VISUAL RHETORIC OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE. AN ANALYSIS OF A POLITICIAN'S LOCAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FOR THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

RALUCA IULIA BANCOŞ[1]

ABSTRACT. Political culture offers a community its values, attitudes, norms and ideals that help to the good functioning of its institutions, and it also offers the individuals a guidance through public and political life. The political discourse, as mean of communication, implies rhetoric, in order for the orator to convince their audience, and therefore obtain their votes. The rhetoric of the political discourse is of capital importance if we agree that the politician is an orator not only for the knowledge he has, but also thanks to his persuasion skills. The orator actively builds an image for himself, the party that supports him and for mass-media, as the fourth power in the state. Behind this built image that the audience expects and decrypts, there is a language of signs and meanings. This research aims to present the political candidate who successfully used the rhetoric to reach a common code with his audience.

Keywords: rhetoric, political speech, manipulation, visual communication

Rhetoric – theoretical approach

In ancient times, rhetoric was a philosophical discipline that targeted an audience who had to adopt the thesis of the orator. The ancient rhetoric was much about the language, the style and the compositional structure of the speech. In the 5th century BC, in Athens, the rhetoric was used as a main tool in politics and philosophy. Plato, as well as Aristotle, recognized rhetoric's capacity of rational foundation. Aristotle identified three types of 'evidence' achieved through speech: the speaker's character, the mood he manages to inspire the audience and the speech itself, that provide a certain proof (Aristotel, 2004).

[1] PhD candidate MA Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Political Sciences, Public Administration and Communication Studies, ralucaiulia.bancos@gmail.com

Various authors have a definition for rhetoric, but Marcu and Maneca define it as 'the art to select expression, used for the purpose of convincing an audience; oratory; eloquence'. (Marcu, Maneca, 1978, p.933) The new rhetoric, on the other side, is a modern philosophical discipline, that has as area of research the analysis of the means of probation used in human science, philosophy and law, that targets all audience categories and aims the most rational argumentation. Among the modern rhetoricians we quote L. Obrechts-Tyteca, Roman Jackson and Ch. Perelman, the one who introduced new terms like 'auditory', 'concrete reader', 'interlocutor'. Nowadays, in Romania, Ion Cristoiu şi Cristian Tudor Popescu are only two of the journalists who succesfully use the rhetoric. (Goia, 2007, pp.97-99).

In the visual argumentation process, to reach the status of a rhetoric, the visual image has to symbolize something, being indirectly connected to its referent, and it also has to be more than a mere sign. Visual rhetoric is a system of signs, as any other mean of communication, and requires an audience for the image to be interpreted and suggest new meanings. (Abrudan, 2008, p.150)

The legitimacy of power through political speech

Some authors agree that politics have the role, in a community, to mediate or to arbiter social conflicts, in a more or less constraining way, taking into account the main values of that community. Denni and Lecomte distinguish three types of analysis of the political attitudes of citizens in a certain community: *the sociological approach*, when the political sympathies are based on economy, demography or religion; *the Michigan paradigm*, when the electorate chooses depending on their problems, identifying themselves with a party *and the rational voter model,* when the vote is offered for the stakes. (Denni, Lecomte, 2004, p.197).

The final purpose of any political actor is to achieve and exercise power, for which there are some very well defined steps in the political speech. The political speech targets the political, economical and social situation in a certain moment, the regulations that need debating, a thorough evaluation of all the candidates, the campaign plans of the current political party. After Constantin Sălăvăstru, the political speech has some particularities: *intentionally ambiguity, dissimulated character, imperative character* and *polemic character.* Through its forms of manifestation, the political speech legitimizes political knowledge and, therefore, political power, which influences the functioning of the other means of power. (Sălăvăstru, 1999, p.173)

Marga claims that, in a speech, problems need to be validated with powerful arguments. The theoretical speech is desired to outline the truth, through arguments based on theoretical assumptions and on the empirical and theoretical knowledge of that who gives the speech, and the political speech has justice as subject, using arguments based on moral and practical knowledge. (Marga, 2006, p.53) Sălăvăstru (1999) specifies that the arguments of a political discourse can be based on deeds, examples, authority or analogy. There are different formulas being used in a speech: *the slogan*, that requires a certain sonority, rhythmicity and has to reflect the essential in the chosen field, *shock-words, cliche-sequences,* reminding of personalities that imposed themselves throughout time or which reveal an unusual truth and *rhetorical interrogation.*

In order for the political discourse to trigger action, it needs credibility, which exists as long as a political speech can be asumed by the receiver. The most important aspect of a receiver is their multidimensional personality.

The freedom of the political discourse based on the rationality of manipulation through discourse, the procedural opening of the discourse and the amplitude of the problematic commitment, and the constrains of the political discourse are determined by the political doctrine, that assures the background of the text, by the credibility that every political man aspires to and by the interest that is promoted through the discourse. (Daisa-Neşu, 2005, pp.115-117)

Political and media manipulation

Based on Mucchielli, the manipulator builds a world of cognitive objects 'whose linking together will certainly lead the manipulated towards fulfilling an action with positive meaning for them' (Mucchielli, 2002, p.192).

Among the modern ways of communication, the political discourse, through mass-media, is considered to be the most influential and direct way of politicians and political parties towards the minds of the audience with the right to vote. Politics through written media is consumed by a minority of citizens, compared to the great masses of people who digest politics through television. Among the authors who defined manipulation, there is also Irina Stănciugelu, according to whom the political speech is 'the action that determines a social actor to think and act in a way that is compatible with the interests of the initiator, but not with their own interests,

by using persuasion techniques that intentionally distort the truth, giving the impression of freedom of choice and decision' (Stănciugelu, 2009, p.187). The author distinguishes between three forms of manipulation: psychological, informational and contextual manipulation. If the way which causes certain ideas, beliefs or actions of the receptor is according to rationality and morality, we use the concept of positive manipulation. On the other side, there is the negative manipulation, which can be unintentional when there are obstacles such as the audience's knowledge of politics.

Armanca (2006) observes in the mass-media institutions managers' the firm belief of the press organs having the role of forming the audience 'correct' political beliefs, and that is why the Romanian yellow press generates a more subjective approach of the reality.

The rhetoric of the political speech through symbol

In the communication process, symbols can have different meanings for different people, based on everyone's aspirations. 'The science of communication deals mainly with the phenomena that relate to meaning and its appearance'. (Mucchielli, 2002, p.195)

Political symbolism is the most powerful cohesion tool between dominants and dominated and is composed of two poles, one of images and one of operations. There are different channels for politicians to build direct relationships with the voters. 'The diversification of the transmission channels is based on the desired type of political speech.' (Sălăvăstru, 1999, p.131). Among the classic ways of persuasion and the modern communication mechanisms, the television prevails. According to Lucien Sfez, 'the symbolic images work as a symbolic pharmacon, they are remedies for the representation's diseases.' (Sfez, 2000, p.67). The winners are those images of the political party that are able to offer: identity purpose, binding capacities and its ability to adapt, by changing the correspondent device.

In order to understand the message, the image communicates generally, and not individually used codes and sends an affective load, as well as meaning.

Last, but not least, the scenery is an element of great importance in the political discourse, which has to transcend the daily routine, thus enhancing the power of perception and persuasion of the audience. Building the political 'self' requires a multitude of symbols to express the roles the political actor desires to play.

The argument of the research

The political discourse is the most powerful tool by which the politicians can persuade a multitude of people. In Athenian democracy, the speech in front of the crowd suffced and the word of every speaker was worth a truth, but nowadays the attitude, the dress-code, the image that the politicians build of themselves, their actions and the people they associate with weigh a lot more in the art of persuasion. If in the time of Aristotle, in order to achieve credibility, the politicians needed practical wisdom, virtue and kindness, what do politicians need today to rule?

The political discourse legitimizes political power. The message a politician sends to its receptor audience is a real perspective by which one can influence the way that reality itself is perceived. The political speech has many sides. The sometimes false image that is created by politicians could be seen not as a tool of negative manipulation, but as an ideal towards which they aspire themselves as ordinary people. Only the politician who, through his discourse, will be accessible for a larger crowd, from least educated to elitists, will have a gain.

Despite the fact that politicians use mass-media to create the most desirable image of themselves for the receptor public, this is not to be entirely blamed, if it targets the interests of the society they represent. After all, we live in a world where the image we create about ourselves is our best seller.

Aims

First of all, we want to analyse the code used in the politician's political discourse. To built an image you need a diversity of visual or auditive signs and significances, so to achieve what we want, we need rhetoric. The audience understands and receives correct the political discourse if it has the same code for the receiver as for the emitter.

Afterwards, a politician who cares about his image also considers the visual rhetoric as part of the communication. This is based on audience's emotions created by the politician through his political discourse. We will analyse here his non-verbal language, gesticulation and expressions.

Also, the political candidate's activity during the electioneering, the way he created his image through mass-media, Facebook and his personal website are important facts to the way audience saw him and how they felt about him.

Methodology

Content analysis was one of the research methods we used. We analysed the videos during the electioneering where the main guest is the political candidate at the European parliamentary elections from 2014, Daniel Buda. We gave information about the images' composition, the genre of the broadcasts, the role he had there, the way his non-verbal language was filmed, so as all the techniques the politician used to convince the audience. The election photos, the TV spot, the election posters, Facebook and his website were some others tools he used in his discourse.

Another method used for the research is part of the qualitative interviews, the focus-group. This method helped us to have additional information about the way electors see this politician at one of the TV shows he has been invited and whether he would have been voted.

One of the reasons we chose this political candidate was his political proficiency. He was a deputy in the Romanian Parliament during 2004-2012, so a man with the ability to convince repeatedly. Lawyer by profession, Daniel Buda was at the time president of the Judicial, Order and Indemnity Commission of the Chamber of Deputies and Senate and president of Common Commission of the Chamber of Deputies and Senate for legislative proposals of the Constitution. Among his achievements as a deputy, he contributed to the fiscal decentralization of the contributions, financial resources of over one milliard of Euros for Cluj and the disposal of over 102 fees and contributions. The politician candidated for the European parliamentary elections with the following important goals: Romania's access to the Schengen Area, the defence of constitutional state and the independence of justice, European money to sustain all the branches, to sustain the young farmers and the development of micro-farms and the title of „Cluj - capitală culturală europeană 2021"('Cluj - European Cultural Capital of 2021') .

During the electioneering (26th of April - 25th of May), his political team shared different types of information materials about the political candidate to the electors (catalogs, folders and election posters) and also small rewards for the citizens (pens, caps and matches). They took over 500 of photos. The politician was present to eight press conferences, in the local press, on sites as citynews.ro, informatiadecluj.ro, monitorulcj.ro, cetateanulclujean.ro, gazetadecluj.ro, dej.biz, turdanews.net, stiridecluj.ro and realitatea.net, at a radio broadcast (on Napoca FM), at TV talk-shows on Digi24 (Cluj), TVR Cluj, Știri de Cluj online, Realitatea (Cluj) and ITV Satu Mare.

The limitation of this research was the fact that two of the TV talk-shows at a local television were inaccessible because of their private property after the elections. One of the advantages consist of attesting his positive image in front of the electors, using as tools his video appearances, his election photos and online activity, increasing the transparency in his political message. The other one is the focus-group, which helped us to centralize opinions of different aged and educated electors about the political man Daniel Buda.

The TV Shows

To begin with, I have analysed one of Daniel Buda's TV presences, broadcasted on April 25th, one day prior to the onset of the elections' campaign. This particular presence seemed important as it allowed us to monitor his position and prospective changes in his subsequent behaviour, examining his bearing before the audience at entering the competition for the European Parliament elections of 2014. The TV show aired on Realitatea TV Cluj and was hosted by Claudia Chira. We are referring to the talk-show called *Clujul în realitate*, broadcasted from 8:15 p.m., and ranked as the most valued political talk-show in Cluj. The program stretched for 35 minutes, out of which 20 minutes were allotted to the main guest, Daniel Buda. Apart from Daniel Buda, *Ziua de Cluj's* journalist Valentin Mălăescu was the other invited guest. Even if as a matter of course, TV hosts and their guests seem to be of the same mind, showing no interest in polemics, this time we were confronted with the opposite, as the host showcased an aggressive stance during the entire interview, a result perhaps of the divergent political orientation, in this case, a clear conflicting position. Instead of providing an open ground for sensible debate, the set turned rather into a continuous hunting ground which conceded the host the opportunity to undermine and take on the political party represented by Buda. This occurrence unfolded as Buda carried on with his account on the party's accomplishments, on his personal feats and on his objectives as a candidate with reference to Romania's current state of affairs.

As mentioned above, the talk-show took place in a small size setting, featuring only the moderator, Claudia Chira and the two guests: Daniel Buda and Valentin Mălăescu. The arrangement of the show's backdrop followed a triangle scheme, thus hinting at the introspection of the scenery's context. The filming started with a close medium shot, with a

regular angle of the anchor, who was presenting the theme of the show and general facts regarding the current political stage, onwards followed the introduction of the guests, using the same type of framing. After the first pertinent question addressed to Buda, the wide shot was used, so that we, as viewers may look over the entire setting. The main types of frames used were the medium shot and the American standard guest shot. Being filmed inside a location, the lighting seemed natural. Therefore, the main lights were used to bring out the facial features and expressions of the guests. The predominant colour (red) appears warm and suggestive of Buda's opposing party, once again creating the illusion of an accommodating space, accessible to any viewer. The host sided with Mălăescu to build a common front for interviewing the main guest, thus giving off the impression of an open battle which facilitated direct hits aimed both at Buda and at the political party he represents.

Image source: http://ziuadecj.realitatea.net/politica/clujul-in-realitate-daniel-buda-despre-miza-euroalegerilor-video--126003.html

The appearance of the guest was in tune with the message he wanted to convey. His attire seemed that of a regular individual, his blue toned shirt without tie suggesting the idea of thoughtfulness, fairness and hope. When the host announced his presence in a cursory manner, he responded accordingly, pretending to look busy (he was minding his notes). When challenged by the host in reference to the financial benefits of a member of the European Parliament, Buda plays the ignorant card and instead shifts the focus on his most recent actions. In this way, he avoids this trial, raising his eyebrows, and thus creating the expression of a preoccupied man, on a mission to persuade the audience through his discourse. Despite the aggressive tone of the addressed questions (Did people fall for your declared objectives when you went out on the field? As a MEP, member of the European Parliament, will you act like the others: make promises and

do nothing about them?) the politician held ground, talking about the fact that MEPs fail to inform the citizens in this regard, while himself was engaged in this direction, discussing how the media fails to cover European matters, mainly due to people's lack of interest, nevertheless, he insisted on the importance of a more solid involvement in order to grant a comprehensive and fair informing of the public in relation to the European order of business. In his speech, Buda seldom raised the eyebrows, in a gesture which appeared to suggest his keen interest concerning the problems of the citizens, also his left-side arm pointed towards the outside, revealing that he is an honest, fair man, opened to all communication. He talked in a fast pace, thus appearing self-assured and well-acquainted with the debated subjects and creating a feeling of competence and responsibility. In the discussion between the host, the journalist and the politician, the latter always changed his voice tone, using a calm and low voice when it came to explaining European regulations, thus impersonating a tutor who exposes the main problems of Romania: corruption, unemployment, the deficiency in absorbing European funds, addressing people from all walks of life. Moreover, Buda used his left hand with the fingers wide open, as a fan, taking his hand to his chest whenever admitting his ignorance in respect to the gravity of the matters until he was confronted directly with the facts and until he talked to people from different work sectors. This body movement indicates guilt and it is particular to manipulation, suggesting that in fact his self-esteem is being tarnished, even if apparently he only wishes to be the accomplice of ordinary folk.

During the times of closing his answers to the addressed questions, he resorts to a gesture that aims to show that he is on the same par with the host (by pointing at the host), sporting a baffling gesture for his public image that may indicate that he is in fact offering himself up. Every time the host interfered, he carried on with his sayings, insisting each and every single time on the problems of the citizens, making himself their accomplice, adopting a firm, unflinching position, thus forging the image of a thoughtful man, with no time to waste on gossip, willing to fight in the name of the common citizen. Within the same context, that of an interruption, he makes use of a gesture through which he seems to dominate his debate partners (palm faced downwards, descending from mid-air unto the table). He uses the same gesture (coupled with the raised brows) when talking about the absorption of European funding and here he proves himself to be preoccupied once again with a better absorption at national level and with

expressing his command in this matter. To describe the obstacles that Romanian have to overcome in order to access the funds, Buda provides an example from one of his close friends, who had faced several impediments in his attempt to access funds for agriculture based projects, in this manner, the guest managed to blur the lines between himself and the common man, successfully posing as one. When talking about smoothing the process for the absorption of European funds, Buda makes a suggestive stand in his discourse, drawing a digital circle with his index finger and the thumb of his left hand. This is a gesture which betrays his composure and motivation and also indicates a real desire to tackle the presented problems, yet without warranting a complete success.

He displays the image of a game-changing man by inserting in his discourse his accolades as a deputy, his contribution to the Civil Code and the Civil Procedure Code, his interest in a better legislation and a keen application of the corresponding laws. Within the same context, he makes himself the accomplice of the other guest and the host in reference to his position regarding the European Parliament and its statutory supervision over our country, stating that in his view, the country should benefit from autonomy, thus skilfully trying to win the sympathy of his fellow opponents in the set. This approach proved to be fruitful, judging on Mălăescu body movements and his gradual opening of arms (in the beginning he was sitting with his arms crossed) which showed that the journalist was opening up to the politician's exposition and was also making himself available to prospective communication.

During the show there was a time when the host sided with Mălăescu in an attempt to attack Buda and the members of his party, especially for his association with Monica Macovei, who is ridiculed. Even under this circumstance Buda remains composed, moving the speech from unfounded rumours to actual facts, quoting instead the sum of accomplishments of his party, PDL, and showing once again that he is collected and he is capable of standing his ground even relentless attacks. He talks about the people whose businesses were directly affected by Romania's failure to enter the Schengen zone. He addresses politely to the invited journalist, complimenting his political competence, and thus, winning his vote of sympathy. He also made use of his time in the show in an optimal manner, commanding most of the discussion and securing sufficient time to allow him to present his objectives and to display his composure even when playing away, on the field of the opponents.

In the moments of greatest tension, when the host and journalist where playing for the opposition, PSD party, the politician picked up the pace of the conversation, thus creating the impression of confidence and certainty with respect to his discourse. He uses the index finger when talking about Victor Ponta, the PM's attack to the rule of law, showing that he wants to extend his influence over the viewers, by making them follow the conditions in which he sets his message, whether it is true or not. Furthermore, in all his gestures, the left hand prevails being very dynamic and thus exposing to the audience a person who lacks authority, identifiable with a maternal image, a field-work man, a man of contact, bestowed with practical intelligence.

Image source: http://ziuadecj.real

In consequence, in this first TV appearance, Daniel Buda manages to put forward an engaging discourse in order to persuade the audience. Through his speech, he conveys his knowledge on current national matters, counting on the experience gathered during his two parliamentary mandates, he also boast his judicial repertoire without getting himself involved in inappropriate discussions for a member of the public, on the contrary, he appears as the champion of the people, blurring boundaries between himself and the common man. The gestures come to dress up his claims, in perfect agreement. In other words, not a single uttered word comes to contradict who he claims to be.

The second show I have chosen for the content analysis is called *Vocile Clujului*, a show airing on Digi24 HD, and hosted by Marius Benţa. The program follows a talk-show format and was part of a series of debates prefacing the European Parliament elections which created a good context to become acquainted with the candidates, their supporters and to look at their plans and objectives for a future MEP mandate. The show has one host and two guests who are discussing over a general topic concerning the European Parliament. In this show, broadcasted on April 28, the host invited

Daniel Buda, president of PDL Cluj and Ioan Petran, president of PNL Cluj-Napoca, to give course to a debate on regionalization and decentralization of Romania. The set is relatively small and the studio soon becomes a carefully structured setting. The host and the guests are placed at opposite ends, separating the area of the questioner and the area of the guest, with the vanishing point towards the second setting. The filming started with a medium shot, from a normal angle (eyes level), with the presentation of the show's theme and with the introduction of the guests into the scenery game, and the filming continued with the same shooting for the guests. The wide shot was used to make the viewer aware of the entire setting for the unfolding action. During one particular moment of the show when Daniel Buda was dominating the debate and would not let Ioan Petran intervene, the close medium shot was used and the angle was that of the horse-rider, with a close-up of Buda, a very suggestive take for that moment. American framing was also used for the times when the two guests appeared to be on the same side of the debated matter. The studio was well lit, the light created a natural ambiance, more precisely, the white light highlighted the two political actors invited. The colours used in the design of the studio are cold (white, blue and grey) which points at objectivity as a purpose of the show.

Image source: http://www.digi24.ro/Emisiuni/Regional/Digi24+Cluj-Napoca/ Vocile+Clujului/Dezbatere+electorala+regionalizarea+si+descentralizarea+Romaniei

The host seems unbiased during the entire length of the program, as he gives the floor to Daniel as well as to Ioan Petran and he also intervenes when the discussions take an aggressive turn towards the opponents. In spite of this, Buda makes the best out of his alocated time, even more so, out of the 50 minutes of the program, he used more than half the time to express his own ideas, achievements and and objectives as a prospective MEP. His stage presence is once again compelling. He takes the first turn in replying

the host. In his speech, he appeals to national sentiments, reminiscing the sacrifices of the revolution and putting this on the account of the current elections. He places his left hand over the right forearm in a gesture that shows that he is willing to stands at odds with any conflict or defective statement. He is evasive enough in his speech, quoting a European journalist to reveal a possible incentive that might drive people to cast their vote in the European Parliament elections.

In matters concerning the importance of European regulations, he uses both the thumb and left index finger in a motion that betrays his imagination and desire to seize the audience. In all this time, his opponent prepares his answer, by writing it on a piece of paper, crossing his arms and suggesting that he quits in this battle. Buda discourse centres on the idea of responsibility and acknowledgment, not only his own but also those of other representatives; here he presents himself as the fittest candidate while Petran only manages to muster unclear answers, out of topic, moreover, he is often quoting and agreeing with Buda, thus improving his image.

In his discourse, Daniel Buda talks about the achievements of his party, of the achievements of other fellow MEP from PDL, while presenting them in contrast with their opponents, who have played a more modest role in politics. Buda comes forward as a regular person, who began his journey in the country-side and betting on his origins to awaken a sense of empathy and familiarity towards current issues in agriculture. In this context, he mentions the absorption of European funds for agriculture as one of his primary objectives. His tone is steady, his pace is swift, leaving no room for jokes and smiles and casting himself as a serious man. He often poses in the clothes of the competent man, calling to attention his professional development and the great advantages that a new mandate might bring. In terms of the body movement, his left hand with the fingers wide open is predominant, this hand of the guilty, which is a symbol of possession and desire to ascend. When interrupted by the host for additional comments, he systematically raises his right hand to take the floor. In his speech which revolves around him being the best possible candidate for a MEP mandate, he resorts to making the *hand gesture of the censor*, one fan opened hand and placed on the table, demanding and supporting his claims. In his speech he also talks about other inefficient measures applied by former MEPs, yet failing to come with solutions to the points he criticizes. At this point, the emotions seem to be converging, but yet he maintains his proved composure which is doubled by his gesticulation (bringing his hands together like in a prayer; this is a sign which shows that the cerebral cortex is mobilised in order to block an emotional outburst).

To create the image of a man forbearing change, he uses a much more commonplace political tool, namely, that of attacking his opponents. He recalls in his speech Romania's letdown in relation to Schengen and attributes this to the fallacy of his opponents. He becomes visibly appalled during this address in which he takes a more aggressive tone, raising his voice and talking faster and faster, making using of wide, dynamic arms gestures and using his right index to point at the culprit. In these circumstances, the moderator interferes and redirects the discussion towards another subject. In spite of this, Buda holds his ground and marshals on with his attacking utterances, contrasting the achievements of his party to the failures of the others. He seems to be casting the blame entirely on his adversaries, while always stressing out the importance of taking responsibility, in this way, reinforcing his image of a man with integrity, serious and truly preoccupied.

Image source: http://www.digi24.ro/Emisiuni/Regional/Digi24+Cluj-Napoca/ Vocile+Clujului/Dezbatere+electorala+regionalizarea+si+descentralizarea+Romaniei

In conclusion, during this show, Buda draws a clear outline in relation to his counter-candidate Ioan Petran, showcasing a responsible stature, self-aware, competent, in stark contrast to the other politician who always seem insecure in his answers, who resorts to jokes all too often and who exhibits a discourse which fails to convince.

We have analysed another program of the series „Vocile Clujului" dedicated to the elections, the last one of this kind featuring Daniel Buda as guest. The show aired on May 25, 2014, at 7 p.m. having the same host Marius Bența and Radu Zlati, PNL MP, as a second guest. Once again we can speak about the poles apart arrangement of the guests inside the setting, which overtly suggests the idea of a face-off. The lights remained in white tones, as natural as possible and the decor was using appropriate colours for an impartial television channel. The frames used here are: the wide shot to reveal the entire setting to the audience, medium shots for each of the guests and for the host and the close medium shot for Daniel Buda alone,

this last one used in the beginning of the show when he was commending the TV station for this series of programs running an elections' theme. For dynamic effects, panoramic frames are introduced to accompany the filmed guests. In this episode, the time is equally divided among the guests, the moderator remaining impartial and addressing relevant questions for the topics discussed. In spite of all these facts, there are two moments in the show that leave us under the impression that the host, and Daniel Buda, are actually in cahoots with each other; although leaving room for an easy competition in order to maintain the talk-show appearance, the ludicrous performance that keeps viewers glued to their screens.

In this show, Daniel Buda's discourse reiterates all the points taken throughout the three TV appearances he registered in this series on electoral debates, namely, he points out his own and his colleagues' accomplishments. Buda keeps up the same mien, showcasing his competencies and knowledge and not allowing his opponents to intimidate him. He is a politician that knows very well how to stand out and to pass even his flaws as something beneficial to voters. As he did previously, he poses as the common man when talking about the low subsidies of the farmers.

Image source: http://www.digi24.ro/Emisiuni/Regional/Digi24+Cluj-Napoca/ Vocile+Clujului/Unitatea+dreptei+este+posibila+dupa+alegeri

He claims that his number one objective on his MEP agenda is bringing Romanian farmers at the same level with those abroad. In this context, he seems belligerent (raising his voice, picking up the talking pace, seemingly more anchored) and he utilizes regional vocabulary in order to conceal the difference between him and the voters (*Di ce gândiţi că nu putem vinde?* Why do y'all think we can't sell?) He promises that once elected MEP he will defend the country and states loud and clear that he will fight till the end until Romania will no longer be humbled before the European

Parliament or treated differently than other states. Consequently, he reinforces his image of a fighter and patriot of the Romanian people. Conversely, his opponent Radu Zlati, shows complacency in the face of national issues, claiming that the status quo cannot be challenged, and therefore relying on the most powerful European nations to continue to hold the reins. A dynamic position is preferable in this case to a static one, of contentment. Buda's discourse is a winner here, taking the lead through the surge of optimism and thirst for making a stand, all desiderata of Romanian who got on the verge of destitution.

For the first time, Daniel Buda appears to be more tolerant as he gives the other guest the opportunity to seize as much air time as possible, even more so, he displays a partnership attitude, perhaps due to the impending union of the two right parties as they prepare for the forthcoming presidential elections.

In addition to the other shows, Buda expresses now the importance of having a MEP candidate stemming from the North-Western region of the country, emphasizing that a man accustomed to the issues and with his experience as MP and President of the Judicial Committee in the Deputies' Chamber is a necessity for the MEP position, since he is the direct representative of the common man, boasting a strong local loyalty and articulating the basic needs of every citizen of this region, but most of all having a vast experience which cannot be contested.

As always, he is very animated, but slightly more toned in gestures, this time his predominant gestures were: the palms turned towards the sky (a means of drawing the viewer's attention his way), the raised eye-brows (his deep preoccupation with the nation's issues), the index pointing towards him (suggesting that he is the fittest choice), looking straight into the camera (establishing a more intimate connection with the viewers).

Image source: http://www.digi24.ro/Emisiuni/Regional/Digi24+Cluj-Napoca/
Vocile+Clujului/Unitatea+dreptei+este+posibila+dupa+alegeri

All in all, it is a discourse anchored in the current matters of the country and in the quest for their solution, distinguishing himself from the PNL representative who seems rather anchored in problems of the past and complacent before the lack of efficiency of Romanian politicians.

The TV spot

Daniel Buda made the dynamic TV spot hand in hand with TVR Cluj. Five minutes in length, the spot has as background the PDL anthem. The spot brings into focus the political candidate at the european parliamentary elections, a man of experience (frames from the time he used to be a deputy), solidary with the party he represents (frames with meetings he had with other representatives of the party or supporters), concerned about the difficulties companies from Romania have, but also a simple, authentic Transylvanian man. Therefore, Buda's characteristics in this spot are conceived to convince the audience.

Image source: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xfYK9gjOScA

Election posters

During the electioneering for the European parliamentary elections (on 25th of May, 2014), the candidate used four election posters to promote himself. The posters presents the politician either in a strong light, as a good, calm man, either as a serious man, with the look of a man determined to accomplish things, a fighter, as the text used in one of the posters says: 'Daniel Buda defends your rights'. The colours used in the posters (white and blue) represents faith, honesty, innocence and lack of corruption. The posters show us a politician who protects the Romanian's interests, perfectly imaged by the one with the house made of hands. Also, the politician gains credibility through the support of Emil Boc, former prime minister and representative of the same party.

Image source: www.danielbuda.ro

Election photos

Daniel Buda and his political team took 400 of photos that summarises his activity during the electioneering, his visits at companies from Cluj, his meetings with citizens from Cluj, Bihor, Sălaj, Bistriţa, Maramureş and Satu Mare. These photos are important to the politician's image, talking about a popular politician, interested in any field of activity and commited.

Image source: http://www.danielbuda.ro/evenimente/

Facebook and his website

In order to make himself more visible, Daniel Buda also used Facebook. During the electioneering, he posted at least two times per day and he received over 100 of commentaries per each posting and hundreds of

"likes". He created a public page and a personal page (facebook.com/pages/ Daniel-Buda and facebook.com/daniel.buda.oficial). He also has a website where citizens can find out information about him (www.danielbuda.ro).

Focus-group

In order to increase the accuracy of my research, I have created a focus-group. For the start, I chose the theme I was targeting, specifically what image is Daniel Buda creating. Next, I have identified the subjects who could fit to the suggested thematic, in this case, voting citizens aged over 18. From the educational point of view, the focus-group selected subjects formed a non-homogeneous group: five members have bachelor degree and three members have high school degree, four males and four females. Age structure: two subjects aged between 18 and 29 years old, three subjects aged between 30 and 49 and three over 50. The location used was selected as neutral, within a public space in order to avoid any kind of discrimination. I realised an interview guide with six questions with an estimated answering time between one and half minute and two minutes for each question. At the beginning the group was requested to watch one of political campaign shows broadcasted on Digi24 HD channel where Daniel Buda and his opponent candidate, Ioan Petrean were invited. Thus, the interview guide questions were:

1. What was the general impression did the political man Daniel Buda transmit, after you have watched the 'Vocile Clujului' show?

2. What do you think about moderator's attitude regarding his guests during the show?

3. How do you perceive Daniel Buda's political discourse (during the show) in comparison with his opponent, Ioan Petrean, one?

4. Can you please mention if you noticed something inappropriate to the Daniel Buda behaviour during the show?

5. After watching the show, would you vote for Daniel Buda?

6. What are the key elements of a candidate's political speech that will win your vote?

The focus group discussion was free and comfortable for the group members. The group conclusions were split in two: three persons with access to high education (one male and two females) were not convinced by Daniel Buda's message, mostly because they prefer a different political doctrine than the party he represents. The remaining group members were convinced by the same candidate political discourse. Thus, the majority of convinced group member were males with access to mid education.

Conclusions

This research shows that the citizens were convinced to vote for this politician with a specific image: a man of the people who focuses on the need of developing the Romanian agriculture, on tradition, usage of authentically language, fairness and corruption fighting, Daniel Buda.

The politician managed to successfully transmit the message to his targeted audience according to his image choice. This image has merged with the politician person, especially during his Parliament representative mandate, where he managed to accomplish most of his objectives, thus adding more credibility in front of voters. He also had a good collaboration with mass media, in order to advertise his accomplishments and his image. In our situation, the rhetoric of the political discourse proved to be a convergence of electioneering message and the political man image built specifically for a target audience identified by the politician within his campaign strategy. The campaign message, thus proved to be fully aligned with campaign strategy planning phases, mostly because the expected result was achieved.

The political message rhetorical convinced its targeted audience as presented in this research and shows that the political man Daniel Buda constructed correctly his image and was elected.

REFERENCES

Abrudan, Elena (2008). *Comunicarea vizuală.* Cluj-Napoca: Accent
Aristotel (2010). *Politica*, București: Univers Enciclopedic. Trad. Alexander Baumgarten
Aristotel (2004). *Retorica.* București: Iri. Trad. Maria-Cristina Andrieș
Armanca, Brândușa (2006). *Media culpa.* București: Curtea Veche Publishing
Daisa-Neșu, Nicoleta (2005). *Textul politic: limite și deschideri semiotice.* Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință
Denni, Bernard, Lecomte, Patrick (2004). *Sociologia politicului*. Cluj-Napoca: Eikon. Trad. Maria Nora Țărnea
Goia, Vistian (2007). *Retorică și argumentare: note de curs pentru studenți în jurnalistică și științe politice.* Cluj-Napoca: Dacia
Lucien, Sfez (2000). *Simbolistica politică.* Iași: Institutul European. Trad. Diana Sălceanu
Marcu, Florin, Maneca, Constant (1978). *Dicționar de neologisme.* București: Academia R.S.R.
Marga, Andrei (2006). *Argumentarea.* Cluj-Napoca: Fundațiile Studiilor Europene
Mucchielli, Alex (2002). *Arta de a influența. Analiza tehnicilor de manipulare.* Iași: Polirom. Trad. Mihaela Calcan
Sălăvăstru, Constantin (1999). *Discursul puterii. Încercare de retorică aplicată.* Iași: Institutul European
Stănciugelu, Irina (2009). *Măștile comunicării. De la etică la manipulare și înapoi.* București: Tritonic