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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 | 0,3 | 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.  *“And that is why I believe Donald Trump is so dangerous.”*  *“It’s there in how he wants to ban Muslims from coming to the United States, and toyed with creating a database to track Muslims in America. It’s there in the way he demeans women, in his promotion of an anti-Semitic image pushed by neo-Nazis, and in the months that he spent trying to discredit the citizenship and legitimacy of our first black President.”*  *“This man is the nominee of the Party of Lincoln. We are watching it become the Party of Trump. And that’s not just a huge loss for our democracy – it is a threat to it.”* | 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.  *“Everyone in America, everyone deserves to be treated with respect and dignity. Surely that is something we can all unite behind.”*  *“We may disagree on the causes and the solutions to the challenges we face – but I believe like anyone else, they’re trying to figure out their place in a fast-changing America. They want to know how to make a good living and how to give their kids better futures and opportunities. That’s why we’ve got to reclaim the promise of America for all our people – no matter who they vote for.”*  *“And let’s be more than allies to each other. Let’s take on each other’s struggles as our own.”* |
|  |  | 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.  *“We share this miraculous country. This land and its heritage is yours, mine and everyone’s – willing to pledge allegiance and understand the solemn responsibilities of American citizenship. That’s what ‘indivisible’ means – that big word that every grade school student knows – that we’re in this together, even if that’s not always easy.”* |
| Evil elite | 0 | 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 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.”  *“We do need criminal justice reform to save lives and to make sure all Americans are treated as equals in rights and dignity.”*  *“That’s why I’ve pledged that in my first 100 days as President, we will make the biggest investment in new, good-paying jobs since World War II.”* |
|  |  | 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 considera como populista. En primer lugar, no se reconoce una apelación al pueblo americano. Segundo, tampoco se reconoce una elite clara que atente contra los intereses del pueblo. Por sobre la construcción de un pueblo en oposición a una elite, el discurso está centrado en el pluralismo y la indivisibilidad del pueblo americano. Sin embargo, el discurso presenta un carácter maniqueo al referirse a la figura de Donald Trump, reconociéndolo como alguien peligroso y una amenaza para la democracia de EEUU. Finalmente, no se identifica una noción de voluntad general del pueblo como fuente de legitimidad política que cambie la situación actual, sino que se reconocen ciertas políticas específicas orientadas a generar empleo y reformar la justicia. Por estas razones el discurso puede ser calificado con una **nota de 0,1.**