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2 A speech in this category is extremely populist and comes very close to the ideal populist discourse. Specifically, the speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal populist discourse, and has few elements that would be considered non-populist.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Score here (0, 1,2)** | **Populist** | **Pluralist** |
| Manichaean vision | 0.9 (1) | It conveys a Manichaean vision of the world, that is, one that is moral (every issue has a strong moral dimension) and dualistic (everything is in one category or the other, “right” or “wrong,” “good” or “evil”) The implication—or even the stated idea—is that there can be nothing in between, no fence-sitting, no shades of grey. This leads to the use of highly charged, even bellicose language. | The discourse does not frame issues in moral terms or paint them in black-and-white. Instead, there is a strong tendency to focus on **narrow, particular issues**. The discourse will emphasize or at least not eliminate the possibility of natural, justifiable differences of opinion. |
|  |  | The moral significance of the items mentioned in the speech is heightened by ascribing **cosmic proportions** to them, that is, by claiming that they affect people everywhere (possibly but not necessarily across the world) and across time. Especially in this last regard, frequent references may be made to a reified notion of “history.” At the same time, the speaker will justify the moral significance of his or her ideas by tying them to **national and religious leaders** that are generally revered.  *the Constitution framed by the sages and patriots of the Revolution*  *the Father of his Country*  *George Washington*  *the most sanguine hopes of the founders of the Republic*  *May He who holds in His hands the destinies of nations make you worthy of the favors He has bestowed* | The discourse will probably not refer to any reified notion of history or use any cosmic proportions. References to the spatial and temporal consequences of issues will be limited to the material reality rather than any mystical connections. |
| Populist notion of the people | 1.9 (2) | Although Manichaean, the discourse is still democratic, in the sense that the good is embodied in the will of the majority, which is seen as a unified whole, perhaps but not necessarily expressed in references to the “voluntad del pueblo”; however, the speaker ascribes a kind of unchanging essentialism to that will, rather than letting it be whatever 50 percent of the people want at any particular moment. Thus, this good majority is romanticized, with some notion of the common man (urban or rural) seen as the embodiment of the national ideal.    *the liberties of the people*  *Never for a moment believe that the great body of the citizens of any State or States can deliberately intend to do wrong.*  *the pockets of the people – from the farmer, the mechanic, and the laboring classes of society*  *this respectable portion of our citizens are so proudly distinguished from the laboring classes of all other nations by their independent spirit, their love of liberty, their intelligence, and their high tone of moral character*  *The agricultural, the mechanical, and the laboring classes have little or no share in the direction of the great moneyed corporations*  *these classes of society form the great body of the people of the United States; they are the bone and sinew of the country – men who love liberty and desire nothing but equal rights and equal laws*  *see that the wishes of the people are carried into faithful execution*  *while the people remain, as I trust they ever will, uncorrupted and incorruptible* | Democracy is simply the calculation of votes. This should be respected and is seen as the foundation of legitimate government, but it is not meant to be an exercise in arriving at a preexisting, knowable “will.” The majority shifts and changes across issues. The common man is not romanticized, and the notion of citizenship is broad and legalistic. |
| Evil elite | 1.3 (1) | The evil is embodied in a minority—more specifically, an elite—whose specific identity will vary according to context. Domestically, in Latin America it is often an economic elite, perhaps the “oligarchy,” but it may also be a racial elite; internationally, it may be the United States or the capitalist, industrialized nations or international financiers or simply an ideology such as neoliberalism and capitalism.  *Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed*  *Congress has no right under the Constitution to take money from the people unless it is required to execute some one of the specific powers intrusted to the Government*  *leading State politicians who have friends to favor and political partisans to gratify?*  *Some of the evils which arise from this system of paper press with peculiar hardship upon the class of society least able to bear it.*  *Recent events have proved that the paper-money system of this country may be used as an engine to undermine your free institutions, and that those who desire to engross all power in the hands of the few and to govern by corruption or force are aware of its power and prepared to employ it.*  *It is one of the serious evils of our present system of banking that it enables one class of society – and that by no means a numerous one – by its control over the currency, to act injuriously upon the interests of all the others and to exercise more than its just proportion of influence in political affairs.*  *incessant efforts made daily to encroach upon them* | The discourse avoids a conspiratorial tone and does not single out any evil ruling minority. It avoids labeling opponents as evil and may not even mention them in an effort to maintain a positive tone and keep passions low. |
|  |  | Crucially, the evil minority is or was recently in charge and subverted the system to its own interests, against those of the good majority or the people. Thus, systemic change is/was required, often expressed in terms such as “revolution” or “liberation” of the people from their “immiseration” or bondage, even if technically it comes about through elections.  *These views alone of the paper currency are sufficieint to call for immediate reform* | The discourse does not argue for systemic change but, as mentioned above, focuses on particular issues. In the words of Laclau, it is a politics of “differences” rather than “hegemony.” |
|  |  | Because of the moral baseness of the threatening minority, non-democratic means may be openly justified or at least the minority’s continued enjoyment of these will be seen as a generous concession by the people; the speech itself may exaggerate or abuse data to make this point, and the language will show a bellicosity towards the opposition that is incendiary and condescending, lacking the decorum that one shows a worthy opponent. | Formal rights and liberties are openly respected, and the opposition is treated with courtesy and as a legitimate political actor. The discourse will not encourage or justify illegal, violent actions. There will be great respect for institutions and the rule of law. If data is abused, it is either an innocent mistake or an embarrassing breach of democratic standards. |

Though there are other subjects mentioned, the most bellicose and clearly populist is his diatribe against the paper-money system. There is a clear belief in a pure and “uncorrupted and incorruptible” people who are held back by the malicious actions of those who wish to control the system – a corrupted aristocracy.