

Philip Warton

Professor Azadeh Ghanizadeh

English Composition

29 September 2018

(Writing Assignment #1 Title)

It is quite ordinary for a meticulous politician with a well-groomed image to suddenly put their foot in their mouth. How are these moments perceived in the media circles, and eventually perceived by the people? In the articles, *Hilary Clinton takes her 'deplorables' argument for another spin* and *On Hilary Clinton's Pandering*, we see two interpretations of former presidential candidate Hilary Clinton's campaign and her attitude. While one claims that her intentions are malicious due to how she speaks about her opponent's voters, the other suggests that the unfortunate context of her comments may matter more than their authentic intentions.

Aaron Blake's article on the Washington Post relies heavily on the artistic logic, but shows flaws occasionally, detracting from the argument as a whole. After discussing Clinton's comments regarding how her voters are more intelligent and prosperous, Blake insinuates that Clinton believes "wealthy people's votes should have counted for more". Blake attempts to support this by saying that because she compares her voter base to that of her opponent, and does this critically, she believes that a particular group of people is more valid politically than another. Never does Clinton suggest that her voter's votes are more valid, she simply says that they are morally superior. While the latter is not a particularly empathetic point to make, the author of the article misconstrues it, turning rude remarks into a classist view of politics entirely.

Clinton's comments are misconstrued once again later in the article. The author references a quote in which Hilary speaks on how Trump's campaign appealed to bigotry, and

from this concludes that she said Trump's supporters, "didn't even want black people to have civil rights". Not once in the quote did Clinton say that all supporters of Trump were racist, she merely stated that aspects her opponent's campaign appealed to those ideas. Blake continues on to use the bandwagon appeal, saying that "this is not a mainstream argument". He cites the fact that over two thirds of Americans thought that such an idea was unfair. The consensus around the unfairness does not inherently validate it. Not only that but it was not the point Clinton made in the first place. While it is clear that Clinton thinks less of Trump voters than of her own, to suggest that she believes their votes should not count or that they are all extreme bigots is a wild exaggeration. The author creates a straw man, and further fails to acknowledge any other perspective.

An article responding to Clinton's radio appearance by John Gillis views the woman in a more favorable light. The author writes on how Clinton's love for hot sauce, though genuine, may not have been without ulterior motives in the context of a hip-hop radio show. Gillis neither praises nor condemns pandering, but explores the idea of it being a necessary evil, furthermore questioning whether or not it is evil at all. Acknowledging the existence of a counter-argument gives the author the opportunity to counter it, which Gillis does effectively. He suggests that even though pandering is quite common in politics, it is still unfortunate, and Hilary Clinton has been guilty of it for a longer time than most. Gillis's article is most effective because each point is backed up clearly, and because it provides the context of his argument within the spectrum of nuance and grey area. When his logic and his argument remain reliable despite this, it shows that he has something convincing to say.