

PragerU as Genre: How Ideologies Typify Speech

Christopher Luis Shosted

Introduction

PragerU is a website founded by conservative talk show host Dennis Prager. It features five-minute videos on a variety of topics such as immigration, criminal justice, and education. As demonstrated by its name, PragerU brands itself as a university but this branding is part of a larger trend of ideology-promoting discourse garbing itself in well-established genres. PragerU is a university in much the same way Fox News is news; while both use the style of the genre they are mimicking, the use of false information to reaffirm hegemonic ideologies belies the motivations that inspire these types of rhetoric.

As a system of genres, the social motivations and exigencies that propel PragerU's rhetoric can be understood. That rhetoric may seem laughable due to how poorly it apes academic discourse, but its producers are keenly aware of the conventions they flout. Their videos less resemble the crackpot conspiracy videos of YouTube instead opting for slick visual graphics and simple, carefully chosen language. Their rhetoric is also demonstrably successful; their YouTube channel currently sits at 2.2 million subscribers and has garnered three-quarters of a billion cumulative views since 2009, yet the facts used to support the arguments in these videos are often cherry-picked, misrepresented, or wholly incorrect. It is not that PragerU succeeds *despite* its fallaciousness, but *because* of it. Their rhetoric preys upon the social anxieties endemic to modern life and lays them at the feet of a particular community: academics.

For the purposes of this article, three video from PragerU will be analyzed: Jordan Peterson's "Dangerous People are Teaching Your Kids," Heather Mac Donald's "Who Killed the Liberal Arts?," and George Will's "The Speech Every 2015 Grad Needs to Hear." These videos are just three in PragerU's extensive catalogue but they demonstrate a pattern of rhetoric united in their goals. Each video discusses a different feature of college: professors, curricula, and tuition and degree marketability respectively, but each speaker addresses their topic with a layer of ridicule and disdain.

PragerU's videos can be seen as a more palatable form of the discourse that has become common in online spaces, but there's no denying that they attempt to garner credibility for some of the more problematic aspects of society. In short, they cloak rhetoric that promotes racism, misogyny, and social inequality under the banner of fact. There is a risk present in the wanton promotion of these videos even when the goal is to counter them. Engagement with these videos

brings them into a conversation they otherwise may not have been a part of, but in the age of the internet inaction is a form of engagement as well.

The intent here is not to amplify this rhetoric; rather, the exigence is to warn. The rhetorical studies community is uniquely equipped to understand the larger implications behind problematic rhetorics such as those promoted by PragerU. Yet understanding requires engagement and unfortunately promotion of these regressive ideals. The issue is that PragerU and rhetors who will adopt PragerU's strategies in the future will continue to see success independently of scholarly engagement with their rhetoric. That is unless that rhetoric can be understood in terms of a higher order.

What this analysis proposes is one of myriad potential lenses that might be used to understand this type of rhetoric. PragerU's claims cannot be countered because they exist on an order beyond a true-false dichotomy. Instead, what is required is public education on the ways in which rhetors attempt to supersede truth. This analysis is one step toward that goal.

The three videos analyzed here are part of PragerU's larger strategy to usurp the social role held by the mode of discourse it mimics: academia. By lowering the credibility of orthodox education PragerU bolsters its own authority to promote ideology that skews further and further right. PragerU operates within systems of genre, but the ways genres function and what epistemic roles they serve require definition.

Theories on Genre:

A rhetorical genre is more than a collection of typified action, speech, or writing. A genre is a genre based on the recurrent social situations rhetors face and the exigencies that those situations are in response to. While those genres may aid in individual understandings of discrete utterances or artifacts within those situations, there are significant cognitive processes that contribute to the creation of genres themselves.

Carolyn Miller in her 1984 essay "Genre as Social Action" proposes that genre exists as a part of a hierarchy of meaning-making processes (162). This definition of genre is useful because it allows inferences to be made about how an audience extrapolates meaning from a rhetorical work. The typified structure of a genre guides an audience toward a desired response.

For a genre to typify speech, it must be in response to recurrent rhetorical situation. This situation can be anything, so long as it is common enough. An electrician can be faced with a situation of warning other electricians quickly of the dangers of a live wire, so they shout out "It's hot!" Within the genre of electrician-to-electrician discourse the exigence of a potential electrocution is enough to warrant a recurrent situation of warning others of that danger. That

leads to specialization of language that at once is brief and evokes a common warning that everyone has encountered in the past. As Miller writes, “Situations are social constructs that are the result, not of ‘perception,’ but of ‘definition.’ Because human action is based on and guided by meaning, not by material causes, at the center of action is a process of interpretation” (158). To understand a genre, the rhetorician must understand not only the exigence, but the interpretation of that exigence by the rhetor.

The interpretation of an exigence is tied to Charles Bazerman’s description of social facts. A social fact is similar to ideology, but whereas an ideology is a lens through which we interpret the world around us, a social fact is information once it passes through that lens. Bazerman writes, “social facts bear on subjects that are primarily matters of social understanding, such as whether or not a mayor has authority to make certain decisions and act in a certain way. That authority is based on a series of historically developed political, legal, and social understandings, arrangements, and institutions” (312). The response to an exigence has ties to ideology, therefore, a rhetor’s ideology can be inferred through analysis of the response. In the case of a genre, the recurrent situations imply widespread, even hegemonic ideologies that prevail throughout those who practice and consume that genre. Social facts influence our responses to exigencies, therefore if a rhetor’s goal is to change the behavior of an audience, it requires a changing of the social facts held by an audience. Ideologically motivated rhetoric requires the rhetor to make claims addressing problematic social facts and support an argument regarding why those social facts are false.

In addition to typifying speech, genres continually promote themselves, in part, because typified speech leads to typified responses (Bazerman 316). Genres offer a layer of subtext through the area they occupy on Miller’s hierarchy. An audience intuits what genre discourse belongs to and adjusts their response accordingly. Bazerman notes that speech acts involve three stages: a phase of locution and proposition, the message intended within that locution (known as the illocutionary act), and the consequences, or perlocutionary effect, that the act had on the audience (314). Genre offers a fast-lane between the illocutionary act and perlocutionary effect. Proper knowledge of genre allows a rhetor to augur the consequences of their rhetoric, though these predictions are not uniform.

While discursive acts do fit into particular genres, they also act in concert with other genres in genre sets and genre systems as a form of social activity (Bazerman 317-319). Within the frame of social activity, genres dictate roles and appropriate responses. The mere use of a genre suggests that the speaker possesses a certain amount of knowledge and authority that comes with that genre’s use. According to Bazerman, an individual will engage with multiple genres in the capacity of their role, and those genres will comprise a set as well as operate within an organized system of discourse generated by others (318). An understanding of the genre system that an artifact is composed within allows the researcher to better determine the context and exigencies that shaped the

rhetorical action itself, or as Bazerman states: “In defining the system of genres people engage in you also identify a framework which organizes their work, attention, and accomplishment” (319). For research purposes, a genre is understood holistically in terms of where it appears, how it prompts further rhetorical action, and what those relationships mean for the genre in question.

It is easy to think of genres as the nexuses where a rhetor melds exigence, situation, ideology, and purpose to create an utterance, yet an algorithmic understanding of genres lacks a way to understand their fluidity and the ways rhetors adapt and re-establish them. Anne Freedman in her essay “Anyone for Tennis” refers to this as the “recipe theory of genre” (46). She instead advocates for an understanding of genres rooted in the use of “like-statements” to understand the class of a genre, and also “not-statements” to understand the meaningful distinctions between discursive actions (49-50). These differences include the settings the texts are situated in and the discursive features they possess. But while a researcher with a critical eye could spot these differences, there is substantial room for error as texts circulate through public spaces.

The problem with understanding genre is that determining what genre a particular rhetorical work belongs to is subjective. For example, in 1964 the Supreme Court of the United States heard the case of *Jacobellis v. Ohio*, which alleged that the French film *The Lovers* was pornographic and therefore violated federal obscenity laws. The court ruled that the film was not obscene, and Justice Potter Stewart wrote in his concurring opinion that: “I shall not today attempt further to define the kinds of material I understand to be embraced within that shorthand description [of pornography], and perhaps I could never succeed in intelligibly doing so. But *I know it when I see it*, and the motion picture involved in this case is not that” (italics added). While Justice Stewart may have deemed the film to not be pornographic, it does not negate the actions of the Ohio government who prosecuted the plaintiff for distributing what they deemed to be obscene material. This court case hinged on determining what genre *The Lovers* belonged to – pornography or art. Within the “I know it when I see it” test exists a large room for error. An audience intuitively knows what genre a rhetorical work belongs to, but which features determine that genre can be difficult to define beyond a personal level. The result of this is that a rhetorical work can masquerade as another genre if the rhetor chooses to deceive their audience.

PragerU’s Videos

The speakers analyzed here, Jordan Peterson, Heather Mac Donald, and George Will, may be speaking at different times and do not reference each other by name, but they are acting in concert. These videos respond to a common exigence of perceived problems within academia but vary in their situations. For Peterson, speaking in 2018, the situation he responds to is the liberality of college professors and the indoctrination of students by neo-Marxists. Mac Donald instead chooses to discuss college curricula, which she perceives to be

abandoning a scholarly tradition dating back to Classical Greece and Rome. Likewise, George Will derides modern college graduates, whom he determines to have been suckered into unmarketable degrees that came with colossal investments of time and money. In all three cases, the speakers choose to discuss a flaw with American academia but do not posit a solution. These videos do not advocate for policy change, rather they ridicule colleges over subjective or outright false grievances. The shared rhetorical goal of Peterson, Mac Donald, and Will is to undermine colleges in the mind of their audience to bolster their brand.

The process of interpretation that Miller presents (163-164) and the influence of social facts that Bazerman describes (312-313) are seen as these speakers present their arguments. A common strategy of PragerU is to claim that Western society is being degenerated in some way. This claim is most apparent in Mac Donald's video where she states: "the modern professoriate has repudiated the great humanist tradition on which much of Western Civilization -- and the Western university -- has been built." This statement posits two social facts: that Western civilization is being denied in some fashion by a group, and that the Western tradition she refers to is the superior method. These same facts can be seen in Peterson's video where he echoes Mac Donald by saying: "[professors] have made it their life's mission to undermine Western civilization itself, which they regard as corrupt, oppressive and 'patriarchal.'" And though Will does not mention changes in society, he does dismiss several fields of study as "academic fads" that produce degrees that hold little to no value in the world outside of college. Within each of these claims, an exigence is defined through the interpretation of social facts. Each speaker interprets his/herself as protector of traditional values that have been deemed as sacrosanct and that they perceive as being threatened.

The next interpretation that the speakers present in these videos is the identities of the attacker whom they are defending against. Within each of these arguments, the opposing side is dehumanized using language that is openly hostile. Peterson, for example, refers to professors as a "gang of nihilists." The term "nihilist" is not defined within Peterson's video but implied to be an individual who is both amoral and malicious. And by describing them as a "gang" implies some level of organization; they have an assumed hierarchy, goals, as well as methodology to achieve those goals. Mac Donald labels UCLA faculty as "academic narcissists" who ignore "the loving duty we owe those writers, artists and thinkers whose works made our world possible," and Will victimizes college graduates by writing that they "have been cheated, bilked, propagandized and badly educated." The purpose behind these statements is to damage the relationship between professor and student. By alleging that the greater academic community is acting out of some combination of their collective greed, ego, and malice, these speakers damage the foundation of trust that is necessary for education.

The speakers continue their attempt to discredit the academic community by demonstrating their perception of professors advocating change in the name of diversity and inclusion as an excuse to constrict personal freedoms and growth. Will and Peterson make mention of free speech being quarantined into zones (Will) or being limited by metaphoric police (Peterson). Mac Donald does not reference free speech, but her citation of a Columbia University student who complains about the demography of the school's curricula fulfils a similar goal: demonstrating changes made to accommodate fads. In this case, other students are forced to be deprived of the superior works of Shakespeare and Mozart, because one student believes that she doesn't need to learn about "dead, white men."

The deeper logic behind these claims is that universities and colleges exist within their own world that is divorced from reality. Each of the strategies endemic to this genre are based around how academia either actively harms society or wastes the time of its students. Will belittles college graduates with a sardonic "good luck, you're going to need it," Mac Donald claims that UCLA commits "a tragedy equal to *Hamlet* or *King Lear*," by not mandating the teaching of Shakespeare to English students, and Peterson accuses college professors of being obsessed with the application of post-modernist doctrine to every facet of life.

Comparing PragerU to Academic Discourse

It's important to note that PragerU vies for the same demographic as the organizations they attempt to discredit. PragerU styles itself as almost a diasporic university – a college with no campus. But these videos operate as a systematic deconstruction of the organizations they mimic. PragerU recognizes the importance of academia within the modern zeitgeist and aims to usurp its role in the mind of its audience. Linguist Ann M. Johns describes ten features of academic discourse in her essay "Discourse Communities and Communities of Practice: Membership, Conflict and Diversity" (327-332) and defines the purposes and reasons these features recur throughout that community. But while PragerU appears to use this mode of discourse, it deviates in striking ways.

The features Johns lists do not align with PragerU's style and in most cases are flouted by their speakers. The first characteristic Johns lists is textual explicitness, or how academic texts feature precise vocabulary, deliberate citation and clear descriptions of methodology, analysis, and argumentation (327). PragerU meanwhile trades in vagaries by obfuscating their arguments, using undefined terms, and not mentioning their sources by name. Will, for example, frames his entire argument around a hypothetical commencement address but never gives a reason for why he chose this form. Likewise, he makes mention of free-speech zones but fails to say which schools have implemented such policies, those administrations' reasons for implementing them, and the effects – positive or negative – that those policies have had on

their communities. These are not burdensome criteria for any publicly disseminated argument – especially for one written by a Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist such as Will, but nevertheless, they are absent from this video.

The lack of specificity in PragerU's videos is a deliberate rhetorical strategy, and this strategy is embedded in their patented five-minute video format. By keeping the time to five minutes, the speakers increase their authority and credibility by implying that their ideas align with common sense values. This juxtaposes with the months required to complete a single course in college and years of study to achieve a degree. It also further portrays professors as charlatans who dupe their students with overly complex and false ideas. Likewise, the specific and rigid format of academic discourse appears foreign to those outside of an academic environment, and Johns notes the difficulty of students applying this particular feature in their writing because exposure to this style is rare (327). Academic discourse outside of the context of academia can seem dull or even pedantic, thus PragerU's style garners ethos among its viewers by abandoning this feature and adopting a more familiar discursive method.

The other features Johns lists follow a similar trend to the first; characteristics such as impartiality, openness, and objectivity are conspicuously absent in these videos. Johns makes mention of a habitual hedging of analyses that is present in academic discourse (329), meaning researchers make it clear that the evidence they report suggests or supports a possible fact; PragerU makes no such attempt to leave the proverbial door open for other interpretations. Mac Donald's example of a dissatisfied student is not an isolated case, rather it "represent[s] the dominant ideology in the humanities today." Similarly, Peterson's video is not titled "Dangerous People *May* be Teaching your Kids," rather, these people *are* doing irreparable harm to your children. Peterson's video is not framed as an argument with this title; rather, it is framed as an alarm for a crisis that this community is facing.

The positioning of claims as facts is one of the starkest contrasts between PragerU and actual universities. Mac Donald, Will, and Peterson each attempt to promote ideologies about academia but do so without the discussion typically used to support those claims. As a result of the authority these speakers possess, and the importance of that appeal in modern discourse, these ideological claims are fast-tracked to being social facts. For example, Peterson states, "[the world of the post modernists] is instead a Hobbesian nightmare of identity groups warring for power. They don't see ideas that run contrary to their ideology as simply incorrect. They see them as integral to the oppressive system they wish to supplant, and consider it a moral obligation to stifle and constrain their expression." There are several claims about postmodernists in these three sentences, but each lacks the hedging Johns mentioned. The result of this is that these claims operate as evidential facts to support Peterson's main argument.

The supplemental material PragerU uses alongside their videos does more to further these claims. Linked to each video in PragerU's catalogue is a PDF document that is referred to as a study guide, which includes key terms from the video, a section for notes, discussion and review questions, a five-question multiple choice quiz with answer key, and a further reading response to a news article that is framed as a case study. Each of these sections operates as a warped version of a genre the audience would be familiar with writing in. The study guides are one of the most troublesome characteristics of this genre because they dictate audience interpretation of the video itself and interpretation of further discourse. The quizzes are extremely simplified, as is the case with question four of Peterson's video: "Post-modernists don't believe in individuals." The audience is asked to determine whether the statement is true or false with true being the correct answer, but without the qualifier, "according to Jordan Peterson," this posits that post-modernists, whoever they may be, adhere to a strict dogma of absolute collectivism.

The discussion questions continue this habit of simplification but also phrase those questions to illicit a particular response. An excerpt from one of the discussion questions on George Will's video asks:

What does [Will's hypothetical speaker] mean by "enforced conformity?" What are some examples of "enforced conformity" that you have experienced? Do you feel that the money you are paying now and later for college is worth you being subjected to "enforced conformity" and the entitlement mindset being foisted upon you? Why or why not? How do you think that the enforced conformity and entitlement propaganda affect college students in regards to their course of study and in terms of preparing them for life after college?

Will's term "enforced conformity" is a meaningless neologism because all societies are predicated on its members accepting social norms under threat of some sort of punishment. For example, workplaces have implicit and explicit rules that govern decorum and professionalism, and governments dictate which actions are acceptable through laws. Organizations ensure that their members follow these rules through responses that focus on punishment, reform, or restitution. Colleges and universities are no different. Enforced conformity is a term with fascist connotations used to describe a universal social system, therefore, this term engineers an indignant response from its audience. Colleges, in this argument, are attempting to craft an Orwellian environment that restricts free speech, and the tuition and tax dollars given to these institutions are providing the capital needed for that environment's construction. The subtextual question posed here is: "are you O.K. with helping these people who are taking away your freedom?" which is, of course, met with a resounding, "No!"

The case studies of these study guides use the same technique shaping the questions but have the added caveat of prescribing and applying a methodology

to interpreting outside discourse. The study guide for Mac Donald's video offers an article written by the *USA Today* Editorial Board titled "Recommit to free speech on campus: Our view" as a case study to demonstrate an example of the concepts Mac Donald explains. The *USA Today* editorial is just that – an editorial – and as such, is another matter of opinion. The terms of discussing this editorial employ similar strategies as in Will's guide with this guide asking: "Should professors have the power to so heavily influence students to become what Miss Mac Donald refers to as an '... academic narcissist, oblivious to beauty and nobility...'? If yes, why? If no, what is the alternative?" This question is listed under the heading "Case Study: University of Chicago" but makes no mention of the college, nor the ideas presented by the editorial's author[s].

The use of Mac Donald's terminology under this heading implies that the editorial board's opinions agree with, or are at least similar to, Mac Donald's critique of professors. However, the editorial makes no mention of professors, instead taking umbrage with students limiting free speech while University of Chicago faculty and staff are the actors whose actions are lauded. The *USA Today* Editorial Board writes: "recently, a desire by students to protect themselves and others from speech they consider hurtful is driving new assaults on academic freedom and freewheeling debate." In this case, Mac Donald and the editorial staff are actually in disagreement on who is influencing whom, but because of the framing of the question, this discrepancy is not challenged.

Furthermore, *USA Today* publishes most of their editorials alongside a counter-argument, and in this case the editors of the University of Chicago student newspaper, *The Chicago Maroon*, wrote an editorial titled "Hate Speech Creates Fear" PragerU strikes almost all mention of this counterargument save for a footnote that states "Most editorials are coupled with an opposing view — a unique USA TODAY feature." PragerU does provide a link to the original article, but this is superfluous because the editorial is reproduced in its entirety except for the link to the opposing editorial. The exclusion of the opposing editorial is due to the fact that these videos all describe topics of social debate as settled matters, and those who continue the debate as raving lunatics. To include a counterargument written by prominent students at a university that has just been by assailed by conservatives would shatter the narrative that PragerU continually constructs.

PragerU and Post-Truth

PragerU is not an isolated case; instead, it represents one application of post-truth rhetoric in modern discourse. The claims made by these videos are demonstrably false, poorly argued, and harmful to society, yet they are still effective. Due to myriad factors, post-truth rhetoric has gained a place within the rhetorical tradition, and unethical as it might be, it merits discussion to counter it. As Bruce McComiskey writes in his 2017 book *Post-Truth Rhetoric and*

Composition, “[post-truth] is a fact of life, it is here to stay, and, as rhetoricians and teachers of writing, we’re going to have to deal with it” (6).

The claims espoused by PragerU are false, but to say that these speakers are lying is to misrepresent these actions. Rather, the website has abandoned distinctions between true and false and is only concerned with establishing, promoting, and reaffirming an ideology. McComiskey states, “In this post-truth world (without truth *or* lies) language becomes purely strategic, without reference to anything but itself” (8). Rhetors whose agenda runs contrary to objective truth face a crisis due to fact-checking being easier than ever now. The internet and its proliferation allow anyone with so much as a cell phone to counter any claim with the *truth*. The issue here lies in the modern definition of truth. With strategic language, rhetoric becomes less of a constructive action where the rhetor researches, supports, and finally argues their interpretation of the truth, and instead becomes a battlefield where participants employ statements that suit their ideologies.

The use of so-called “alternative facts” is the locus of the rhetorical strategies outlined in this analysis. Post-truth rhetoric and its rhetors attempt to dismantle the understanding of truth as we know it. McComiskey cites Benjamin Tallis who claims that through ideologies based around consistent cynicism, post-truth rhetors have damaged the epistemological continuum that defines truth as a concept (8-9). Post-truth rhetoric creates an ecology where everything is at once false *and* true, therefore audiences are not swayed by appeals to logic; instead, pathos and ethos become the rhetorical currency that these rhetors trade in.

PragerU is a repetition of the rhetorical style that gave rise to Fox News. Jeffrey Jones, in his essay titled “Fox News and the Performance of Ideology,” states:

Fox has demonstrated that news production is aimed not at representing truth but at representing audiences it can assemble around its ideological renderings of ‘truth...’ Using the genre of news as cover, Fox confidently creates and dramatizes all sorts of contestable and debatable ideas about public life using the codes and conventions of established journalistic practice (184).

Like Fox News, PragerU constructs a narrative comprised of villains destroying the American way of life, and the heroes who stand in their way. Through the establishment of genres, PragerU and Fox News craft communities of purpose due to their ideological cores. In addition, by mimicking institutions that are known for their honesty, they position themselves as the true successors to these rhetorical traditions while the others are relegated to the status of “fake news” and post-modern universities.

Post-truth rhetoric presents a clear danger for the health of discourse. While the locutionary acts performed by post-truth rhetors may have little to no basis in

reality, the perlocutionary effects they beget will change reality. McComiskey notes that regardless of whether fake news is fake, it is still news, and people will treat it as such (14-15). Rhetoric may be tied to its relationship with persuasion, but the nature of that persuasion may have an inexorable link to ideology. As long as PragerU exists under its current branding, there will be those who interpret it as better than the real thing.

The videos discussed in this essay contain a torrent of information to unpack and analyze, and most of that information is false. Multiply the number of claims in these videos by the more than 300 other videos thus far that comprise the main series of PragerU, and the scattershot strategy begins to reveal itself. A viewer of these videos is placed in a precarious position where verifying the sheer number of these claims is not feasible. The danger here is in how PragerU presents itself. Through targeted advertising on platforms such as YouTube, a PragerU video can appear in its entirety before an unrelated video. Through their generic mimicry, reaffirmation of ideologies, and deconstruction of institutions that can challenge them, PragerU's videos demonstrate a clear need for further rhetorical research and scrutiny.

Conclusion

Using genre to understand ideological trends is useful because through observing the typification of speech, the core values of those who engage with that genre are revealed. In this case, the genre of PragerU's videos shows a habitual manipulation of facts to suit a particular narrative. This genre system is one of many operating under the terms of a Faustian bargain whereby authority is gained in exchange for the breeding of mistrust toward all rhetorical action. PragerU is rhetoric distilled to its basest form where persuasion is the only goal regardless of the cost.

PragerU's videos are a genre by virtue of their response to an exigence, but it is through their generic mimicry that they cross into the realm of the unethical. PragerU is an example of why a genre is more than its features, because despite its branding, its style, and the social standing of its speakers, it is still far removed from the academic form it brandishes. Rather, it is an offshoot of the troubling trend of post-truth rhetoric that pollutes discourse. Actual universities do not run counter to PragerU's ideology because they are bastions of post-modern, neo-Marxist, narcissistic fools, but because the ideologies promoted by PragerU are actively harmful to modern life.

The ideology of PragerU is a terrifying one that frames the world into wars of opposing ideas where cheap tricks and dirty tactics are de rigueur. The irony is that the very issues PragerU's speakers condemn are the very same actions they themselves commit. Jordan Peterson is quick to point out post-modernist ideological application by professors but ignores his fellow speakers' application of PragerU's ideology to every facet of modern life through their extensive

catalogue of videos on politics, history, literature, economics, science, theology, public policy, race, and sex and gender. Heather Mac Donald takes umbrage with the notion that professors could limit exposure to the literary canon, but the study guide accompanying her video intentionally hides opposing viewpoints and demonize those who disagree with her. And George Will chastises federal student aid for being the government meddling where it doesn't belong but does not mention PragerU's tax status as a charitable organization to help underwrite the \$50,000 cost of their weekly videos. Hypocrisy is the trademark of the charlatan and PragerU is no different. Like all post-truth rhetoric, their claims fail to withstand the slightest amount of scrutiny, and in the words of Jordan Peterson, deserve to be "consigned to the dustbin of history."

Works Cited

- Bazerman, Charles. "Speech Acts, Genres, and Activity Systems: How Texts Organize Activity and People." *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*, edited by Charles Bazerman and Paul Prior. Taylor & Francis, 2003, pp. 309-339.
- Freadman, Anne. "Anyone for Tennis?" *Genre and the New Rhetoric*, edited by Freedman Aviva and Peter Medway, Taylor & Francis, 1994, pp. 43-66.
- Johns, Ann. "Discourse Communities and Communities of Practice." *Writing About Writing: A College Reader*, 3rd ed., edited by Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs, Bedford / St. Martins, 2017, pp. 319-42.
- Jones, Jeffrey. "Fox News and the Performance of Ideology" *Cinema Journal*, vol. 51, no. 4, 2012, pp. 178-85, JSTOR. www.jstor.org/stable/23253592.
- Mac Donald, Heather. "Who Killed the Liberal Arts?" *PragerU*. PragerU.com, 26 Oct. 2015, www.prageru.com/videos/who-killed-liberal-arts.
- McComiskey, Bruce. *Post-Truth Rhetoric and Composition*, Utah State University Press, 2017.
- Miller, Carolyn. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. Taylor & Francis. May 1984, pp. 151-167.
- Peterson, Jordan. "Dangerous People are Teaching Your Kids." *PragerU*. PragerU.com, 11, Jun. 2018, www.prageru.com/videos/dangerous-people-are-teaching-your-kids.
- United States, Supreme Court. *Jacobellis v. Ohio*. Legal Information Institute, Cornell Law School, 22 June 1964, www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/378/184#writing-USSC_CR_0378_0184_ZC1.
- Will, George. "The Speech Every 2015 College Grad Needs to Hear." *PragerU*. PragerU.com, 31 May 2015, www.prageru.com/videos/speech-every-2015-college-grad-needs-hear.