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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 | 0,6 | 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.  *“This is no ordinary election. 2016 is not just a choice between two political parties. 2016 is a referendum. It is a referendum on our identity as a nation and as a people. In America, there are only two ways for us now. We can be either greater than we’ve ever been or we can be a great nation in decline. If Bernie Sanders or Hillary Clinton get elected, if they were to win, we will be a great nation in decline.”* | 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.  *“But tonight — tonight — here in Iowa, the people of this great state sent a very clear message. After seven years of Barack Obama, we are not waiting any longer to take our country back. This is not a time for waiting for everything that makes this nation great now hangs in the balance.”*  *“Now the moment has arrived for this generation of Americans to rise up to the calling of our heritage. Now the time has come for us to take our place and do what we must.”*  *“If I am our nominee — and I will be our nominee thanks to what you have done here in this great state — when I am our nominee, we are going to unify this party and we are going to unify the conservative movement. When I’m our nominee, we are going to grow the conservative movement. We are going to take our message to the people who are struggling paycheck to paycheck, to the students living under the burden of student loans, to the families struggling to raise their children with the right values.”* | 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 | 0,6 | 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.  *“Hillary Clinton is disqualified from being the president of the United States because she stored classified and sensitive information on her email server because she thinks she’s above the law. And Hillary Clinton can never be commander-in-chief because anyone who lies to the families of the people who have lost their lives in the service of this country can never be commander-in-chief of the United States.”* | 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.”  *“This is the time for a president who will defend our Second Amendment rights, not a president who undermines them. This is a time for a president that will rebuild the U.S. military because the world is a safer and better place when the United States has the most powerful military in the world.”* |
|  |  | 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.  *“This is a time where we need a president that will truly preserve and protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, not one that undermines, attacks, and ignores the Constitution of the United States.”* |

**Overall Comments (just a few sentences):**

El discurso no presenta los elementos necesarios para ser considerado como populista. En primer lugar, se reconoce cierta apelación a un pueblo el cual es entendido en cuanto nación. Además, se reconoce la apelación a sujetos políticos como el movimiento conservador, los estudiantes y las familias. Segundo, no se reconoce la identificación de ninguna elite o grupo minoritario que represente el mal. Sin embargo, se identifica una visión maniquea del mundo (entre ellos y nosotros), a partir de la crítica que hace Rubio a Hillary Clinton, Bernie Sanders y la administración Obama. En tercer lugar, se reconoce cierta noción de la voluntad general del pueblo como fuente de legitimidad política, a partir de la necesidad e importancia de recuperar los valores conservadores y el país de la administración Obama. El discurso no está centrado en un cambio radical, sino en ciertos temas específicos como la defensa de la segunda enmienda y fortalecer a los militares. Por estas razones, el discurso puede ser calificado con **una nota de 0,4**.