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0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaean worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Score here (0, 1,2)** | **Populist** | **Pluralist** |
| Manichaean vision | .4 | 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.  Mr. Adams, it is said, is friendly to the regulation of the tariff of duties, with a view to the encouragement of American manufactures... |
|  |  | 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.  That mercy and humanity may unite with the offended law and constitution, in accusing General Jackson of being unmindful of their voice, will be acknowledged by impartial posterity. 19 | 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.  Thus far, we have endeavored to correct error and disarm prejudice, that reason might be left free, to estimate fairly, the present Administration and its principal measures. |
| Populist notion of the people | 0 | 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. | 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.  The good should disdain...those prejudices and passions [of the people]. Pp 12  The public mind has been prejudiced and inflamed. 14 |
| Evil elite | .4 | 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.  We must, in a most solemn manner, protest against a claim to civil rule, founded exclusively upon military renown.  Nothing has occurred in the history of our country, so much calculated to shake our confidence in the capacity of the people for self-government as the efforts, which have been made, to elevate to the first office in the nation, the man who, trampling the laws and constitution of his country, sacrificing the liberties and lives of men, has made his own arbitrary will the rule of conduct. p17 | 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. | 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. |

Overall Comments: <https://archive.org/stream/proceedingsofant00nati#page/12/mode/2up>

This is a speech given at an Anti-Jackson convention, in opposition to the election of Andrew Jackson and in support of retaining the incumbent John Quincy Adams. There were some redemptive elements that stressed the importance of this election for the future of the country, preventing it from being turned into a military dictatorship or monarchy if Jackson were elected. However, it was not very Manichaean. Though it emphasized the evil and imprudence of electing Jackson, this was measured against the only somewhat tolerable, more reasonable election of Adams; Adams’ virtues were mostly measured as the inverse against Jackson’s faults. Much of the speech was spent in defense of the Adams’ administration decisions. There was absolutely no populist notion of the people, because the speech questioned the will of the people several times, consistently doubting the judgement of the masses who could be fooled into thinking that Jackson was possibly a better candidate than Adams. The notion of an evil elite is also low; it vilifies Jackson, specifically as a candidate, but does not connect him to a broader conspiracy of elites trying to take over the government. It does mention his military power and influence, but doesn’t hint that other military leaders would be involved, only that Jackson would be a despot. This speech thus earns a very low populism score of 0.