



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Argument Ad Feminam: The Use of Gendered Attacks to Discredit the Women Participating in the 2020 Hearings of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol

Herbeck, Dale A.; Mehlretter Drury, Sara A.; Boogaart, Ronny; Garssen, Bart; Jansen, Henrike; Van Leeuwen, Maarten; ... ; Reuneker, Alex

Citation

Herbeck, D. A., & Mehlretter Drury, S. A. (2024). Argument Ad Feminam: The Use of Gendered Attacks to Discredit the Women Participating in the 2020 Hearings of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. *Proceedings Of The Tenth Conference Of The International Society For The Study Of Argumentation*, 355-364. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4107805>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4107805>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Argument *Ad Feminam*

The Use of Gendered Attacks to Discredit the Women Participating in the 2021 Hearings of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol

DALE A. HERBECK & SARA A. MEHLTRETTER DRURY¹

*Communication Studies Department
Northeastern University
United States*

*Rhetoric Department
Wabash College
United States
drurys@wabash.edu*

ABSTRACT: This analysis focuses on argument *ad feminam*, a distinctive form of the abusive *ad hominem* fallacy in which an argumentative claim is discounted because a woman made it. As a case study, we focus on the gendered attacks that Donald Trump and his surrogates used to discredit the women who testified in the televised hearings conducted by the Select Committee to Investigate the Attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021.

KEYWORDS: *ad feminam*, *ad hominem*, fallacy, January 6, Trump

1. INTRODUCTION

The standard treatment of the *ad hominem* fallacy, van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2015) observe, recognizes three distinct forms of the fallacy: (1) the abusive variant, (2) the circumstantial variant, and (3) the *tu quoque* variant. The most common variant, abusive *ad hominem*, can be characterized as an attack targeting a person rather than their ideas. van Eemeren and Grootendorst explain, “By portraying the opponent as stupid, dishonest, unreliable or indicate otherwise negative aspects, an attempt is made to undermine his credibility” (p. 616).

Argumentation theorists frequently discount such attacks as fallacies of relevance. While there may be a connection between the premises and the conclusion, under closer scrutiny, Rescher explains, the premises “fail to provide sufficiently relevant evidence for the conclusion” (p. 70). “It is,” Cliff (2017) concludes, “an attempt to distract from the matter at hand by introducing irrelevant details aimed at discrediting the individual” (p. 10).

A growing body of scholarship suggests that *ad hominem* in public discourse is worthy of reconsideration and rehabilitation. For example, Hinman (1982) has observed that “there is a wide variety of situations in which *ad hominem* arguments are not fallacious” (p. 338). Echoing this sentiment, Johnson (2009) argued that “intellectual

¹ Corresponding author.

virtues, moral virtues, and non-moral character traits can all be legitimate factors” when dealing with public argument and “deciding contentious public issues that are otherwise irresolvable” (p. 252). Argumentation theorists have identified two contexts in which *ad hominem* attacks might be both relevant and effective: the courtroom, where *ad hominem* may undermine the character or credibility of a witness, and the political campaign, where *ad hominem* may be used to distract the audience and undermine a candidate.

Our interest in argumentation theory and political campaigns led to a project that focused on presidential candidate Donald Trump’s use of *ad hominem* attacks with a particular emphasis on name-calling (Mehltretter Drury & Herbeck, 2019). While campaigning for the Republican nomination in 2016, Trump faulted “Lying’ Ted” and “Crooked Hillary” for displaying a lack of character, he disparaged “low energy” Jeb Bush and “Crazy Bernie Sanders” for possessing flawed personalities, and he savaged Carly Fiorina and “Little Marco” Rubio for their appearance and physical stature. Instead of treating these verbal assaults as simple insults, we concluded that Trump’s campaign used personal attacks as “an important means of persuasion for audiences when the *ad hominem* connects to larger arguments through references, enthymemes, and other rhetorical forms” (Mehltretter Drury & Herbeck, 2019, p. 150).

While researching the 2016 campaign, we noted that Trump talks about women, especially political rivals, in language intended to trivialize and demean. Building on this observation, this analysis focuses on argument *ad feminam*, defined as an attack against a specific woman grounded in her character rather than the argument or position she espouses. We argue that such attacks are worthy of attention as they reinforce gender stereotypes, especially the idea that women are less than men.

This analysis begins with Trump’s tendency to insult women, it develops a typology for *ad feminam* arguments, and it illustrates the typology using attacks by Trump and his surrogates against the women who played prominent roles in the January 6 Hearings conducted by a Select Committee of the United States House of Representatives.

2. THE ART OF THE INSULT

Donald Trump has an exceptional talent for delivering *ad hominem* attacks, so much so that the *New York Times* maintained a detailed list of his insults before being barred from Twitter (Quealy, 2021). While the breadth of the list is impressive, we were especially interested in Trump’s attacks on women. “Men receive just as much criticism when it comes to Mr. Trump and his nicknames,” Zoeller (2020) noted, “but his comments against females have often focused on insulting their looks, mentioning bodily functions, calling them ‘that women,’ and even comparing them to animals.” “He talks about women, any prominent, powerful women,” Walsh added, “in the most demeaning of ways, trivializing them” (Prasad, 2019). Echoing this sentiment, Munoz highlighted the distinctive ways he attacks females, noting his preference for a “very gendered attack” (Zoeller, 2020).

To dismiss female politicians, Trump uses derisive labels like “Crazy Nancy” Pelosi or “that woman in Michigan,” referring to Governor Gretchen Whitmer, who he belittled as a “half-whit” (Quealy, 2021). In the September 9, 2015, edition of *Rolling Stone* magazine, Trump disparaged a Republican rival, business executive Carly Fiorina. “Look at that face!” he cried. “Would anyone *vote* for that? Can you imagine that, the face of our

next *president?!'* (Solotaroff, 2015). To question her competence, he labeled Senator Elizabeth Warren as “goofy,” “nasty,” and a “lowlife” (Quealy, 2021). During the 2016 presidential campaign, he attacked Hillary Clinton’s emotional and mental state, referring to her as “totally unhinged” and “unbalanced” (Quealy, 2021). Some of his most vitriolic attacks are reserved for women of color, as when he attacked Senator Kamala Harris after the vice-presidential debate in 2020, referring to her as a “monster,” a term generally reserved for murderers or terrorists (Summers 2020).

Trump’s *ad hominem* attacks are not confined to female politicians, as he has a particular disdain for female journalists, especially those who dare to challenge him in public. He denounced a former Fox reporter and moderator of a 2015 Republican primary debate, Megyn Kelley, for “asking me all sorts of ridiculous questions.” He added, “you could see there was blood coming out of her eyes, blood coming out of her whatever” (Zoeller, 2020). After a 2020 Town Hall moderated by Savannah Guthrie, Trump claimed Guthrie had gone “totally crazy.” “Everybody thought it was so inappropriate,” Trump added. “Savannah—it was like her face, the anger, the craziness” (Maddaus, 2020). Trump terminated an interview with veteran journalist Lesley Stahl for a *60 Minutes* segment because she displayed a “negative attitude” when questioning his response to the coronavirus pandemic. At a campaign rally, he claimed Stahl had “fire coming out of her eyes,” an attack reminiscent of his comments about Kelly (Alexander, 2020). On Twitter, Trump called the Stahl interview a “vicious takeout attempt,” adding, “watch her constant interruptions & anger. Compare my full, flowing and ‘magnificently brilliant’ answers to their ‘Q’s’” (Grynbaum & Haberman, 2020). During a contentious Town Hall in May 2023, Trump derided CNN anchor Kaitlan Collins for being a “nasty person” when she questioned him about his mishandling of classified documents (Mastrangelo, 2023).

Although they pose no political threat, Trump routinely attacks female celebrities. For more than a decade, Trump exchanged insults with comedian Rosie O’Donnell, referring to her as “fat,” “a total loser,” and “a trainwreck.” When Megyn Kelly called him out for making demeaning comments about women, Trump replied, “only Rosie O’Donnell” (Zoeller, 2020). Celebrity TV star Omarosa Manigault Newman joined the Trump administration at the start of his presidency. After leaving the White House, she published a tell-all book titled *Unhinged*. Trump responded by calling a “crazed, crying lowlife.” “Good work by General Kelly for quickly firing that dog!” (Zoeller, 2020). During the 2015 Republican presidential primaries, Trump commented on the appearance of Heidi Klum, a German-American model and television host. “Sadly,” he lamented, “she’s no longer a 10” (Bueno, 2017). After teenage environmental activist Greta Thunberg was honored as *Time*’s 2019 Person of the Year,” Trump tweeted that she had an Anger Management problem.” He encouraged her to “go to a good old fashioned movie with a friend!” (Quealy, 2021).

These *ad feminam* attacks are effective because they undermine the character of the women that Trump is targeting while simultaneously shifting the audience’s attention away from the issue being discussed. We should pay particular attention to such attacks, Mercieca (2020) warns, as demagogues like Trump skillfully use these arguments to “appeal to our stereotypes or prejudices about people and as distraction, diverting attention away from legitimate issues” (p. 18).

3. ARGUMENT *AD FEMINAM*

“Developed to assist the male participants in Greek and Roman political life,” Moi (1999) explains, “classical rhetoric never coined the term *ad feminam* to describe arguments direct ‘to the woman’” (p. 138). This omission is understandable, Moi continues, as *hominem* is a Latin word meaning “literally to the person.” Under this definition, “to argue *ad hominem* is to attack the person who makes the argument one detests, rather than the argument itself, usually in order to move the audience, to stir their passions against this adherent person” (p. 138). Since *hominem* is gender-neutral, *ad hominem* would include attacks against both men and women.

The attacks on female politicians, journalists, and celebrities recounted in the previous section are a form of *ad hominem* argument. However, there is good reason to differentiate *ad feminam* attacks, as they are based on different stereotypes and prejudices. To illustrate this distinction, we focused on the six women who testified before a select committee investigating the January 6, 2021, assault on the United States Capitol Building. President Trump and his surrogates chose not to participate in the legislative process. They were quick to respond to the televised hearings, especially to the testimony offered by the women. Using social media and televised interviews, Trump and his surrogates responded to criticism of his behavior with *ad feminam* attacks. These attacks took three forms: 1) they questioned the women’s competence, 2) they denigrated the women’s physical appearance, and 3) they questioned the women’s emotional and mental health. In so doing, Trump pursued the same strategy that he has successfully used to respond to all women who challenge him, criticizing them in personal terms designed to undermine their credibility, question their integrity, and raise doubts about their sanity.

4. CASE STUDY: THE ATTACK ON THE WOMEN PARTICIPATING IN THE 2020 HEARINGS ON THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

On January 6, 2021, supporters of former President Donald Trump stormed the capital and tried to stop the Congress’s ratification of the 2020 presidential election. On July 1, 2021, the House of Representatives voted for an independent bicameral commission to investigate the insurrection. The measure passed the House by a vote of 252-175, with thirty-five Republicans supporting the bill. When a Republican filibuster in the Senate defeated the measure, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi appointed a select committee to investigate the events. The House of Representatives then passed a resolution, “Establishing the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol,” by a vote of 222-190. This resolution allowed Pelosi to appoint eight members, and House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy was empowered to nominate five members “in consultation” with the Speaker. To fill her eight seats, Pelosi selected seven Democrats and Republican Liz Cheney, who was designated as vice chair. When McCarthy proposed three House members who had voted to overturn the Electoral College results in Arizona and Pennsylvania, Pelosi rejected his recommendations. Rather than offering substitutes, McCarthy pulled all his picks. The refusal to participate was a mistake, as it allowed Pelosi to control the Committee’s makeup, and she appointed Adam Kinzinger, a Republican who had voted for Trump’s second impeachment.

After a year of investigation, the House Select Committee publicized its key findings during ten televised hearings between June 9, 2022, and December 19, 2022. “Each hearing,” Press (2022) observed, “had one central theme, delivered in skillfully edited—and short—video clips and buttressed by carefully chosen—and short— statements by live witnesses.” The Final Report, an 845-page document, was released on December 22, 2022. Shortly after that, the Committee began releasing transcripts of the interviews completed during the investigation. The Committee officially disbanded on January 3, 2023, when the 117th session of Congress ended.

“One persistent theme now runs through all of the House Select Committee’s Jan. 6 hearings,” Ferullo (2022) observed. “Forget Hollywood Studios, forget the Marvel Universe—taken together, these hearings are the most compelling television series in years about the power of women.” Unfortunately, the courageous women who testified were singled out and attacked for their participation. In exposing ex-President Trump’s effort to overturn the 2020 election, Karni and Haberman (2022) emphasized that the House Select Committee “relied on the accounts of several women who came forward to publicly tell their stories. Their statements, and the attacks that ensued, laid bare how women often still pay a higher price than men for speaking up.”

Many witnesses who testified before the Committee and appeared in the televised hearings were male. While the men were critical of President Trump’s behavior on January 6, 2021, their testimony was often ignored by the former president and his surrogates. As Karni and Haberman (2022) observed, male witnesses “received some criticism from the right,” but “the attacks have not been at the same volume or intensity, or of the same degree of personal nastiness, as those against Ms. Hutchinson in particular.”

This restraint was not evident in the response to Vice Chair Cheney and the five women who testified during the televised hearings. His targets included Caroline Edwards, a Capital Police officer who testified at the first hearing (June 9, 2022); Ruby Freeman and her daughter Wandrea “Shaye” Moss, Georgia election workers who testified at the fourth hearing (June 21, 2022); Cassidy Hutchinson, a White House aide to Chief of Staff Mark Meadows who was the sole witness at the fifth hearing (June 23, 2022); and Sarah Matthews, a White House Deputy Press Secretary who testified at the seventh hearing (July 12, 2022) (Select Committee).

Twitter permanently barred ex-President Trump from its service on January 8, 2021, “due to the risk of further incitement of violence” (Delkic, 2021). Stripped of his platform, Trump shifted to Truth Social, the flagship app of his new social media company. During the televised hearings, the ex-president issued *ad hominem* attacks from his Truth Social account. He denounced the investigation as a partisan “witch hunt,” attacked witnesses, and denied wrongdoing. Members of the “Unselect Committee” were denounced as “political HACKS” and “Thugs and Scoundrels” (Axelrod, 2022). Trump singled out Vice Chair Cheney for special criticism, referring to her as a “despicable human being . . . who is hated by the great people of Wyoming” (Moore, 2022). These attacks are notable, but this analysis focuses on the gender-based *ad feminam* attacks that Trump directed against the women who participated in the hearings.

The first set of *ad feminam* attacks focused on the women’s competence. To undermine their credibility, Trump achieved this by downplaying their service length, minimizing job responsibilities and proximity to power, and using derisive nicknames to minimize job performance. These moves were deliberate and consequential, as they

allowed Trump to ignore the substances of the women's testimony by questioning their competence.

Trump responded to Sarah Matthews' testimony with a statement on Truth Social: "'15 minutes of fame' Matthews, who I don't know, is clearly lying" (Eaton, 2022). As part of this post, Trump included a picture of himself with Matthews, the woman he did not know. The post concluded with a tweet from Matthews thanking Trump and Vice President Pence for their service, adding, "It was the greatest honor and privilege of my life to serve this great nation" (Patteson, 2022). Trump's response was masterful, as it dismissed Matthews' service as inconsequential, and at the same time, it appropriated her compliment as genuine.

Even before the attack on the Capitol, Trump attacked Georgia election workers Ruby Freeman and Shaye Moss. In his phone call with Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger, Trump claimed they had engaged in ballot tampering, falsely alleging that they pulled fake ballots from suitcases hidden under tables at a ballot-counting center (Miller & Kinsella, 2023). During the conversation, Trump used Freeman's name "no less than 19 times," labeling her "a vote scammer, a professional vote scammer and hustler, known scammer, known political operative, and ballotteer" (*Freeman v. Giuliani*, 2022).

Trump's surrogates reiterated these *ad feminam* attacks on the women who testified. Rudy Giuliani used his podcast to question Ruby Freeman's integrity, referring to her as someone with "a history of fraud participation," and claiming that she, with the help of other election workers, counted the same ballots "eight times," "cheating" in a manner that "looked like a bank heist." On Christmas Day in 2020, Giuliani attacked "Ms. Freeman and her crew" for attempting to scan ballots multiple times, likening them to "crooks springing into action" (*Freeman v. Giuliani*, 2022).

A second *ad feminam* attack highlighted physical appearance. This attack is based on "pretty privilege," a phenomenon that occurs when people associate physical beauty with health, talent, and success. Western appeals to beauty are built on a particular conception of attractiveness: feminine facial features such as a smaller jaw-to-cheekbone ratio, thinner nose bridges, and a smaller forehead. "For Mr. Trump," Filipovic (2017) observes, "this sexism moves in two directions: Women who are young, slim, white and conventionally attractive are sex objects, while women who don't fit his narrow ideal of femininity are dismissed as pigs and dogs."

Between 1993 and 2015, then-reality TV star Trump did regular interviews with radio host Howard Stern. During these conversations, the pair discussed topics ranging from celebrity feuds to Trump's sex life. The pair frequently talked about women, and Trump offered disparaging comments and issued attractiveness ratings (Heil, 2017). Given this background, it was not surprising when a statement with Trump's "Save America" masthead attacked "Hutch, as we called her," for being a "terrible employee." "Her biggest job," the statement continued, "was making sure that we had Die Coke in the kitchen, on a least two occasions, she brought in Diet Pepsi. TOTAL FAILURE." Switching to Hutchinson's appearance, the statement concluded, "the kids say 'she's a 10 but and I can't go that far, we we're being completely honest. She's a 6 but she turned her back on MAGA'" (Reuters Fact Check, 2022).

When Reuters tried to authenticate the post, it discovered that "the purported statement is not viewable on Trump's official website, nor can the statement be seen in archived versions of the website dated June 28, 2022" (Reuters Fact Check, 2022). The

fake statement was widely circulated, however, likely reflecting that the message was consistent with authentic posts and the interviews with Stern in which Trump had disparaged female employees for their competence and rated their attractiveness.

While the statement linked Hutchinson's competence and appearance, Newsmax host and Trump supporter Greg Kelly flipped this argument. Instead of dismissing a woman because she is unattractive, Kelly argued that the Select Committee "picked her, in part, because of her good looks." "They've done this before," he continued. "They had hundreds of cops to choose from. They chose Ms. Edwards." Switching back to Hutchinson, Kelly added, "they dressed her up real nice. I think they may have sent her to some, sort of, rancho relaxo" (Media Matters, 2022). Kelly's attacks objectify women, dismissing them because they are either too pretty or not pretty enough.

Finally, Trump's argument *ad feminam* takes a particular form when attacking the women's emotional or mental health. Passion or emotion is often understood as a reasoned argument when displayed by a man; questioning a woman's emotional or mental state is often sufficient to render her argument irrational and irrelevant. On this point, Palczewski and Chase (2021) explain: "An angry man is just an arguing man. However, woman's argument, regardless of its emotional expression, is coded as angry/emotional and, thus dismissible" (p. 26).

To be fair, Trump routinely calls his political opponents or critics as "crazy." This is a derisive label that he has applied to CNN reporter Jim Acosta, Former New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg, Connecticut Senator Michael Blumenthal, Texas Senator Ted Cruz, *New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowd, New York Congressman Jerry Nadler, Virginia Governor Ralph Northam, MSNBC host Lawrence O'Donnell, Vermont Senator Bernie Sanders, California Congressman Adam Schiff, and California Congressman Maxine Waters (Quealy, 2021). However, the argument *ad feminam* takes the form of attacking the emotional state to a new level which is evident in Trump's diatribe about Cheney on Truth Social: "Those that know Chaney [spelled wrong] are not surprised because she is a COMPLETE PSYCHO has no regard for the truth as to what really happened, and is angry that the people of the Great State of Wyoming put her out to pasture in a record setting defeat" (Mueller, 2022). "She blames me for this, but she only has herself to blame," Trump added. (Mueller, 2022).

Trump used the same type of *ad feminam* attack against Cassidy Hutchinson. In a Truth Social Post on June 28, 2022, he laid the foundation: "When she requested to go with certain others of the team to Florida after my having served a full term in office, I personally turned her down. I understand that she was very upset and angry that I didn't want her to go, or be a member of the team. She is bad news" (Bustillo, 2022). In an interview on Newsmax, Trump referred to Hutchinson as "this girl." He accused her of making up stories, adding, "She's got serious problems, let me put it that way." He concluded she has "mental problems" (Karni and Haberman, 2020). The implication of this attack is clear: Hutchinson's testimony is not credible. Such attacks draw on stereotypes of "hysterical" women who cannot be trusted with important tasks.

5. CONCLUSION

Trump's use of *ad hominem* attacks was integral to his political success and a formidable weapon that he used to attack his political opponents. This analysis argues *ad feminam* attacks are a distinct subset of argument *ad hominem*. These attacks function rhetorically to create spectacle, to divert attention, and to reinforce gender stereotypes against women's competence, thereby enhancing traditional claims to masculinity and power. Such appeals are devastating, and yet pervasive and persuasive.

The analysis of the Select Committee hearings found three distinct forms of *ad feminam* arguments: attacks based on a woman's competence, physical appearance, and mental and physical health. Moreover, we note that whereas our previous analysis of the 2016 *ad hominem* attacks found that others who tried these fallacious appeals tended to be criticized for their lack of valid support, Trump's *ad feminam* attacks were often spread beyond his social media and interviews. There are many examples in which conservative commentators use similar strategies to attack these courageous women and undermine. We should thus be wary of *ad feminam* attacks, as they threaten democracy while devaluing women.

NOTE: Any opinions, findings, recommendations, or conclusions expressed in this analysis are those of the authors and do not reflect the views of the authors' places of employment.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, H. (2020, October 27). Trump says Lesley Stahl had 'fire coming out of her eyes' as he complains about 'tough' 60 Minutes interview. *The Independent*.
<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-election-2020/donald-trump-lesley-stahl-60-minutes-interview-speech-today-rally-b1376625.html>
- Axelrod, T. (2022, December 19). How Trump has responded to the Jan. 6 committee. *ABC News*.
<https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trump-responded-jan-6-committee/story?id=95323334>
- Bueno, A. (2015, August 17). Donald Trump says Heidi Klum 'is no longer a 10'—see her amazing response! *Entertainment Tonight*. https://www.etonline.com/news/170120_donald_trump_disses_heidi_klum
- Bustillo, X. (2022, June 28). Witness recalls being told Trump grabbed the wheel when he couldn't go to the Capitol. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/2022/06/28/1108301900/witness-recalls-trump-lunging-for-the-wheel-when-told-he-couldnt-go-to-the-capit>
- Cliff, J. (2017). *Fallacious Trump: The Donald J. Trump guide to logical fallacies*. Colchester, UK. Antbear.
- Delkic, M. (2022, May 10). Trump's banishment from Facebook and Twitter: A timeline. *New York Times*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/05/10/technology/trump-social-media-ban-timeline.html>
- Eaton, S. (2022, July 22). Jan. 6 hearing describes President Trump's inaction as rioters called for his vice president to be hanged; ex-White House aide from Ohio quit in disgust. *Cleveland.com*.
<https://www.cleveland.com/news/2022/07/january-6-hearing-describes-president-trumps-inaction-as-rioters-called-for-his-vice-president-to-be-hanged-ex-white-house-aide-from-ohio-quit-in-disgust.html>
- Ferullo, J. (2022, July 3). Wonder Women: Jan. 6 hearings highlighting strong women with courage and integrity. *The Hill*. <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/3545010-wonder-women-jan-6-hearings-highlighting-strong-women-with-courage-and-integrity/>
- Filipovic, J. (2017, December 5.) Our president has always degraded women — and we've always let him. *Time*. <https://time.com/5047771/donald-trump-comments-billy-bush/>
- Freeman v. Giuliani*. 2022 WL 16551323 (D.D.C. October 31, 2022).

- Grynbaum, M. M., & Haberman, M. (2020, October 22). Trump Posts ‘60 Minutes’ interview after telling Lesley Stahl: ‘that’s no way to talk.’ *New York Times*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/22/business/media/trump-pence-lesley-stahl-60-minutes.html>
- Heil, E. (2017, September 25). From Angelina Jolie to Kim K, how Donald Trump rates women in new Howard Stern tapes. *Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/reliable-source/wp/2017/09/25/from-angelina-jolie-to-kim-k-how-donald-trump-rates-women-in-new-howard-stern-tapes/>
- Hinman, L. M. (1982). The case for *ad hominem* arguments. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 60, 338-345.
- Johnson, C. M. (2009). Reconsidering the *ad hominem*. *Philosophy*, 84, 251-266.
- Karni, A., & Haberman, M. (2022, July 23). In Jan. 6 hearings, gender divide has been strong undercurrent. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/23/us/politics/jan-6-hearings-women-witnesses-committee.html>
- Maddaus, G. (2020, October 16). Trump on Savannah Guthrie: I have somebody going totally crazy. *Variety*.
<https://variety.com/2020/politics/news/trump-savannah-guthrie-crazy-nbc-town-hall-1234807920/>
- Mastrangelo, D. (2023, May 10). Trump snaps at CNN’s Kaitlan Collins: ‘You’re a nasty person.’ *The Hill*.
<https://thehill.com/homenews/3998955-trump-snaps-at-cnns-kaitlan-collins-youre-a-nasty-person/>
- Media Matters. (2022, June 29). Newsmax host dismisses Cassidy Hutchinson, saying she testified ‘because of her looks.’ <https://www.mediamatters.org/greg-kelly/newsmax-host-dismisses-cassidy-hutchinson-saying-she-testified-because-her-looks>
- Mehltretter Drury, S. A., & Herbeck, D. A. (2019). Understanding abusive *argumentum ad hominem* through rhetorical context: Donald Trump’s *ad hominem* in the 2016 presidential campaign. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (eds.), *Argumentation in Actual Practice* (pp. 137-155). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mercieca, J. (2020). *Demagogue for president: The rhetorical genius of Donald Trump*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- Miller, L., & Kinsella, M. (2023, July 27). Fact check: Trump’s Georgia call to Raffensperger. Brennan Center for Justice. <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/fact-check-trumps-georgia-call-raffensperger>
- Moi, T. (1999). *What is a woman? and other essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moore, M. (2022, July 4). Trump rips ‘despicable’ Liz Cheney after she suggests Jan. 6 charges for ex-president. *New York Post*. <https://nypost.com/2022/07/04/trump-rips-liz-cheney-after-she-suggests-jan-6-charges/>
- Mueller, J. (2022, November 23). Trump attacks Cheney over WaPo report Jan. 6 panel staff frustration. *The Hill*. <https://thehill.com/homenews/house/3748948-trump-attacks-cheney-over-wapo-report-jan-6-panel-staff-frustration/>
- Palczewski, C. H., & Chase, A. (2021). A nasty and persistent feminist theory of argumentative anger. In D. Hample (ed.), *Local theories of argument* (pp. 25-31). London: Routledge.
- Patteson, C. (2022, July 22). Trump goes on Truth Social rant after Jan. 6 hearing. *New York Post*.
<https://nypost.com/2022/07/22/trump-goes-on-truth-social-rant-after-jan-6-hearing/>
- Prasad, R. (2019, November 29). How Trump talks about women – and does it matter? *BBC News*.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-50563106>
- Press, B. (2022, July 26). Press: Success of Jan. 6 hearings: Three brave GOP women. *The Hill*.
<https://thehill.com/opinion/3573844-press-success-of-jan-6-hearings-three-brave-gop-women/>
- Quealy, K. (2021, January 19). The complete list of Trump’s Twitter insults (2015-2021). *New York Times*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/01/19/upshot/trump-complete-insult-list.html>
- Rescher, N. (1964). *Introduction to logic*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Reuter’s Fact Check. (2022, June 30). Fact Check-Image purporting to show Trump calling Cassidy Hutchinson a ‘total failure’ after Capitol assault hearing is fabricated. *Reuters*.
<https://www.reuters.com/article/factcheck-trumpimage-cassidyhutchinson/fact-check-image-purporting-to-show-trump-calling-cassidy-hutchinson-a-total-failure-after-capitol-assault-hearing-is-fabricated-idUSL1N2YHIQ6>
- Select Committee to Investigate the January 6 Attack on the United States Capitol. (2022). *Final Report of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol*.
<https://www.webharvest.gov/congress/17th/2022/1231143403/january6report.house.gov/>

Boogaart, R., Garssen, B. Jansen, H., Leeuwen, M. van, Pilgram, R. & Reuneker, A. (2024). Proceedings of the Tenth Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation. Sic Sat: Amsterdam.

- Solotaroff, P. (2015, September 9). Trump seriously: On the trail with the GOP's tough guy. *Rolling Stone*. <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/trump-seriously-on-the-trail-with-the-gops-tough-guy-41447/>
- Summers, J. (2020, October 9). Trump calls Harris a 'monster,' reviving a pattern of attacking women of color. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/2020/10/09/921884531/trump-calls-harris-a-monster-reviving-a-pattern-of-attacking-women-of-color>
- van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2015). The history of the argumentum *ad hominem* since the seventh century. In F. H. van Eemeren (ed.), *Reasonableness and effectiveness in argumentative discourse* (pp. 611-620). New York: Springer.
- Zoeller, D. (2020, October 30). From Greta to Gretchen: How Trump has used the office of presidency to attack dozens of women. *The Independent*. <https://www.the-independent.com/news/world/americas/us-politics/trump-attacks-women-hillary-clinton-aoc-greta-thunberg-gretchen-whitmer-b1402098.html>