

## CONFLICT ON THE WASHINGTON MALL: THE RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH AND THE RESPONSIBILITY TO LISTEN IN THE AGE OF DEMAGOGUERY

*David Beard*

On Friday, Jan. 18, 2019, on the Washington Mall, three groups of protesters accidentally encountered each other. The groups included protesters from a group known as Black Hebrew Israelites, groups of Americans of African heritage who believe that they are the descendants of the ancient Israelites. Another group included attendees of the Indigenous People's March, an event to draw attention to injustices against indigenous peoples within the U.S. and around the world. The third group was composed of Catholic high school students from Kentucky attending the anti-abortion March for Life, a March held annually since 1974. Each of these groups were present on the Mall for highly scripted political action: daylong events with scheduled speakers, designated routes for marching, and a remarkable homogeneity of identity and purpose. Each of these groups were in a space with like-minded others, until they converged on the Mall together. There, their encounter with each other at day's end was not intended; their interaction was unscripted, and it was, in a way, a microcosm of our public sphere today.

According to accounts,<sup>1</sup> a half a dozen Black Hebrew Israelites had been goading the Indigenous People's marchers and the Covington high schoolers. The Black Hebrew Israelites used vulgar, misogynist, homophobic, and racist language as they yelled at the other groups for nearly an hour. Covington students, meanwhile, heckled passing women with chants of "MAGA" and "Build the wall" and returned some of the hateful language from the Black Hebrew Israelites (for example, returning hateful speech about the nature of their conception, insultingly, as the products of rape and incest with assertions that "it's not rape if you enjoy it"). After the Indigenous People's March, Nathan Phillips, an elder with the Omaha Native American tribe, positioned himself physically between the two groups. In that space, he performed a traditional drum chant in the hopes of defusing the tension between the two groups—a gesture that was, for Phillips, infused with meaning of his culture (as Phillips told Sara Sidner of CNN, in "Native American elder Nathan Phillips, in his own words," "we need to use the drum, use our prayer and bring a balance, bring a calming to the situation").<sup>2</sup> Arguably, I think, that meaning was largely lost on the Covington students and the Black Hebrew Israelites, who simply felt that a third party was physically entering their space with banging and noises.

Surveying the accounts of these events and watching video taken by multiple bystanders, I have come to the conclusion that popular accounts of these events typically

evaluate them in terms of the speech of the individuals. Critical questions include “Were the Black Hebrew Israelites provoking the situation with violent, hateful language toward the Covington students and indigenous marchers?” “Were the Covington students provoking the situation with sexist and racially inflected language?” “Was Phillips defusing the situation or escalating it by inserting his body, song, and drum into the situation?” It seems that every assessment turns on assessing failures of speech.<sup>3</sup>

In a small way, this encounter on the Washington Mall resembles a microcosm of contemporary American life. Three groups of people, from carefully regulated zones of activity where their free speech was guaranteed amid communities of the like-minded, moved into an unregulated “contact zone.” Covington students, Black Hebrew Israelites, and Nathan Phillips each moved from what we casually call our “bubbles” into a public space “where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power.”<sup>4</sup> None of these groups were prepared to enter this contact zone. Within a contact zone, when we are caught unprepared, Americans cling to their rights to free speech. After all, the right to speech is guaranteed by our Constitution. There is no constitutional right to listen. But listening is the dimension along which communication in the contact zone fails most often.

In this essay, I will map the contours of our contemporary political climate that were so hostile to listening on the Mall that day. I will demonstrate that the policies of the Parks Service are designed to bottle demonstrators—to isolate them to minimize their disruption of the Mall and of each other. As a result, when the three groups came into contact, our larger political climate of demagoguery, driven by ingroup/outgroup thinking, driven toward an adversarial democracy, kicked into action. This climate of demagoguery—here meaning a rhetorical and political phenomenon described by Patricia Roberts-Miller in *Rhetoric and Demagoguery* (2019) and in *Demagoguery and Democracy* (2017)—encourages us to listen only to those within our ingroup.<sup>5</sup>

When we fail to recognize the position of the others, we participate in faulty dialogues (likened to synchronized trading of speech utterances, or what Elizabeth Parks calls, elsewhere in this special issue, “cacophonous” dialogue<sup>6</sup>) in which we fail to listen to others and they fail to listen to us. These faulty dialogues shaped conflict on the Mall, conflict in Charlottesville, and conflict in an exchange online on the Fourth of July. Our political climate of demagoguery encourages these dialogues, which keep us from listening to what others have to say by redirecting our attention to whether the speaker is a member of our ingroup or not. Only by learning to listen can we change this dynamic.

## DIALOGUE IS SUPPRESSED AND MUFFLED ON THE MALL

The Washington Mall has served as a site for protests for more than a century, including a suffrage parade of 1913 with 5,000 participants as a demonstration for women’s rights of the last decade, and a Ku Klux Klan march in 1925 with more than 25,000 participants through the demonstrations for civil rights. The Mall occupies a space in the popular imagination as the place where people gather to call for change.

The Mall also serves to contain or domesticate dissent and to diffuse conflict. The Mall is “specially designed for demonstrations” and to “make place for opposition,

reflecting the hegemonic power to incorporate dissent into the political structure.”<sup>7</sup> Protest and dissent are regulated:

On National Park property (most of the parks and monuments in the city, as well as the Mall), any protest activity by more than 25 people requires a permit. Permits for protests larger than the limits set for Lafayette Park (3,000 people) or for the sidewalk in front of the White House (750 people) must be applied for 10 days in advance. All others can be applied for as late as 48 hours in advance according to the ACLU and representatives of the National Park Service. If the Park Service does not act on a permit application within 24 hours, it is considered presumptively granted; the Park Service may, however, withdraw approved applications if done in a content-neutral way (ACLU, 1982: 7). On National Park property, a whole section of the Code of Federal Regulations (36 CFR7.96), extending to some 12 pages, regulates the location of protests and the kinds of allowable actions (such as standing or moving). The rules are intricate, in part because many of them are the result of lawsuits.<sup>8</sup>

Like picnickers who have reserved a pavilion for their family reunion, protestors on the Mall have a reasonable expectation that the space is “theirs,” and they can go about their self-expression in safety.

Sometimes, demonstrators on the Mall want to be arrested; they want their protest to exist in a tradition of civil disobedience. Sometimes, they hope that being arrested will earn media attention. When demonstrators want to be cited for disobedience, the safe construction of policies and procedures minimizes the disruptive consequences of being arrested. The police responsible for safety and security on the Mall explain their relationship to officially sanctioned and registered in this passage:

[Demonstrators] want to know, ‘What do I have to do to get arrested and minimize the impact against the police or against property?’ and what’s going to happen to them. So we explain it to them. Like in front of the White House, if you sit down in the center portion holding a sign, that’s illegal, you’ll be arrested. There are times where they’ll time their arrest to make sure it gets on the evening news and stuff like that. And we will explain to them exactly what steps they can take to minimize the disruption in their lives. If they have a valid ID, and they don’t have any contraband on them, and they cooperate fully, you can probably be processed pretty quickly.<sup>9</sup>

Policies exist to regulate the spaces of protest. Procedures exist to minimize the disruption of protest. Protest and demonstration become “fully regularized, fully incorporated into the business of the nation-state.”<sup>10</sup> Seen in this light, demonstrating on the Mall is an act as challenging to the state and to the citizen as renewing your driver’s license in the DMV. The state has taken the teeth from those protests and placed them within a safe buffer zone that isolates them from any power to disrupt the workings of the City or of the State. According to Mitchell and Staeheli, “An additional incentive to routinize protest has been a desire—both on the part of police and protesters in the wake of the violent riots and demonstrations of the 1960s—to find ways to minimize the threat of violence.”<sup>11</sup> Routinizing the seeking of permits and the flow of crowds decreases opportunities for violence. But that same routinization means that demonstrations are less likely to receive media coverage, less likely to draw attention from tourists and passersby, and less likely, perhaps, to effect change.

Analyses of the soundscapes in the Mall reflect the systems and structures that regulate protest. What the Parks Service calls “anthropogenic sound” is highly regulated.<sup>12</sup> Gretchen, Benfield, and Bell report that unregulated anthropogenic sound both decreases learning and decreases satisfaction among visitors to the National Mall, and the Park Service uses this information to work harder to regulate noise in the soundscape of the Mall.<sup>13</sup> All of the policies enacted by the federal government are designed to create a space to speak. These policies reinforce the fact that the literal space of the Mall serves as what Carmack calls, elsewhere in this special issue, a “narrative ground” that authorizes speech. In demonstrating at the Mall, protestors join a history and tradition of eloquent, powerful political speech (with no mention of how the assembled audiences listened). Nothing in the policies that govern the Mall or the history that shapes the narrative ground of those present prepares a demonstrator for dialogue. And so, the interactions between the Covington students, the Black Hebrew Israelites, and Nathan Phillips flew off the rails, exacerbated by a culture of demagoguery.

### A POLITICAL CLIMATE OF DEMAGOGUERY DAMAGES LISTENING

The contact zone of the Mall on Jan. 18, 2019, was conditioned by the political climate of demagoguery that typified life under the Trump administration. Rhetorical theorists have mapped that climate;<sup>14</sup> most systematically, Patricia Roberts-Miller traces that climate in *Demagoguery and Democracy*.<sup>15</sup>

The dimensions of the contemporary political climate that are most damaging for listening are twofold.

- Demagoguery depends on the energy created by ingroup and outgroup identities.
- Demagoguery thrives within and celebrates adversarial democracy instead of deliberative democracy.

Demagoguery, on both counts, devalues listening. I’ll explore both below.

#### *Ingroup and Outgroup Identities Drive Communication*

The dynamics of ingroup and outgroup identities are a defining feature of political life under Donald Trump’s presidency, as traced by Roberts-Miller. Probably the most complicated aspect of demagoguery to describe is how identity functions. The central presumption behind demagoguery—and the most attractive promise it makes—is a stable taxonomy of identity, woven into the fabric of the universe.<sup>16</sup>

Under demagogic rhetoric, citizens are being encouraged to embrace rhetorically constructed identities as conservatives, as “real” Americans with a desire to Make America Great Again. Demagogic rhetoric is also calling into being identities as Progressives, as Indigenous, perhaps even as Black Hebrew Israelites, in response or in resistance to the identities that Trump calls into being for his followers. Those rhetorically constructed identities are promised, within the discourse of politics, to be stable, or “woven into the fabric of the universe.” To be a progressive or a conservative is to occupy a fixed position on the political landscape, not a temporary identity.

Membership within one of these identities creates ingroups and outgroups. Membership within an ingroup promises symbolic benefits. According to Roberts-Miller,

(S)ome people are entitled to more goods than others by virtue of being better—they are better by virtue of having a certain identity, regardless of their behavior. Hence, paradoxically, members of the ingroup (by virtue of being essentially “better” people) are held to lower standards, and can behave worse... One consequence is that precisely the same behavior in both groups is explained in dyslogistic terms for the outgroup (they are greedy) and eulogistic terms for the ingroup (they are hard-working).<sup>17</sup>

We see this lower, or double, standard in the repeated claims of hypocrisy that have replaced political debate. *A willingness to impeach Clinton should mean a willingness to impeach Trump. Calls for Al Franken’s resignation should mean a rejection of Roy Moore.* Pundits replace genuine dialogue about policy with ad hominem attacks on alleged inconsistency in the positions of their political rivals. But in the climate of demagoguery, individuals are being consistent. Support of members of the ingroup, by virtue of their membership in the ingroup, whatever their actions, is a consistent position to hold.

Most salient for scholars of communication, Roberts-Miller explains why ingroup dynamics serve to shut down listening: Effective performance of ingroup membership serves as adequate evidence for one’s claims, and, as corollary, membership in an outgroup serves as adequate evidence to dismiss one’s claims.<sup>18</sup> Once we have identified our interlocutor as a member of the outgroup, we do not need to listen critically anymore. We should agree with ingroup communication, and we should disagree with outgroup communication, and there our obligation ends.

### *Adversarial Democracy Replaces Deliberative Democracy*

The diminished communication inherent in these ingroup/outgroup dynamics is transforming our democracy. Carcasson, Black, and Sink tell us that “It is clear that one of the major barriers to a more deliberative democracy is the lack of quality interaction, and thus understanding and mutual respect, across perspective.<sup>19</sup> Deliberative practitioners and scholars thus strive to create spaces where multiple voices cannot only be heard, but truly listened to.” We are failing to create spaces of free deliberation, and so our democracy is changing. Metaphorically: The Parks Service seeks to tightly regulate the anthropogenic sound generated by visitors (from the sound of celebratory music to the sound of protest chants), preserving a public sphere that loses all potential to be a contact zone. When I visit the Mall, the only sound I should hear is the sound I create, not the unwanted noises created by others. Park policy protects me from the sounds created by others who share my space on the Mall. Our political discourse functions in much the same way, protecting us from the noise of the opposition. Bottled up and isolated in our political discourses, we have moved into an era of “adversarial democracy,” where deliberation has been replaced by winning. Instead of collaboration and discussion, political leaders engage in building alliances, gaining media exposure, lobbying effectively, voting strategically to earn political power, gerrymandering, and other strategies to secure victory.

In this new, demagogic context, winning is more important than collaboration and consensus. The tools imagined to create deliberation are now refigured to create winners and losers around ingroup and outgroup lines. Communication, the central tool for collaboration, consensus, and deliberation, is devalued. In our adversarial democracy,

for example, Levinson tells us, “Hispanics or Muslims or gays may exert influence and power not by convincing politicians of the reasonableness of their positions, but by convincing those politicians that their positions must be treated as reasonable if they want to earn the Hispanic/Muslim/gay vote.”<sup>20</sup> When a political figure seeks power in an adversarial democracy, communicating with people outside their ingroup is warranted only if it serves the interests of securing power. Therefore, the needs of marginalized communities, without access to power, are reduced to levers exercised by those who seek to secure power.

Returning to the Mall in Washington on Jan. 18, 2019—is it any wonder that communication was reduced to heckling, yelling, high school spirit chants, goading, and the beating of a drum?<sup>9</sup> Each person sought to fill the Mall with their sounds, to drown out the noises of the others. These are the communication tools of an adversarial approach to the contact zone, in which the loudest side wins the acquiescence and the silence of the outgroup others.

## FAULTY DIALOGUES ON THE WASHINGTON MALL

Deciding whether or not to trust someone else in a communication situation is tricky (and I imagine, even trickier when everyone is yelling). Communication Studies has examined questions of recognizing “source credibility” from message content. For example, Cornan et al. (2006) noted that we evaluate sources of messages on three key dimensions: trustworthiness, competence, and goodwill.<sup>21</sup> In the context of demagoguery, the outgroup is untrustworthy, incompetent, and their goodwill is suspect.

A failure to trust a credible source is so common, communication research has given it a name: an “incredulity error.”<sup>22</sup> We are incredulous, and so we refuse to trust someone we could or should listen to. As Roberts-Miller reminds us, “people will often reject a source as ‘biased’ on the grounds that the author is a member of an out-group” (37), which is an incredulity error.<sup>23</sup>

Philosopher Marc Angenot describes these dismissive dialogues, in which we refuse to attend to a member of an out-group.<sup>24</sup> These dialogues are typified by the presumption that the interlocutor is irrational, and so we have no obligation to listen to them. Instead of attempting to occupy, with empathy, the position occupied by the other, we take up a position of apathy or hostility toward them. In dismissing our interlocutor, *we assert that they do not see what we see so clearly. We do not need to listen to people who do not see what we find obvious—their perspective is just noise. We could, instead, begin with an empathy that would ask what do they see, instead.*<sup>25</sup>

Angenot tells us what a faulty dialogue looks like:

“The other’s arguments are not dismissed because they are deemed to be unilateral or self-seeking (which would allow us to understand them and assume that we do), but they are dismissed as specious and invalid, that is to say as ‘illogical,’ ‘absurd,’ ‘irrational,’ and ‘outrageous.’”

This is the nature of the exchanges on the Mall. The Covington students sang their school chants in lieu of attempting to understand the Black Hebrew Israelites. Nathan Phillips did not enter with intent to understand either the Black Hebrew Israelites or the

Covington students. As he told Sara Sidner, “The song I was singing, the reason for it, was to bring unity and to bring love and compassion back into our minds and our beings as men and as protector of what is right”—noble goals, but still complicated, in that he set out to speak without listening first.<sup>26</sup> He brought his ritual communication into a situation he believed to be defined by hatred and irrationality. Angenot claims “that [faulty] dialogues are the rule rather than the exception in our social interactions.” He goes on to map the significance of these clashes for defining social life. These clashes [regard] how we approach the world, how we derive and produce meaning from it, and how we end up with “convictions.” Some of these [faulty] dialogues, particularly when it comes to political struggles in public life, can last a generation (or several generations, for that matter).<sup>27</sup>

We see the truth of Angenot’s claims when we reflect on the events of Charlottesville, in which the clashes of the nineteenth century (anti-Semitism and racism) shape the faulty dialogues today. How do we turn off the filters that prevent us from listening across the in-group/out-group divide? How do we convert a faulty dialogue, rooted in apathy and indifference to the perspective of the other, into a genuine exchange?

#### A MISSED OPPORTUNITY: NPR ON THE FOURTH OF JULY

What we could not engage on the Mall or in Charlottesville, we might have engaged online. National Public Radio (NPR) maintains a July 4 tradition of reading the Declaration of Independence during the broadcast *Morning Edition*; in 2017 they expanded the tradition to include tweeting the Declaration, a few lines at a time. The resulting tweetstorm exemplifies discussion in an age of demagoguery and exemplifies a missed opportunity to turn a faulty dialogue into something more.

Several readers, as reported in the *Washington Post*, CNN, and *Business Insider*, believed that NPR was calling for revolution, or at least, issuing a sharp critique of former President Trump.<sup>28</sup> Twitter user D. G. Davies is typical of this response:



Figure one, Tweets from D. G. Davies, from *Business Insider*.

Davies reads the tweets within the ingroup and outgroup frame and decides that NPR, as a member of the outgroup, is calling for revolution. After all, NPR is part of the mainstream media, an enemy of the state, the outgroup in many of the president's speeches. Through the eyes of readers enmeshed in adversarial democracy, NPR's tweets about ending the reigns of tyrants must refer to a coup against the Trump administration. Under conditions of demagoguery, the goal of an adversarial democracy is the achievement of power. NPR is making a grab for power, or at least, exhorting the taking of power from the president. Davies reads the tweet within that interpretive frame, and within that interpretive frame, the "implications are clear."

But Davies' reading was a misreading. NPR was acting as a *platform* from which the declaration could be read, not as a *speaker*. The speakers were "the founding fathers." In this moment, in a small way, we had a chance to discuss, to deliberate, to collaborate. Having destabilized Davies' presumptions about the source of the message, we could bracket questions of an ingroup or outgroup and actually talk to each other. We lost that chance. If the Trump supporters were eager to jump down the throat of NPR for fomenting revolt by declaring Trump a tyrant, NPR listeners responded equally as viscerally. Listeners (often liberal political opponents of Trump who are just as driven by the ingroup and outgroup dynamics of our age) were eager to pounce on this error as a sign of the stupidity of the Trump supporters.

An age of demagoguery produces a reluctance to listen to each other across the political spectrum. Trump's followers are bad listeners, in this case, as they let their interpretive frame block genuinely open listening to the Declaration. The liberal listeners of NPR closed their own ears just as quickly. Notably, no one discussed the Declaration itself. Followers of the president did not pick up the moment to discuss the intent of the founding fathers; progressive listeners of NPR did not seize the moment to discuss the significance of their language for today. Instead, they bickered about "who really said" the language tweeted. After all, if you can clearly identify the speaker as a member of your in-group or out-group, you don't need to listen to the language of the message at all.

I'd like to imagine that the moment could have gone differently—that instead of being driven by ingroup and outgroup heuristics in an adversarial contest, we might have listened to the words of the Declaration in a new way, opening up new dialogues about what that language might mean for us, today. What if, instead of fixating on correctly identifying the source of the text, so that we could affirm or deny the text based on their ingroup/outgroup status, we just listened to the text, and then, we listened to one another?

## CONCLUSION

I want to return to the Mall one more time. Over the next week after the conflict between the three groups, journalists issued so many corrections. Some were factual and insubstantial (e.g. Nathan Phillips was a veteran, but was not, as initially reported, a Vietnam vet). Some were significant in reframing the narrative (by changing our understanding of who approached whom on the Mall, who goaded whom into anger,



who yelled what hateful speech). Every time the frame shifted, we had an opportunity to evaluate the emerging story, instead of the ingroup/outgroup status of the storyteller.

Slowly, as media outlets found the narrative that worked for their readers and viewers, the story hardened, as hard as the hearts of the ingroups who were their readers. Media outlets developed narratives that reinforced ingroup and outgroup dynamics and started shutting down opportunities to hear other voices. The loudest ingroup “wins,” if only by silencing or dismissing the outgroup as the noise that (metaphorically) the Parks Service should have silenced for us.

To break this cycle, we need to learn to listen again.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Accounts include Michael E. Miller, “Stare-down between MAGA-hat wearing teen and Native American on National Mall comes into focus” in *The Washington Post*, Jan 20, 2019, and Jeff Karoub and Adam Beam, “Correction: Native American March-Videos story / Teen in confrontation with Native American: I didn’t provoke” in the *Associate Press Wire Service*, January 23, 2019, and Emily Stewart, “How the story of a clash between a boy in a MAGA hat and a Native American elder unfolded.” *Vox*, January 23, 2019.

<sup>2</sup>Sidner, Sara. “Native American elder Nathan Phillips, in his own words.” CNN.com March 12, 2019

<sup>3</sup>Anjuli Brekke describes this phenomenon using the language of Kate Lacey, who traces social interactions that amount to a “performance without an audience” Kate Lacey, *Listening Publics: The Politics and Experience of Listening in the Media Age* (Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2013), 181. Brekke, elsewhere in this special issue, calls our attention to speaking over listening “a continual display of self that lacks political agency and the ability to enact change; in short, ‘a performance that need not be listened to.’”

<sup>4</sup>Pratt, Mary Louise. “Arts of the Contact Zone.” *Profession* 1991: 34.

<sup>5</sup>Roberts-Miller, Patricia. *Demagoguery and democracy*. The Experiment, 2017.

<sup>6</sup>Elizabeth S. Parks, “Dialogic Listening: Moving Beyond Idealism to Intercultural Ethical Praxis,” *Listening: Journal of Communication Ethics, Religion, and Culture*, 2021.

<sup>7</sup>Orna Blumen and Sharon Halevi. “Staging Peace through a Gendered Demonstration: Women in Black in Haifa, Israel.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 99, no. 5 (2009): 978. Accessed January 31, 2020. [www.jstor.org/stable/20621267](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20621267).

<sup>8</sup>Mitchell, D., & Staeheli, L. A. (2005). Permitting protest: Parsing the fine geography of dissent in America. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4), 796-813.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid, 805.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid, 805.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid, 805.

<sup>12</sup>E. Lynch, D. Joyce, & K. Frstrup, “An Assessment of Noise Audibility and Sound Levels in US National Parks.” *Landscape Ecology* 26 no.9 (2011), 1297.

<sup>13</sup>Gretchen, N. R., Benfield, J. A., & Bell, P. A. (2012). The influence of anthropogenic sound in historical parks: Implications for park management. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 30(4), p. 804. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1730141477>

<sup>14</sup>The collection of essays in *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* are significant here; for a summary, see Ryan Skinnell & Jillian Murphy (2019) “Rhetoric’s Demagogue | Demagoguery’s Rhetoric: An Introduction,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 49:3, 225-232, DOI: 10.1080/02773945.2019.1610636, as is Ryan Skinnell, ed. *Faking the News: What Rhetoric Can Teach Us About Donald J. Trump*. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic, 2018.

<sup>15</sup>Roberts-Miller, Patricia. *Demagoguery and democracy*. The Experiment, 2017.

<sup>16</sup>Triangulation is important. Roberts-Miller’s thesis are affirmed by social scientists Reicher and Haslam in “The politics of hope: Donald Trump as an entrepreneur of identity” (in *Why irrational politics appeals: Understanding the allure of Trump*). Roberts-Miller, Patricia. *Demagoguery and democracy*. The Experiment, 2017.

<sup>17</sup>Roberts-Miller, Patricia. *Demagoguery and democracy*. The Experiment, 2017, 49.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid, 36-37.

<sup>19</sup>Carcasson, Martín, Laura W. Black, and Elizabeth S. Sink. “Communication studies and deliberative democracy: Current contributions and future possibilities.” *Journal of Public Deliberation* 6.1 (2010): 8.

<sup>20</sup>Levinson, M. (2003). Challenging Deliberation. Theory and Research in Education, 1(1), 23-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878503001001003> ... *No citizen left behind*. Harvard University Press, 2012.

<sup>21</sup>Coman, S., Hess, A., & Justus, Z. (2006). Credibility in the Global war in Terrorism: Strategic Principles and Research Agenda. Consortium for Strategic Communication, Phoenix Metropolitan Area: Arizona State University.

<sup>22</sup>Fogg, B. J., and Hsiang Tseng. "The elements of computer credibility." *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, 1999. Thanks to my colleague Ed Downs for this terminological insight and for engaging conversation.

<sup>23</sup>*Rhetoric and Demagoguery* 37.

<sup>24</sup>I want here to preserve Angenot's insights while rejecting the ablist discourse of his metaphor, and so I relocate his coinage to this footnote. He calls encounters in which we dismiss others out of hand, like the one on the Mall, "dialogues de sourds," or "dialogues of the deaf." See Marc Angenot, "Divergent Reasonings and Dialogues of the Deaf: Why Do We Often Find Others 'Irrational'?" A 2006 Lecture at the University of Edmonton. Available online at [http://marcangenot.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Divergent\\_Reasonings\\_translation.pdf](http://marcangenot.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Divergent_Reasonings_translation.pdf)

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Sidner, Sara. "Native American elder Nathan Phillips, in his own words." CNN.com March 12, 2019.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>Sheth, Sonam. "NPR Tweeted out the Declaration of Independence on July 4th — and Twitter Went Nuts." *Business Insider*. Jul 5, 2017. <https://www.businessinsider.com/trump-supporters-react-to-npr-declaration-of-independence-tweets-2017-7>.