2015. <https://liberal.ca/the-reviews-are-in-first-round-goes-to-trudeau/>.
- Thibedeau, Hannah. 2019. "5 Things Jagmeet Singh Wants You to Know about His Turban | *CBC News*." *CBC*. September 16, 2019. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/singh-list-turban-questions-ndp-1.5284388>.
- Trudeau, Justin. 2015a. "Back on Twitter Post-Debate after Calling My Top Advisor. Thanks Sophie. Http://T.Co/RMFKsHPTwU." *Twitter*. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629489892146319360>.
- . 2015b. "Called My Top Advisor. Thank You Sophie. // Un Appel Avec Ma Conseillère La plus Importante. Merci Sophie. @macdebate #cdnpoli #polcan #elxn42." *Photo*. *Instagram*. August 6, 2015. <https://www.instagram.com/p/6ERu2JDj0v/?hl=en>.
- . 2015c. "De Retour Sur Facebook Après Le Débat... et Après Un Appel Avec Ma Conseillère La plus Importante. Merci Sophie. // Back on Facebook Post-Debate after Calling My Top Advisor. Thanks Sophie." *Photo*. *Facebook*. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/JustinPJTrudeau/photos/a.101277015648/10153624988200649/?type=3>.

- . 2015d. “First Round of the Day. #elxn42.” Video Post. *Twitter* (blog). August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629361532518817792>.
- . 2015e. “Morning Boxing Session in Toronto. // Entraînement de Boxe à Toronto Ce Matin. #elxn42.” Photo. Instagram. August 6, 2015. <https://www.instagram.com/p/6C6Gpbjjyn/>.
- . 2015f. “Okay Facebook, I’m Turning over My Account to the Liberal Party’s Campaign Team for the #macdebate. Watch This Page All Night. #elxn42.” Post. Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/JustinPJTrudeau/posts/10153624523345649>.
- . 2015g. “Okay Twitterverse, I’m Turning over My Account to @liberal_party’s Campaign Team for the #macdebate. Watch This Account All Night. #elxn42.” Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629393767838056448>.
- . 2015h. “On the Environment, Stephen Harper Trusts His Ideology. Liberals Will Trust Science. #elxn42.” Text. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629455748767064064>.
- . 2015i. “Real Change. // Changer Ensemble.” Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/JustinPJTrudeau/videos/10153624938675649/>.
- . 2015j. “Stephen Harper Broke His Promise to Never Appoint a Single Senator. 59 Times. #elxn42.” Video. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629460011756818432>.
- . 2015k. “Trudeau to Harper - Canadians Know That You’ve Let Them down Because You’ve Chosen to Give Benefits and Tax Breaks to the Wealthiest Canadians.” Photo. Twitter. August 6, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629472296487419904>.
- . 2015l. “Trudeau to Harper-Canadians Know That You’ve Let Them down Because You’ve Chosen to Give Benefits and Tax Breaks to the Wealthiest Canadians.” Photo. Facebook. August 6, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/JustinPJTrudeau/photos/a.101277015648/10153624892460649/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2015m. “FACT CHECK - Stephen Harper Has the Worst Economic Growth Record of Any PM since the Depression. #elxn42.” Link Post. *Twitter* (blog). August 7, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629443751459618816>.
- . 2015n. “FACT CHECK - The Bank of Canada Says Canada Is Again in a Recession. #elxn42 #macdebate.” Image Post. *Twitter* (blog). August 7, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629449100518420480>.
- . 2015o. “Mr. Harper Has Failed Our Veterans by Not Giving Them the Service and the Help They Need. #elxn42 #cdnpoli.” Video Post. *Twitter* (blog). August 7, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629469569640337408>.
- . 2015p. “My Number Is 9. // Mon Chiffre c’est 9. #elxn42.” Post. *Twitter* (blog). August 7, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629459057708007425>.
- . 2015q. “Tale of the Tape: Read a Full Transcript of Maclean’s Debate.” *Maclean’s*, August 7, 2015. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/tale-of-the-tape-read-a-full-transcript-of-macleans-debate/>.
- . 2015r. “Trudeau to Harper: ‘You Haven’t Been Able to Get It Done on the Environment, Mr. Harper’ - Justin Trudeau.” Image Post. *Twitter* (blog). August 7, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629455958981365760>.
- . 2015s. “Trudeau to Mulcair: #elxn42 #macdebate.” Image Post. *Twitter* (blog). August 7, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/629463282835795968>.

- . 2015t. “A Better Canada Is Always Possible.” Video. Facebook. August 11, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/JustinPJTrudeau/videos/10153636713535649/>.
- . 2015u. “A Better Canada Is Always Possible. #elxn42.” Video Post. *Twitter* (blog). August 12, 2015. <https://twitter.com/JustinTrudeau/status/631427662532055040>.
- . 2019a. “Préparation Pour Le Débat. Debate Prep.” Instagram. October 2, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3IRbnFgWwJ/>.
- . 2019b. “Andrew Scheer Confirmed on Quebec TV He Would Allow His MPs to Reopen the Abortion Debate. A Real Leader Would Stop Them. But the Truth Is He Agrees with Them. @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli.” Photo Post. *Twitter*. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/justrinrudau/status/1181367961258463233>.
- . 2019c. “Andrew Scheer Is against Gay Marriage, against a Woman’s Right to Choose, against Stronger Gun Control, and against Fighting Climate Change. @JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli.” Video Post. *Twitter*. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/justrinrudau/status/1181353671319261186>.
- . 2019d. “Do We Go Back to the Harper Years When the Conservatives Did Nothing about Climate Change? Or Fight for a Better Future? I’m for Moving Forward, for Everyone. #ChooseForward.” Video Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/JustinPJTrudeau/videos/720900321746143/>.
- . 2019e. “I Asked You during the Debate, @AndrewScheer and You Still Haven’t Answered: Why Are You Offering Millionaires a \$50,000 Tax Break and 17 Billion Dollars in Cuts for Everybody Else? #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli.” Post. *Twitter*. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/justrinrudau/status/1181376610018250753>.
- . 2019f. “.@JustinTrudeau #leadersdebate2019 #elxn43 #cdnpoli – ‘Mr. Bernier, Your Role on This Stage Right Now Seems to Be to Say Publicly What Mr. Scheer Believes Privately.’ -Justin Trudeau.” Photo Post. *Twitter*. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/justrinrudau/status/1181348854920290304>.
- . 2019g. “The Best Kind of Debate Prep: Walking These Two to School This Morning!” Photo Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/JustinPJTrudeau/photos/a.101277015648/10158140195280649/?type=3&theater>.
- . 2019h. “The Best Kind of Debate Prep: Walking These Two to School This Morning! ca La Meilleure Préparation Pour Un Débat : Aller Les Reconduire à l’école Ce Matin!” Instagram. October 7, 2019. <https://www.instagram.com/p/B3VF2w0gg5C/>.
- . 2019i. “To Be Clear: We Will NOT Put a 50% Tax on the Sale of Your Home.” Video Post. Facebook. October 7, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/JustinPJTrudeau/videos/445041959439122/>.
- . 2019j. “To Be Clear: We Will NOT Put a 50% Tax on the Sale of Your Home.” Video. *Twitter*. October 7, 2019. <https://twitter.com/justrinrudau/status/1181277122222014464>.
- . 2019k. “Federal Leaders Debate 2019: Full Transcript.” *Macleans’s*, October 8, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/federal-leaders-debate-full-transcript/>.
- Tu, Katherine. 2019. “Collocation in Rhetorical Figures: A Case Study in Parison, Epanaphora and Homoiototon.” *University of Waterloo*, June. <https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/handle/10012/14778>.
- Turcotte, André. 2016. “A Debate About The Debates.” In *The Canadian Federal Election of 2015*, edited by Jon H Pammett and Christopher Dornan, 253–74. Dundurn Press.

- Wallace, Patricia. 1999. *The Psychology of the Internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walther, Joseph B. 1996. "Computer-Mediated Communication: Impersonal, Interpersonal, and Hyperpersonal Interaction." *Communication Research* 23 (1): 3–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365096023001001>.
- Walton, Douglas N. 2008. *Informal Logic: A Pragmatic Approach*. 2nd ed. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ware, B. L., and Wil A. Linkugel. 1973. "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59 (3): 273–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637309383176>.
- "Watch the Federal Leaders' Debates Translated into Indigenous Languages." 2019. CBC News: Indigenous. October 7, 2019. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/federal-leaders-debates-indigenous-languages-1.5310012>.
- Webb, Ruth. 2016. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wells, Jon. 2013. "Trudeau Boxes, Showers, Shakes Hands, and Explains His Tattoo in Hamilton Visit." *The Hamilton Spectator*, February 11, 2013, sec. Hamilton Region. <https://www.thespec.com/news/hamilton-region/2013/02/10/trudeau-boxes-showers-shakes-hands-and-explains-his-tattoo-in-hamilton-visit.html>.
- Wells, Paul. 2015a. "Tale of the Tape: Read a Full Transcript of Maclean's Debate." *Maclean's*, August 7, 2015. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/tale-of-the-tape-read-a-full-transcript-of-macleans-debate/>.
- . 2015b. "Paul Wells: 'My Bias Is All in Your Head.'" *Macleans.ca* (blog). September 11, 2015. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/paul-wells-my-bias-is-all-in-your-head/>.
- "What Role Did Social Media Play in #ELXN42?" 2015. Digital Marketing. *SEO TWIST* (blog). October 20, 2015. <https://www.seotwist.com/digital-marketing/role-social-media-election/>.
- Wherry, Aaron. 2015. "After Appointing 56 Senators, Stephen Harper Is Done - Macleans.ca." *Maclean's*, July 24, 2015. <https://www.macleans.ca/politics/after-appointing-56-unelected-senators-stephen-harper-decides-hes-done/>.
- Whitman, Jon. 1987. *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique*. Oxford [Oxfordshire]: Clarendon Press. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015012083666>.
- Woolf, Nicky. 2015. "Canada Party Leaders Debate: May and Mulcair Outshine Harper – as It Happened." *The Guardian*, August 7, 2015, sec. World news. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/live/2015/aug/06/canada-first-party-leaders-debate-live-updates>.
- Wright, Teresa. 2019. "Main Contenders For PM Should Get Their Own Debate, Says Commissioner." Politics. HuffPost Canada. November 12, 2019. https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/federal-leaders-debate_ca_5dcaff82e4b04a60650c287c.
- Wynne, Robert. 2016. "Five Things Everyone Should Know About Public Relations." Forbes. January 21, 2016. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/robertwynne/2016/01/21/five-things-everyone-should-know-about-public-relations/>.
- Yoos, George E. 1979. "A Revision of the Concept of Ethical Appeal." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 12 (1): 41–58. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40237094>.

Zimonjic, Peter. 2019. "Singh Asks Commissioner to Rethink Decision to Allow Bernier to Join Election Debates | CBC News." CBC News. September 17, 2019.
<https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/singh-johnston-bernier-debate-letter-1.5287227>.

Appendices

Appendices can be found as a separate but connected document within the UWSpace submission.

Glossary

<i>Ad personam</i>	An object of a dispute is cast aside and its proponent is attacked, or any argument directed at a proponent rather than to the issue (often termed <i>ad hominem</i>)
Allusion	An expression designed to call something to mind without mentioning it explicitly; an indirect or passing reference
<i>Anacoenosis</i>	The move of turning judgement over to one's audience, traditionally 'only' a figure of speech where no reply is sought, but strategically seeks to induce agreement with the rhetor's position
Anthropomorphism	The attribution of human characteristics to animals and non-animate objects
<i>Antimetabole</i>	The repetition of words in successive clauses, but in transposed order, e.g., 'I know what I like, and I like what I know.'
<i>Antithesis</i>	Contradictory predication
<i>Arete</i>	Good moral character or virtue, associated with ethical conduct
<i>Apostrophe</i>	The rhetorical move of directing speech at someone or something (a god, a corpse, an abstraction) that cannot answer back; what the speaker says is meant to be <i>overheard</i> by some audience, far more than to be heard by the person or thing being addressed
<i>Atechnic</i>	Aristotle's means of 'inartistic' persuasion external to argumentation
<i>Chiasmus</i>	A rhetorical or literary figure in which words, grammatical constructions, or concepts are repeated in reverse order, in the same or modified form, e.g., 'Poetry is the record of the best and happiest moments of the happiest and best minds.'
<i>Dinumeratio</i>	A figure of amplification
<i>Ekphrasis</i>	Making the audience 'see' the subject in their mind's eye
<i>Enargia</i>	The general figure of vivid evocation
<i>Entechnic</i>	Aristotle's means of 'artistic' persuasion internal to an argument (<i>ethos</i> , <i>pathos</i> , <i>logos</i>)
<i>Epiphora</i>	The repetition of a word at the end of successive clauses or sentences
<i>Epanaphora</i>	Phrase-initial lexical repetition
<i>Erotema</i>	'Rhetorical question,' assertion in the form of a question
<i>Ethos</i>	Projected character of the rhetor
Ethotic	Adjectival form of <i>ethos</i>
<i>Eunoia</i>	Goodwill, associated with clearly valuing the audience's desires and needs, sometimes at the sublimation of the rhetor's own desires or needs
<i>Ethopoeia</i>	The depiction of someone else's <i>ethos</i>
Heteroglossia	Referring to the juxtaposition of different languages, speech genres, and dialects, <i>heteroglossia</i> is a term Mikhail Bakhtin used to describe both the multiplicity of different ways of speaking and the nature of the relations among different languages
<i>Homoioptoton</i>	Morphological repetition
<i>Hyperbaton</i>	Unconventional syntactic ordering
<i>Logos</i>	The discursive structure of the rhetoric, mostly associated with rational argumentation

<i>Mesodiplosis</i>	Medial lexical repetition
<i>Metonymy</i>	The substitution of the name of an attribute or adjunct for that of the thing meant, for example <i>suit</i> for <i>business executive</i> , or <i>the track</i> for <i>horse racing</i>
<i>Microkairos</i>	Transient matters of rhetorical timing, e.g., utterance of a zinger or knock-out blow in a debate
Mimicry	The action or art of imitating someone or something, typically to entertain or ridicule
Net Zero	An economy that either emits no greenhouse gasses or offsets its emissions
Parison	Syntactic parallelism
<i>Pathos</i>	The emotional of state of the audience
Pathotic	Adjectival form of <i>pathos</i>
Personification	The attribution of human characteristics to abstract concepts
<i>Phantasia</i>	Imagination, and sometimes impressions, outward show, or appearance
<i>Phronesis</i>	Good sense or practical wisdom, associated with rational judgement and domain competence
<i>Pisteis</i>	The three basic appeals or Aristotelian ‘proofs’ (<i>ethos</i> , <i>pathos</i> , and <i>logos</i>)
<i>Progymnasmata</i>	A set of written exercises from the Greco-Roman rhetorical curriculum, intended to prepare students of rhetoric for the creation and performance of complete practice orations
Proofs	See <i>Pisteis</i>
<i>Prosopopoeia</i>	The incorporation of someone else’s <i>ethos</i>
Seat	Member in the House of Commons, who represents a single electoral district (also called a riding)
<i>Symploce</i>	The repetition of words or phrases at both the beginning and end of successive clauses or verses
TikTok	Short-form video hosting platform
<i>Topos</i>	A standard form of rhetorical argumentation or a variably expressible literary commonplace