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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 | 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.  *“Because it’s not just the political system that’s rigged. It’s the whole economy.*  *It’s rigged by big donors who want to keep down wages.*  *It’s rigged by big businesses who want to leave our country, fire our workers, and sell their products back into the U.S. with absolutely no consequences for them.*  *It’s rigged by bureaucrats who are trapping kids in failing schools.*  *It’s rigged against you, the American people.”*  *“I am running for President to end the unfairness and to put you, the American worker, first.*  *We are going to put America First, and we are going to Make America Great again.*  *This election will decide whether we are ruled by the people, or by the politicians.”*  *“The choice in this election is a choice between taking our government back from the special interests, or surrendering our last scrap of independence to their total and complete control.”*  *“Come November, the American people will have a chance to issue a verdict on the politicians that have sacrificed their security, betrayed their prosperity, and sold out their country.”*  *“No Secretary of State has been more wrong, more often, and in more places than Hillary Clinton.*  *Her decisions spread death, destruction and terrorism everywhere she touched.”* | 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.  *“Americans are the people that tamed the West, that dug out the Panama Canal, that sent satellites across the solar system, that built the great dams, and so much more.”* | 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 need to reform our economic system so that, once again, we can all succeed together, and America can become rich again.”*  *“But this latest Clinton cover-up doesn’t change anything: if she is elected president, she will adopt the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and we will lose millions of jobs and our economic independence for good.”* | 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.  *“The other candidate in this race has spent her entire life making money for special interests – and taking money from special interests.”*  *“Then, when she left, she made $21.6 million giving speeches to Wall Street banks and other special interests – in less than 2 years – secret speeches that she does not want to reveal to the public.”*  *“She gets rich making you poor.”*  *“Hillary’s Wall Street immigration agenda will keep immigrant communities poor, and unemployed Americans out of work. She can’t claim to care about African-American and Hispanic workers when she wants to bring in millions of new low-wage workers to compete against them.”* | 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.”  *“Our country will be better off when we start making our own products again, bringing our once great manufacturing capabilities back to our shores.”* |
|  |  | 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 los elementos necesarios para ser considerado como populista. En primer lugar se reconoce la apelación al pueblo americano como una entidad virtuosa, construido en oposición a la elite y sus intereses. Segundo, se reconoce de manera clara la identificación de una elite representada por los políticos, los grandes negocios (Wall Street), los intereses especiales y los burócratas los cuales están articulados con la figura de Hillary Clinton. Según Trump, Clinton ha defendido estos intereses y se ha vuelto millonaria a costa del pueblo y sus intereses. Adicionalmente, se reconoce un lenguaje belicoso en relación al desempeño de Clinton como secretaria de Estado. En tercer lugar, se reconoce cierta noción de voluntad general como fuente de legitimidad política y una noción de soberanía nacional (popular) en contra de la globalización. No obstante, la voluntad general no aparece de manera tan clara.

Finalmente, no se reconoce una noción de cambio radical, sino la identificación de temas específicos como el proteccionismo económico. A partir de los elementos anteriores es posible clasificar el discurso con una **nota de 1,3.**