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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 |  | 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.      Let virtuous principle and national gratitude have its proper and legitimate effect upon our minds, and I would ask, where is the man to be found who would stand in competition with the hero of Orleans?    Without these strong measures, New Orleans could not have been defended. | 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.  Under Washington, our independence was achieved. Under Jackson, our independence has been preserved.  Can those of us then, my fellow-citizens, who believe in an overruling Providence, be charged with presumption in supporting to the Presidency, him whom Heaven has chosen as the humble but signal instrument of our preservation. | 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 |  | 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.    ...fix on us an aristocracy, which may swallow up the most sacred and important rights of the people, which the Constitution evidently intended to secure  “Like the towering oak in the surrounding forest, he could be desired at a distance, and the people, faithful to themselves, would elect a man endeared to them by his services and paramount qualifications.  His correspondence with Mr. Monroe, shew that he possesses sound and statesmanlike views of our national interests, and the administration already owes him much.  While he shall fight our battles, we will sleep securely.  Unless the people rise in their majesty, and interpose their constitutional prerogrative of judging, they may in time lose the power altogether. | 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 |  | 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.  The practice of taking the President from the heads of departments should be discouraged, because it has the tendency to encourage the arts of intrigue and corruption and to fix on us an aristocracy  Has it become a crime to express our indignation against the enemies of our country, although secret and insidious foes lurking within its bowels?  Pg 6, Crawford and Clay cast aspersions on Jackson’s character and cry “crucify him! Crucify him!” because they knew he had too fast a hold on the affections of his country  The making a president by Congress at Washington, who are carressed and flattered by the candidates, has an ill-boding prospect. It will lead tocorruption and aristrocracy, in which the rights of the people will be swallowed up. | 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 friends of Mr. Crawford see nothing improper in his loaning out of one or two hundred thousand dollars of the people’s money, for his own benefit and that of the banks | 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: This piece of campaign literature, given at a convention for Jackson, naturally focuses on extolling Jackson’s virtues and fitness for the office of president. It sets him apart from the conspiring, patronage-loving legislators currently in office--Jackson is outside of the establishment. The evil elite is the politicians who appoint each other and their friends to favorite offices, and misappropriate government funds at the expense of the people. Jackson, on the other hand, has only ever acted wisely and with the interests of the people at heart. As a general, he fought for them. And as candidate for president, he is not campaigning through corrupt, insidious means like through a party caucus in D.C. or selection by sitting congressmen who are friends. He is a true man of the people, while Clay, Crawford and cronies only desire to subvert the will of the people for their own ends. There is only one way to see these issues, so it’s very Manichaean. Jackson is another Washington, invoking redemptive, cosmic principles. Ultimately, I would give this speech a 1.7, so it earns the score of a 2.