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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 | 0,5 | 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 are going to start winning because our country doesn't win anymore. Doesn't win. We don't win with the military. We can't beat ISIS. We have great military but we can't beat ISIS. We don't win on trade. You look at what China's doing to us, what Japan does to us, what Mexico is just killing us at the border -- at the border and with trade. Mexico is killing us absolutely. We'll do the wall.”*  *“We're going to build our military so big, so good, so strong, so powerful that nobody is ever going to mess with us, folks.”* | 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 | 0,8 | 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 have people -- the only thing that stops the crowds are the walls because we can't get them in. We have to send thousands of people away. Time Magazine -- Time Magazine last week did an incredible cover story. They said it's a movement, and that's what it is. It's an incredible movement with incredible people -- incredible people. It's an incredible movement with incredible people, I tell you.”*  *“And the last two weeks because I've gotten to see so many, I guess, millions when you add them all up with all of these rooms and all of these speeches and I've met so many people. But the people are so incredible that I've been saying make America great again and it's going to be greater than ever before. That's the kind of potential that we have -- greater than ever before.”* | 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 | 1,5 | 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 I love Mexico. I love Mexico. I love China. I love many of these countries that rip us off because we have leaders that are incompetent and don't know what they're doing.”*  *“We're not buying equipment that sells because they have political people, because they take campaign and they give campaign contributions. We are going to get the equipment that they want, not the equipment that they're told to have by senators and congressmen in Washington.”* | 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.”  *“The people in this community -- every time I see them, they want education locally. The parents, the teachers, they want to do it. They don't want bureaucrats telling them how to educate their children. We spend as a nation more for education per pupil than any other nation in the world.”*  *“We are going to build our military, which I thank, because a number of the people came down and a number of the pundits watching tonight -- we love our military. We love our military. And by the way, we love our police. Our police are terrific. We love our police. They are not being treated properly.”* |
|  |  | 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 algunos elementos lo acercan a la nota 1. En primer lugar se reconoce la apelación al pueblo americano, pero este no está claramente definido y no es central en el discurso. Segundo, se reconoce de manera clara la identificación de una elite representada por los políticos y líderes tradicionales. Éstos son criticado y considerados como incompetentes que deben favores políticos. Adicionalmente, se reconoce un lenguaje belicoso en relación a los enemigos externos de EEUU (China, Japón, México e ISIS), aclarando que va a potenciar militarmente a EEUU. En tercer lugar, se reconoce cierta noción de voluntad general como fuente de legitimidad política. Esta noción, se reconoce en la identificación de la candidatura como parte de un movimiento que reúne al pueblo (la gente) para volver a América grande de nuevo.

Finalmente, no se reconoce una noción de cambio radical, sino la identificación de temas específicos como la educación y la seguridad. A partir de los elementos anteriores es posible clasificar el discurso con una **nota de 0,9**.