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2 A speech in this category is extremely populist and comes very close to the ideal populist discourse. Specifically, the speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal populist discourse, and has few elements that would be considered non-populist.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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.  *“It’s going to be a victory for the people. A victory for the wage-earner, the factory worker, a victory for the everyday citizen – and for all the people whose voice hasn’t been heard.*  *It will be a win for the voters – not the pundits, not the journalists, not the lobbyists, not the global special interests funding my opponent’s campaign.*  *This is going to be YOUR victory.”*  *“This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: death, destruction and terrorism.*  *America deserves a better legacy. All of you deserve a better future. I am the change agent. Hillary Clinton is the defender of the status quo.”* | 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 | 1,5 | 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.  *“In my visit, I saw not only the suffering of our people, but also their strength, courage and unbeatable spirit. Their spirit will overcome.”*  *“Law and order will be restored, and the poorest places in our country will know safety and peace.*  *American values and culture will be cherished and celebrated once again.”*  *“In A Trump Administration, the State Department will work for the country – not for Hillary Clinton’s donors.*  *And I will work for you – and for no one else.*  *I will never lie to you, I will never put any other interest before you, and I will never, every stop fighting for you.*  *The government will work for the people again.”* | 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 inner cities of our country have been run by the Democratic Party for 50 years. Their policies have produced only poverty, joblessness, failing schools, and broken homes.*  *It is time to hold Democratic Politicians accountable for what they have done to these communities.”*  *“The destruction that NAFTA started will be finished off if the Trans-Pacific Partnership is approved. We know from Hillary’s closest friend, Terry McAuliffe, that she is planning to ram through the TPP if she’s elected. She even called the TPP the “gold standard.””* | 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.  *“In this New American Future, American workers will always come first.”*  *“In my Administration, every American will be treated equally, protected equally, and honored equally. We will reject bigotry and hatred and oppression in all of its forms, and seek a new future built on our common culture and values as one American people.”*  *“This is the change I am promising all of you: an honest government, a thriving economy, and a just society for each and every American.*  *It is time to vote for a New American Future.”* | 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.” |
|  |  | 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 de manera clara la apelación al pueblo americano como una entidad virtuosa. Segundo, se reconoce de manera clara la identificación de una elite representada por los políticos tradicionales, el partido demócrata, los intereses especiales y en especial la figura de Hillary Clinton y el presidente Obama. De esta forma, el discurso muestra elementos maniqueos dividiendo la sociedad en dos grupos antagónicos y en donde el pueblo americano va a prevalecer. En tercer lugar, se reconoce claramente una noción de voluntad general como fuente de legitimidad política para generar los cambios que se necesitan para construir el “Nuevo Futuro Americano”. A partir de la definición de éste horizonte, un posible gobierno de Trump es entendido como la liberación del pueblo americano. A partir de los elementos anteriores es posible clasificar el discurso con una **nota de 1,5.**