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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 | 0,5 | 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.  *“And Donald Trump did something the other night that no other presidential nominee has ever done of either party. He refused to say he would respect the results of this election.”*  *“He is threatening our democracy.”*  *“And I do hope you will talk about, you know, the reality versus the demagoguery of what we have seen in this campaign.”* | 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.  *“But both of us, unlike our opponent, do not believe we can do this alone. We believe that we are going to do this by working with all of you.”*  *“Whether you care about new, good jobs with a rising incomes or you care about better education or you care about what we can do to get the cost of prescription drugs down. What ever it is you care about, it is literally going to be on that ballot.”*  *“she believes our economy should work for everyone, not just those at the top.”*  *“People are coming together -- democrats, republicans, independents -- all to reject hate and division.”*  *“That when you focus on helping the middle class, you end up lifting everybody.”*  *“You know, we need to come together around all of the issues that are important to everybody and as I said in the beginning, whatever issue you care about, it's going to be on the ballot. I care a lot about making sure that women and girls are treated with dignity and respect that they deserve in our country.”* |
|  |  | 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 | 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. |
| Evil elite | 0,3 | 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 are going to grow this economy from the middle out and the bottom up, not the top down.”*  *“When you focus on helping the top, you help the top.”*  *“Our members of congress, members of the senate going to be on the side of the rich, the powerful, and the wealthy, or on your side? And you know what? They are going to have to answer that question. Because if they stay beholden to the special interest, if they continue to do the bidding of the lobbyist and lawyers and others who stand outside their doors -- I have been in the senate. I have seen it. I know it. If they are going to continue to do the work of those who are already privileged in America, then I want to make sure that they don't come back to Washington after the next election.”* | 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.”  *“And when we invest in working families, in the middle class, in small businesses, we can make the economy work again for everybody.”*  *“With your help, we will make the biggest investment in new jobs since World War II, jobs in infrastructure. Our roads, our bridges, our tunnels, our ports, our water systems all need help, and those are a lot of good jobs waiting to be done, jobs that can't be exported out of Pennsylvania.”*  *“I believe we can bring advanced manufacturing back to the United States.”*  *“We are also going to fight climate change with clean, renewable energy jobs.”*  *“We are going to start with universal pre-k. We want good schools with good teachers in every zip code so every kid gets a world-class education.”* |
|  |  | 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. En primer lugar, no se reconoce una apelación al pueblo como una entidad virtuosa. Segundo, es posible reconocer la identificación de una elite minoritaria que debe decidir si sigue apoyando a los de arriba o se hace cargo de toda la población. En el discurso predomina una visión pluralista del mundo en la cual todas las opiniones valen y deben ser consideradas en esta elección. No obstante, se observan elementos maniqueos cuando comprende a Trump como una amenaza para la democracia. Finalmente, no se identifica en el discurso una noción de voluntad general del pueblo como fuente de legitimidad política. El discurso enfatiza en algunas propuestas de la candidata tales como, inversión en empleo e infraestructura, promover las energías limpias, reformar la educación, entre otras. Por estas razones el discurso puede ser calificado con una **nota de 0,2.**