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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. | 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.  We would be unfaithful to ourselves and our posterity, if we did not rise in the majesty of our strength, and show the world that the dearest rights of freemen are not lightly to be trifled with.  It was so with our fathers; they fought not against the amount of taxes but against the principle of taxation. So long as this glorious spirit maintains its ascendency in the bosoms of our children, so long we shall be free. | 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.  Fellow-citizens, it is time that we awake and buckle on our armour;  In one section of the country we must meet Mr. Adams and his influence; in another, Mr. Clay and his patronage. They make common cause against us; while all those who fatten on their bounty, and whose fortunes are dependent on their continuance in office, join in the cry and clamour against us as the *rabble of the country*.  In violation of the popular will, Mr. Adams was made president, and General Jackson excluded.  Though ignorant, let us prove to the world that we have sufficient intelligence to discern our rights, and energy enough to defend them.    And why is it that such desperate efforts are made to tarnish the fame of General Jackson? It is because he is sustained by the people. | 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.  Mr. Adams was elected… without the assent of a majority of the people, in violations of the spirit of the constitution.  The encroachments of power are always artful and insidious; and oft-times conceal themselves among the sanctions of forms. | 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.  This line of cabinet succession...we have reason to be alarmed. | 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: (pg 10-12 are particularly strong)

There are some very strong populist elements in this piece of campaign literature. It leans strongly on the perception of the “corrupt bargain” that resulted in John Quincy Adams having won the presidency, despite lacking a majority or plurality of the votes. The evil, conspiring elite are politicians in Washington who work with Adams, Clay and their cronies to undermine the will of the people. The people are the common, hard-working folk. They have chosen Jackson, but have been undermined once already. Warlike, bellicose language is used (though the change will happen through elections) and cosmic significance is reiterated--this is a moment to defend the principles of our fathers, for the benefit of posterity. Adams is elite, educated in Europe, a statesman, unreliable. Jackson, meanwhile, is “*an American, and nothing but an American*!” He is one with the people, because they have selected him based on intrinsic merit alone, not because of friends in high places (pg 15). He was not a career politician, but had to be “induced” to return to public office after retiring. Everything about Mr. Adams is wrong and elitist and subversive, while everything that Jackson represents, like liberty and the common man, is good; there is a strong Manichaean tone. This speech is very populist, and earns a score of 2.