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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 | 0,4 | 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.  *“Trump would roll back the tough rules that we have imposed on the Financial Industry. I’ll do the opposite – I think we should strengthen those rules so that Wall Street can never wreck Main Street again.”*  *“If you believe that he’s as wealthy as he says, that alone would save the Trump family $4 billion. It would do nothing for 99.8 percent of Americans. So they’d get a $4 billion tax cut, and 99.8 percent of Americans get nothing.”*  *“The bottom line is this: I’m running for President to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top. And based on what we know from the Trump campaign, he wants America to work for him and his friends, at the expense of everyone else.”* | 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.  *“Let’s also expand incentives like the New Markets Tax Credit that can bring business, government, and communities together to create good jobs in places that have been left out or left behind.”*  *“My mission in the White House will be to make our economy work for everyone, not just those at the top.”*  *“So we’re going to make full use of the White House’s power to convene. We’re going to get everyone at the table – not just Republicans and Democrats, but businesses and labor unions, academics and experts, but, most importantly, Americans, like all of you.”* |
|  |  | 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 | 1 | 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.  *“But there are common-sense things that your government could do that would give Americans more opportunities to succeed. Why don’t we do it? Because powerful special interests and the tendency to put ideology ahead of political progress have led to gridlock in Congress*.”  *“And Wall Street, corporations, and the super-rich, should finally pay their fair share of taxes. That’s why I support the so-called ‘Buffett Rule,’ because multi-millionaires should not be able to pay a lower tax rate than their secretaries.”*  *“And then there is Trump’s tax plan. He would give trillions in tax cuts to big corporations, millionaires, and Wall Street money managers. That would explode our national debt and eventually lead to massive cuts in priorities like education, healthcare, and environmental protection.”*  *“His plan was panned from the left, the right, the center – because it transparently is designed for rich people like him.”* | 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, it’s crucial that every American have access to the education and skills they need to get the jobs of the future.*  *So we will fight to make college tuition-free for the middle class and debt-free for everyone.”*  *“We will put Americans to work building and modernizing our roads, our bridges, our tunnels, our railways, our ports, our airports.”*  *“let’s connect every household in America to broadband by the year 2020.”* |
|  |  | 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, se reconoce una apelación al pueblo americano, no obstante, éste no es central en el discurso. Segundo, se reconoce la identificación de una elite representada por las grandes corporaciones, Wall Street, los millonarios y principalmente la figura de Trump como miembro de este grupo minoritario. A pesar de que el discurso muestra algunas dicotomías y a veces una visión maniquea, predomina una visión pluralista del mundo ya que se buscan construir acuerdos con todos los americanos. Finalmente, no se identifica una noción de voluntad general del pueblo como fuente de legitimidad política que permita modificar el status quo. Más bien existe una idea de que todos los americanos se unan e impidan que Trump sea presidente. Además, el discurso está centrado en políticas específicas como la creación de empleo, educación gratuita y la mejora de infraestructura. Por estas razones el discurso puede ser calificado con una **nota de 0,4.**