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1 A speech in this category includes strong, clearly populist elements but either does not use them consistently or tempers them by including non-populist elements. Thus, the discourse may have a romanticized notion of the people and the idea of a unified popular will (indeed, it must in order to be considered populist), but it avoids bellicose language or references to cosmic proportions or any particular enemy.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Score here (0, 1,2)** | **Populist** | **Pluralist** |
| Manichaean vision | 1,0 | 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.  *“And tonight despite millions and millions of dollars of false and nasty attacks, despite the entirety of the political establishment coming together against us…”*  *“And Justice Scalia's replacement will not be decided by the Washington power brokers. It will be decided by we the people. This election will be a referendum on the Supreme Court.”*  *“As president, I will rebuild our military, stand unequivocally with the nation of Israel, and utterly destroy ISIS.”* | 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 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 | 0,5 | 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.  *“Indeed, the screaming you hear now from across the Potomac is the Washington cartel in full terror that the conservative grassroots are rising up.”* | 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 | 1,0 | 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.  *“And tonight despite millions and millions of dollars of false and nasty attacks, despite the entirety of the political establishment coming together against us, South Carolina has given us another remarkable result.”*  *“I cannot wait to stand on that debate stage with Hillary Clinton or Bernie Sanders or whatever other socialist they nominate and make the case against their radical vision of the Constitution that would strip away life and marriage and religious liberty and the Second Amendment and the basic rights of every American citizen.”* | 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.”  *“There is only one candidate who has led the fight against amnesty, who has led the fight against Obamacare, who has led the fight to defend life and marriage and religious liberty, who has led the fight to protect our right to keep and bear arms under the Second Amendment, who will fight to pass a simple flat tax and abolish the IRS.”* |
|  |  | 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 (just a few sentences):**

El discurso no presenta los elementos necesarios para ser considerado como populista, no obstante, posee ciertas características que lo acercan a la calificación 1. En primer lugar, se reconoce la apelación al pueblo americano, en particular el pueblo de Carolina del Sur. Además, apela a los conservadores en cuanto sujeto político. Segundo, se reconoce la identificación de grupos minoritarios tales como el “Washington cartel”, “Washington power brokers” y el “political establishment”, los cuales atentan contra la candidatura. De esta forma, se reconoce una visión maniquea del mundo entre ellos (establishment) y nosotros (el pueblo o la candidatura) a nivel local y entre amigos (Israel) y enemigos (ISIS) a nivel internacional. Tercero, se identifica cierta noción de voluntad general del pueblo y los valores conservadores para que EEUU pueda levantarse.

Además, el discurso muestra un lenguaje de un tono belicoso hacia a las candidaturas demócratas de Clinton y Sanders, como también a la candidatura de Donald Trump. De esta forma es posible reconocer elementos “populistas” en el discurso, por lo que puede ser calificado con una **nota general de 0,8**.