

Waldo and digital populisms. A look at the current relationship between media and politics from the analysis of *Waldo's Moment* of the *Black Mirror* series

JULIAN ANDRÉS BURGOS SUÁREZ¹

Article received on March 16, 2019, approved for publication on August 26, 2019

Abstract

The article analyzes the chapter *The Waldo Moment* of the popular British *Netflix Black Mirror* series, under the pretext of critically reviewing the relationship between digital media and public opinion. Through a discourse analysis, guided by the notion of Laclau's empty signifier, aspects of the plot are reviewed that reveal how the current public sphere is emotionally mobilized thanks to the narrative use of irreverent irony and humor, which manage the outrage as behavior symptomatic policy of the current global political moment.

Keywords: Populism; Digital media; Public opinion.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this text is to highlight the consequences of the use of symbols in the field of political communication. For this, the game of appresentative relations will be unraveled (Algarra, 2011) that occurs when a communicative action is carried out whose purpose is the persuasion of others, as is the case with the communicative actions deployed in the electoral campaigns.

For this, the chapter will analyze *The moment of Waldo* of the renowned British series *Black Mirror*. Waldo is a fictional satirical character, classifiable within subspecies of *fake news*, whereby an entire communication strategy that manages to shake up the political scene in a small English town unfolds. Waldo's fictional quality makes it a notable case of an appealing object whose consequences in the construction of the criterion or political reality, can be better explained in light of Lippmann's theory of public opinion. This shows how the

1 Colombian. Social Communicator. Master in Educational Communication and PhD student in Communication at Universidad de Los Andes, Chile. Professor of the School of Social Communication and Journalism of the University of Manizales. Professor and researcher of the Faculty of Humanities, Social and Education of the Catholic University of Pereira. Research areas: Political communication, Cultural studies, Educational communication. Email: julian.burgos@ucp.edu.co

symbolic objects manufactured by the media are efficient in the conduct of opinions, thereby revalidated, Lippmann's premise of the character of the public sphere, which becomes fertile ground for the growth of populisms to Laclau's way.

Waldo's moment is the third chapter of the second season of the famous British science fiction series *Black Mirror*. This is characterized by addressing the issue of the influences of technology in everyday life in an indeterminate human future. Despite this thematic unit, each chapter of the four seasons develops an independent and unitary history in which these influences are exposed in a sometimes apocalyptic and sometimes integrative way (Eco, 1965).

2. *Waldo's moment*

Waldo's moment is the story of a cartoon and digital puppet that went from being a section of burlesque satire of a television show to a candidate for parliament for the Stentonford and Hershams district in England. Waldo begins to arouse political interest when his producers realize that many marginal and young voters feel identified with the frank and burlesque tone of Waldo, who with vulgar and crude language is distilling criticism and ridiculing the other candidates and to the democratic system in general, including some journalists, so that it is reaching such popularity that its producers launch it as a candidate for parliament.

However, its driver, the frustrated comedian Jamie Salter, who first sees success through Waldo, is in a dilemma when he becomes entangled in a relationship with Gwendolyn Harris, the candidate for the labor party, as she finds out that he was actually Waldo, decides to stop seeing him until after the elections. Salter upon learning that, decides to advance in Waldo's political career so that involves confronting Harris. It is so much the political success of Waldo that an agent of an American intelligence agency proposes to the producers, to turn Waldo into a global idol that represents the marginals of the whole world under a message of hope, once the votes pass. To the extent that Waldo's popularity grows, Salter's discontent with what he is doing intensifies, especially after Harris increases him over the true sense of what he was doing behind Waldo. Salter decides to stop being Waldo and end his way of doing politics based on irreverence and mockery; he tries to destroy the mobile screen that carried Waldo throughout the district, but the producers prevent it, put the public against him and make him beaten. Salter badly wounded, sees how his attempt has been useless, as Waldo reaches the second vote of the district, beating Harris, and unlike Liam Monroe, the candidate of the conservatives who finally wins and who has been mocked throughout the campaign. The story concludes when Jamie Salter, turned *homeless*, sees through a giant screen, as Waldo is present throughout the world, carrying a message that invites change and hope. Angry, Salter throws the beer in his hand against the gigantic screen that is embedded in a wall next to the bridge where he lived, when armed police attack him and immobilize him, then the camera makes a tilt up, showing the rest of the city full of Waldo ads.

What looks at the current landscape of political communication and in general, the relations between media and democracy are put into play from the history of Waldo? Even though it is

a fictional story, *Waldo's moment* can show the most central aspects of these relationships, so it will help to locate the communication problem that is presented today at the intersections between politics and the media.

3. Waldo as fake news and the factuality problem

The first thing Waldo teaches is to consider its nature. Waldo is what is considered a kind of fake news. The authors Tandoc, Wei Lim and Ling (2017) after reviewing more than 34 articles published between 2003 and 2017, have defined fake news as information that appropriates to some degree the appearance of real news, hiding under a legitimacy varnish, because it acquires the appearance of credibility by trying to look like real news (2017, p. 11). From there, they developed a typology of *fake news* in which they included satires, news parodies, fabricated news, a certain type of public relations advertising, photo manipulations and propaganda (2017, p. 5). For their definition and typology, they built a categorical framework with which they can identify the news as false, for that they were based on two criteria: factuality and intentionality. By facticity they will understand the degree to which false news is based on facts, and intentionality is understood as the degree to which the author of false news wants to mislead his readers (2017, p. 11), the following table classifies the different types of fake news in these criteria:

Fact Level	Author's Intention	
	High	Low
High	Advertising and public relations Propaganda Photo manipulation	Satires
Low	Fake News	News Parodies

Typology of fake news. Source: Tandoc, E., Wei Lim, Z. & Ling, R. (2017).

As you can see, all types of fake news are not the same in their two components. This allows them to group different communicative products such as fake news, while these present different levels of factuality and intention to deceive the author. It is ruled out that Waldo is a *fake news* of the type propaganda, photo manipulation or public relations advertising, for its obvious presentation as a puppet and digital cartoon that is not usual in this type of *fake news*. Nor can it be considered a fabricated news because it does not imitate any real human being, nor does it appear in any specific simulated event. Waldo could be a satire, or a parody of news, to clarify it, the definitions of these two types are presented.

The *satire news* is understood as simulated news programs that use humor to present current events in relation to broader generally political or economic contexts. They are made mainly in order to criticize and even ridicule an aspect of reality. These are usually

presented as entertainment products that are made by comedians who do not present themselves as journalists, but as imitators of them. They have become one of the most relevant entertainment products for information and entertainment companies, and although they are received in a humorous way, in a strict sense their information is not false, since it alludes to real events, it is about their format about the one that weighs the cataloging of falsehood (2017, pp. 5-6).

The *parodies news* is another type of *fake news* that resemble the satires in its format of humor and the relationship they establish with political contexts and economic of the moment, but they differ in that they do not allude to real events that have happened, but instead take characters or elements of the events to build fictions with which aspects, situations or people of reality are criticized or ridiculed. The effect achieved is a thin line between what may be possible and the absurd, thanks to the fact that it plays with the likelihood of the news (2017, pp. 6-7).

According to the cited table, satires have a high level of facticity, but a low level of induction to deceit; while the news parodies are presented in the opposite way: with low level of facticity, and high level of induction to deceit. This is explained because the communicative product defines its content with respect to its intentionality (Algarra, 2011, p. 70), then if you do not want to mislead with a product, you can think that it aspires to higher levels of feasibility to achieve its purpose. And, on the contrary, if you intend to deceive, you will try to invent more things that are not real.

But if there is no induction to deceit and there are high levels of facticity, why consider them *fake news*? As it was seen in the initial definition of *fake news*, they adopt a varnish of reality with what they are legitimized to influence readers, that is, they are not news that they intend to inform, but to induce the reader in some direction. In the case of satires, the mockery and ridicule contained in the communicative product comes from an opinion, from a subjective appreciation of its creators regarding some real element of the political world, it does not necessarily come from verifiable information, it is a way of opinion concealed in humor, its factuality is compromised. And by that same condition, it is that it intends to induce transformations in the "regimes of truth" of the political sphere, and for that reason its intentionality is recognized (Baym & Jones, 2012, p. 6).

Waldo is a satire-type *fake news* because his intentionality is clear, by clearly mocking he wants to criticize and ridicule the system, and not with arguments or verifiable information, but with burlesque and offensive opinions, such as when he attends the political program with a respectable journalist at which does not hesitate to increase, avoiding the argued dialogue on the subject:

Q: Waldo, as a pet for the partyless, after all, aren't you seriously neutralizing the effective disagreement?

[They bring a message to Salter that says: make fun of his jargon].

W: Can you subtitle me please, Mr. Crane?

Q: By encouraging people not to worry, are you actively dangerous?

W: Dangerous? Do you think you can't trust the public?

P: No.

W: Are you basically calling them idiots?

P: No, I...

W: Useless, then?

[They bring a message to Salter that says: mention the ratings]

Q: Did you come here to argue or...?

W: You are daring for a puppeteer with Phil pretensions. You know you will have the best rating in months thanks to me. To even get close to the numbers that I will get you, you would have to fornicate a telephone on the air, make a good cocktail...

Q: Say something politically relevant...

W: I have something blue and relevant to you silly do you want to see it? [Brooker (director), 2013].

And as for the factuality, the content of his criticisms are the candidates who aspire to represent the district in parliament, in the most extreme case, the electoral and democratic system itself, as Liam Monroe points out in the vehicle scene: "If that thing is my biggest opponent (referring to Waldo) then the whole system looks absurd [...] [coughs] and it might as well be, but he built these streets" (Brooker, 2013). Waldo is thus a satire, as such, he mocks the system, he wants to become the electoral referent of his audience and a large sector of young and marginal voters, but if Waldo is after all a digital puppet that does not really exist what does Waldo represent? Can something that exists, represent much of what exists?

4. Waldo as an appearing object of what?

To understand what Waldo represents, it is necessary to take into account the proposal on a theory of communication by Manuel Martín Algarra (2011), because as a communicative product, its effectiveness evident in history, can be better understood if analyzed from the category of communicative sharing. In this regard, Algarra states that:

What is really shared is not what seems to be shared - the physical element - but what that physical element that is used in sharing represents. Since that is the human way of owning the world, immaterial realities are shared in communication [...]. For communication it is necessary that some physically present objects act as others that are not. This is what Husserl (1985) calls <appresentative relationships> (2011, pp. 75-76).

On these appresentative relationships is that communication takes place, and the political and public level is no exception, although this definition has been deepened by Shutz in a phenomenology of everyday life (Algarra, 2011, p. 76). These relationships can also be applied

to social communications, as it is a constitutive element of communication, regardless of the plane in which it is carried out, since there is no communication without symbolic exchange (2011, p. 75).

Every appresentative relationship is given by four elements: the object itself, the appresentative object, the presented object and the apresentative relationship (Algarra, 2011, pp. 77-78). *The object itself* is what possesses the character of epiphanic, that is, what it really is and can be identified as itself. Within the framework of the *fake news*, the object itself is related to the factuality, and corresponds to the real event that is not transmitted in the false news. *The presenting object* is the vehicle to present something that is not the same, that is, it is the one who brings the object to the scene itself, but which in itself is also an object in itself, only that it can establish a relationship of presentation with another element. *The presented object* is the non-present object that is made present through the appearing object and “[...] is not considered from its appearance, but from its being represented by an appearance other than itself” (2011, p. 78). Of these elements, the appresentative relationships are fundamentally focused on the relationship between the presenting object and the presented object, which can occur according to the degree of fixation (objectification and standardization) and the type of realities that they put in relation (2011, p. 81).

A piece of news can be considered an object in itself that serves as a presenting object of a presented object that can be an event or a character. In that sense, the news as an appearing object resembles a sign, while as a socially accepted and objectified way of representing events, it makes others a reality (Algarra, 2011, p. 82). It could be argued that a story is not a sign, but is made up of other signs. And this is the case on a semiotic or linguistic level, but as an object that is exchanged in the communication, the news has the same characteristics of an appresentative object and a apresentative relationship similar to that of the signs. Consider, for example, the characteristics of the 5W format for making news: it acts as a standardized and objective way to determine the meaning of a communicative product (the news), which sets the objectivity with which it is proposed to represent events (González, 2017). Likewise, the other communicative products that are exchanged have standardized forms of objectification of what has been presented that makes it possible to talk about genres or formats in media communication, for example, chronicles, reports, news, opinion genres, documentaries, etc.

If a piece of news is a presentation object, as stated, it presents an event, an event or what happens to a character. What happens in the apresentative relationship with *fake news*? It happens that the presenting object is taken as the object itself instead of the presented object, but not in a representation operation, but as a replacement. The presenting object takes the place of the presented object and takes away its epiphanic character becoming the object itself that communicates (Algarra, 2011, p. 78). In other words, the apresentador object becomes the reality that should be vehiculized, breaking the regulatory principles of apresentative relationships (Algarra, 2011, pp. 78-80).

Here is an interesting problem that challenges Waldo's narrated universe. Is the digital cartoon a presenting object or a presented object? If the conclusion of the first section is taken, since Waldo is a *fake news* with high rates of factuality, it can be said that he is not inventing

anything about reality, then something real conveys. At various times in history it is said what Waldo represents of a spiritual or immaterial reality, as Algarra calls it (2017, p. 77). In the scene where the general producer and the producer Tams meet Salter on the golf course to convince him of the next step, they mention what they want Waldo to represent:

J: you know everyone is angry at the *status quo* and Waldo gives that a voice

S: Waldo is a bear, a blue bear.

J: Tell Tams.

T: We were asked Consensus is a one-to-one interview with Phil Crane.

S: Pitbull Crane?

J: great for the big ones.

S: Hello? I'm not a politician, right?

J: We know you hate politics.

S: I don't hate her, I'm just not interested in her.

J: You don't need to be interested, you just need to be Waldo.

[Salter retires angrily to his room, but Jack the producer follows him and the following dialogue occurs].

S: Why did he want to do that?

J: look at the world is wrong, and you can do something about it.

S: I don't know what you want.

J: Waldo has the attention of young people and young people don't care about anything just shoes and hacking movies.

S: Do you have any other ideas about young people?

J: Yes, if I have it, look they care about Waldo, they will vote for Waldo.

S: Waldo is not real.

J: Exactly! That is what you said and that caused anger, it is not real, but it is more real than all the others.

S: Nothing matters.

J: Yes, at least he doesn't pretend he cares. Look, we don't need politicians: we all have iphones, computers, right? So whatever decision is made, any policy, we put it online for people to vote, thumb up, thumb down, most win. That is a democracy, a true democracy.

S: Youtube is too, and I don't know if you've seen it, but the most popular video is a dog pedorrhea a Happy Days song.

J: Good, but today is Waldo [Brooker (producer), 2013].

Despite being *fake news*, the factual element that Waldo represents is evident. This dialogue shows that it represents the position of young people prone to digital communication, dissatisfied with the system, who feel disinterested in politics and want a change in those who

represent them. In that sense, Waldo is clearly an object that presents a reality of political dissatisfaction that does not manifest, Waldo has taken that place and represents them.

Here a central problem arises that defies the theory: Waldo is not real. Waldo is a digital puppet of a bear that does not exist. And knowing that a presenting object must be an object in itself, even more within the scope of political communication, then can a non-real presenting object represent a reality? The problem is even more entangled, because as stated above, a *fake news* replaces the reality it wants to represent for itself, and if Waldo is not real, then the case of a non-reality that is self-transmitted as reality is presented, configuring a total unreality, so how something that is not real becomes an unreal reality?

5. Waldo as a stereotype

To solve the question, two new theoretical perspectives must be introduced. The first one has to do with Gerbner's communication model, which will be related in one of its components to Lippmann's theory of stereotypes to solve the problem of Waldo's represented unreality.

Algarra (2011) presents a synthesis of the general Gerbner communication model from which an aspect of its graphic representation will be taken. It is about the concept of perception and production. This can be explained when an event A is perceived by someone (M) as A1. Note that between A and A1 the model already establishes a distance, similar to that which may exist between a presenting object and a presented object. It can be inferred that A and A1 are not equal, since between the two there is a distance caused by the perception of M: A1 is the perception of M over A, it is not A in its pure state. The distance increases when this action of perception is followed by a production action where A is communicated through the EA1 form, so that for a second someone M2 this content or this reality will again be perceived as EA1M2 (Algarra, 2011, pp. 106-107). What has remained of A? Obviously, the representational distance between A and EA1M2 is wide and it is difficult to believe that the initial content is equivalent when it has gone through different processes of perception and production. It could be said that when the presented object has been vehiculized over and over again by different appearing objects, its epiphany cannot be considered immutable, even more so, in accordance with the regulating principles of the appresentative relations indicated by Algarra (2011, p. 78).

This is what happens when an event that is massively communicated by the news, is reproduced by audiences in their own contexts. In the continuous perception-production, the news that in fact is mediated throughout its manufacturing process will again receive an adjustment according to the public's perception and production situation so that its importance, relevance, or urgency will remain adjusted to the expectations of this new communicative instance (Lippmann, 2003 pp. 284-285).

What is fundamental in the Gerbner model described by Algarra is the perception-production continuum, which is responsible for establishing the distances between A and A1. This is where the model connects with one of the perceptual products that Lippmann introduced in

his explanation of how public opinion works. It refers to the concept of stereotype, which is responsible for generating and facilitating perception and production.

Lippmann understands by stereotype different ways learned and inherited from perception that are responsible for reducing the amplitude “of the outside world” to family issues that are relatively easy to understand, so that the process of apprehension of that outside world is thinned (Lippmann, 2003, p. 83). Lippmann uses the term cultural stereotypes to refer to that set of forms and practices of perception that engender that way of looking. It is noteworthy, the perceptual character of the stereotype that works as a set of impressions on the things that make us perceive them in a naturalized way (2003, p. 101).

In their work to reduce the outside world, stereotypes mediate the way things are perceived, so that there is a distance between reality and the perceived. Lippmann says that it will never be possible to know everything about reality, so it is essential to make stereotypes that schematize the multitude of things to know and reality become apprehendable, without it, it would be overwhelming contact with reality (2003, p. 87). But Lippmann goes further. It states that the news is the result of stereotypes in a double sense: on the one hand, of the stereotypes that the journalist possesses and determine a way of looking at reality, and of the need to adjust the newsworthy event to the perceptual stereotypes of the public, so that the news is interesting to them (2003, p. 116). That is why for Lippmann between the reality of social events and the news that speak of them, there is a distance, to the point that Lippmann well says that these can be considered fictions: “When we tell fictions we do not mean lies, but representations of environment that to a greater or lesser degree are the work of individuals” (2003, p. 33).

What is intended with this introduction of the concept of stereotypes in the preceding discussion, is to tackle the problem of the factuality of fake news, the replacement of reality that operate when they function as presentadores objects and thereby solve the paradox of unreality in the Waldo case.

It is remarkable that Lippmann decades before seeing extended these problems of the crisis in the representation to which Waldo alludes, has given clues to understand them, but also to solve them. It begins by presenting the fundamental idea of Lippmann that states that the news is the result of stereotypes; in that sense, as he says, they are not true, and they are rather images that are constructed to be able to understand reality in a synthetic way (2003, p. 103). Its effectiveness does not lie in faithfully representing reality, but in synthesizing it in an apprehensive way, that is, operating the relationship MA1 or EA2M2 of the Gerbern model that in its verbal version is equivalent to step 7: “with a certain *form*” (Algarra, 2011, p. 105). It can be said that said form, that is, said presentador object, the news form, understood as the product resulting from a standardized process of objectivity generation (González, 2017) adds the factuality component to any communicative product to which it is applied, and since it is originally a stereotype, its success in conveying the representation makes it capable of replacing what is represented and taking its place, without evidencing or perceiving the absence of a meaning or a total reality, as is the case with fake news

The following dialogue between Salter, Jake the general producer and a strange American agent demonstrates this:

A: I'll get to the point. I think what you do with Waldo is fascinating.

S: From the agency?

A: Yes, listen. Waldo could be the perfect political figure.

S: Waldo the bear.

A: The bear that people like. The fact that it is a bear is advantageous.

S: Advantageous?

J: Help.

A: Exactly, when you see human politicians, your instinct is: incredible, right? Like porn girls, you know there is something wrong, why would they do it?

J: Childhood traumas...

A: How politicians Waldo skips that. We already know that it is not real, so there are no personal failures.

S: I am a person.

A: In all respect, Waldo is more than you. They are a team, and they are frank about it, that's fantastic, honesty works. Waldo is a construction that people not only accept, but love. At the moment it is anti-political, which is a political position, right? But it could handle any kind of political content without the disadvantages of a human message. In a debate your team could google every word the other says, then make Waldo contradict it with statistics and launch a tweetable sentence immediately. He is the perfect killer.

S: But we will not win.

A: [laughing] you are very British. It is not clear that they will not win. They started too late, what they offer has no solid foundation and all the nihilism of democracia democracy stinks', yes, it's very crazy; but with a message, concrete, hopeful, that, of course we can create, energize the partyless, without scaring the centrals through a new platform. You have a global product of political entertainment that people really want. You can do this worldwide.

S: How Pringles.

A: Totally.

J: It's something interesting, yes.

A: When they finish with Stentonford there may be an opportunity in South America. [In Spanish] Can you speak Spanish?

J: [in Spanish] I lived in Madrid for three years.

A: [in Spanish] excellent [Brooker (producer), 2013].

In this dialogue, the mysterious American agent declares what has been woven so far. Waldo represents a real nonconformity, but being a kind of fake news, he replaces what he

represents for himself, this makes him successfully drag a multitude of nonconformities that find in him, the symbolic realization of his nonconformities. But from that same success arises his paradox. Since Waldo is not real, and put himself in the place of what is represented, he turns the political nonconformity of young people into a complete unreality that ends up being unrealizable. On this issue, the conclusion of this text will be developed.

6. Waldo as empty signifier

The climax of the story comes when Jamie Salter renounces to be Waldo, leaves the van and tries to tell people that he is Waldo, that Waldo does not exist, that they do not vote for him, that he will not do anything, nor change anything. But his rebellion is in vain, people prefer to laugh, and for 500 pounds, someone hits him before he destroys the truck. Then, wounded in a hospital bed, sees Waldo take the second largest vote in the district, Monroe wins the election but not before receiving a shoe from a dissatisfied Waldo.

Waldo has won, and Salter has lost. The prophecies of the strange American agent are fulfilled, and Waldo is a global phenomenon, while Salter ends up in the street.

With Monroe elected, there is evidence of the unreality that Waldo led to the nonconformity of the young and marginalized, while Waldo has become a real global political phenomenon that mobilizes unrealities.

Waldo is a synthetic and limited exemplification of what Laclau calls an empty signifier. It is enough to understand the message it represents and give the precise explanations of how certain species of fake news such as to which Waldo belongs, despite not being real, have the ability to mobilize public opinion in the same sense that Lippmann attributed to the real news the ability to lead opinions in a democratic context in which the media are essential.

If Laclau is interpreted well, an empty signifier is essential for the formation of popular identities. In the first place, because it acts as an umbrella that can house a chain of equivalent social demands, in a hegemonic formation that collects and gives identity to these demands, making it a totality (2005, p. 209). The important thing about this for the purposes of this work, is that these identities are formed discursively by creating a semantic field that at the same time that can agglutinate the differences, gives them a certain unity. This is made possible by the construction of an empty signifier, in this regard, the Argentine philosopher states:

When we speak of <empty signifiers> we mean something entirely different: that there is a point within the system of meaning that is constitutively irre-presentable, that in that sense remains empty, but it is a vacuum that can be meaning because it is a void within the meaning (2005, p. 136).

That irrepresentable point is for Laclau that which is not yet articulated and that he hopes to be meaning or named. Only until it is articulated discursively and named, does it begin

to be an effective representation that manages identities. This recognizes the dilemma that Waldo represents as *fake news*, which replaces with himself what he wants to represent, that is, it is placed as meaning occupying that empty place. Only in this way is it able to drag the opinions of the dissatisfied who find in it the symbolic form, the semantic field that defines them.

Its function is therefore symbolic, is to represent, not define, not be real. That is why his ambiguity is the best way to provoke the joints, as the strange American agent expressed when he said of Waldo that it was a lethal weapon that can occupy any political message, because the important thing is not the message, the important thing is that Waldo has in the form of a message, that is enough to unrealize realities that have not been summoned, in the words of Laclau, that have not been placed in an equivalence relationship. It is without a doubt a policy of the formal in the sense in which it was explained when Gerbner began to talk with Lippmann to account for the success of the *fake news*: it is a signifier that has taken the place of meaning, replacing it and taking it as such.

Finally, Laclau makes ascending the reflections set forth here in a clarifying way when he says: "Identification with an empty signifier is the *sine-non condition* of the emergence of a people. But the empty signifier can operate as an identification point only because it represents an equivalent chain" (2005, p. 204). This explains the problem of Waldo's representation. Waldo does not need to represent something existing or precedent, in terms of Laclau, especially if it is a popular identity. Waldo is the identity itself, the very meaning of what it represents, which is the unreal. That is why it does not make sense, it has no content, it is an empty signifier that has been proposed as an empty meaning that is proposed to complete, hence it is a lethal weapon applicable in any context.

For that reason, the cartoon becomes digital populism. Waldo gives voice to the dissatisfied and with that, according to Laclau, an identity sufficient to agglutinate them, that way they feel represented. But since Waldo is a void with which another void is filled, the hegemonic representation that it reaches does not end up being the victory of a symbolically interpreted people, but the cartoon that immobilizes and unrealizes the demands of some non-conforming groups that end up on the street, As Jamie Salter ended, meanwhile, *the form* of his allegation becomes everything they always wanted to change: Waldo has been Waldo, in the end he has even made fun of his followers.

References

- Algarra, M. (2011). *Teoría de la comunicación una propuesta*. Madrid: Grupo Editorial Tecnos.
- Baym, G. & Jones, J. (2012). News parody un global perspective. Politics, power and resistance. *Popular Communications*, 10, 2-13. DOI: 10.1080/15405702.2012.638566.
- Eco, U. (2004). *Apocalípticos e integrados*. Barcelona: España: Ediciones Debolsillo.
- González, M. (2017). Objetividad no es neutralidad: la norma objetiva como método periodístico. *Estudios del mensaje periodístico* 23 (2), 829-846. Disponible en: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5209/ESMP.58018>
- Laclau, E. (2005). *La razón populista*. México: Fondo de cultura económica.
- Lippmann, W. (2003). *La Opinión Pública*. Madrid: Editorial C. de Langre.
- Tandoc, E., Wei Lim, Z. & Ling, R. (2017). Defining, "Fake news". *Digital Journalism*. Disponible en DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2017.1360143

Filmography

- Slader, D. (Dir.). (2018). *Black Mirror* [serie de televisión] {Cinta cinematográfica}. Londres: Zeppotron.