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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 | 1,5 | 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.  *“We have sent a message that will echo from Wall Street to Washington, from Maine to California, and that is that the government of our great country belongs to all of the people and not just a handful of wealthy campaign contributors, and their Super PACs.”*  *“And, when the top one-tenth of 1% now owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90%, that's not fair. It is not fair when the 20 wealthiest people in this country now own more wealth than the bottom half of the American people.”* | 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 | 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.  *“We should not be paying by far the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs at a time -- listen to this, when the top three drug companies in this country made $45 billion dollars in profit last year. That is an obscenity, and let me tell you something. When we make it to the White House, the pharmaceutical industry will not continue to rip-off the American people.”*  *“We will all come together to say loudly, and clearly that the government of our great nation belongs to all of us, not just a few wealthy campaign contributors. That is what this campaign is about, that is what the political revolution is about.”* | 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 | 1,8 | 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.  *“Tonight, we served notice to the political and economic establishment of this country that the American people will not continue to accept a corrupt campaign finance system that is undermining American democracy, and we will not accept a rigged economy in which ordinary Americans work longer hours for lower wages, while almost all new income and wealth goes to the top 1%.”*  *“No, we will not allow huge tax breaks for billionaires, we will not allow packed -- huge cuts to social security, veterans needs, Medicare, MedicAid, and education. No, we will not allow back into the White House a political party which is so beholden to the fossil fuel industry that they cannot even acknowledge the scientific reality of climate change”*  *“My friends, we must tell the billionaire class and the 1% that they cannot have it all at a time of massive wealth and income inequality, the wealthiest people and largest corporations in this country will start their paying their fair share of taxes.”* | 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.  *“So, are you guys ready for a radical idea? Together we are going to create an economy that works for all of us, not just the 1%. And, when millions of our people are working for starvation wages, yep, we're going to raise the minimum wage to $15 bucks an hour. And, we are going to bring pay equity for women. And, when we need the best educated workforce in the world, yes, we are going to make public colleges and universities tuition free. And, for the millions of Americans struggling with horrendous levels of student debt, we are going to substantially ease that burden.”*  *“It is a political revolution that will bring tens of millions of our people together. It will bring together working people who have given up on the political process. It will bring together young people who have never participated in the political process. It will bring together blacks, and whites, latinos, Asian-Americans, Native Americans, straight and gay, male and female. People who were born in America, and people who immigrated here.”* | 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 (just a few sentences):**

El discurso presenta todos los elementos necesarios para ser considerado como populista. En primer lugar, se reconoce una apelación al pueblo entendido de manera inclusiva, considerando a los sectores excluidos de la sociedad norteamericana. Segundo, se identifica a una elite minoritaria que atenta contra los intereses del pueblo, representada por los de arriba, el establishment político, económico y mediático, el 1% y la clase billonaria. A partir de la identificación de ambos grupos, se reconoce una visión maniquea del mundo donde la elite es corrupta y engaña al pueblo (negando el cambio climático), mientras que el pueblo una entidad virtuosa. Finalmente, es posible identificar la noción de la voluntad general del pueblo y soberanía popular como fuente de legitimidad política, la cual puede imponerse y cambiar la situación de crisis que vive EEUU. Además, el candidato propone la necesidad de generar una revolución política que cambie de manera radical a la sociedad norteamericana.

No obstante de estos tres elementos, la falta de un lenguaje demasiado belicoso y la defensa de la democracia permite calificar el discurso con una **nota de 1,6.**