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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 | 1,3 | 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.  *“The corrupt media is trying to do everything in their power to stop our movement.”*  *“Either we win this election or we’re going to lose our country, because 4 more years of Obama, you can’t take it.”*  *“The e-mails show that behind closed doors speaking to these international bankers, Hillary Clinton’s pledged to destroy the sovereignty of the United States.”*  *“On November 8th, the arrogance of Washington, D.C. will come face to face with the righteous verdict of the American voter, it’s time, all right?”*  *“I am asking all Americans, Republicans, Independents and Democrats, to join us in our campaign to defeat the corrupt establishment and give our government back to the people.”* | 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.  *“The incredible spirit of the people of this state will power its recovery, and it’s the same spirit that will rebuild our nation. I have property in this state, this is a great state.”*  *“This is our last chance to save our country and reclaim it for we the people, and it’s going to happen.”*  *“The press can’t write the kind of things they write, which are lies, lies, lies. The stories are fabrications and false. And the only thing I say is hopefully, hopefully, our patriotic movement will overcome this terrible deception.”* | 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.  *“In the Trump administration we will end decades of policies that enrich special interests and foreign countries at our expense. We’re going to take on the big media, big business, and big donors that are bleeding our country dry.”*  *“Reporters at the New York Times, they’re not journalists, they’re corporate lobbyists for Carlos Slim and for Hillary Clinton. We’re going to let foreign corporations and their CEO’s decide the outcomes of the — you just can’t do this.”*  *“We have the greatest negotiators in the world, we have the greatest business people in the world, we don’t use them. We use political hacks. So we have a trade deficit of almost $800 billion.”*  *“North Carolina’s industrial (ph) workers have been crushed by Bill Clinton’s signing of NAFTA supported by crooked Hillary. Don’t forget, a lot of people want that to happen because they make a lot of money by taking money out of this country. Those deals are very good for a lot of people.”* | 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 don’t have — we are $20 trillion, half of which came during the Obama years. And yet we didn’t fix anything. Our roads are bad, our bridges are bad, our tunnels are bad, our schools are bad, our hospitals are bad. We’re going to start making things again in America. As part of our plan to bring back our jobs, we’re going to lower our business tax from 35 percent to 15 tax, the biggest since Ronald Reagan. Wages will rise, jobs will return, and factories will come rushing, rushing back in to our country.”* |
|  |  | 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 algunos 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 la identificación de una elite representada por Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, el establishment político y los medios de comunicación. De esta forma, se reconoce una visión maniquea en la medida que esta elite no tiene estándares morales más que beneficiarse a costa del pueblo. En tercer lugar, se reconoce una noción de voluntad general como fuente de legitimidad política que permitirá al pueblo americano y el movimiento patriótico creado por Trump superar la crisis en la que se encuentra EEUU. Finalmente, el discurso se enfoca en algunas políticas publicas específicas como la reducción de impuestos, la construcción de infraestructura, la defensa de la segunda enmienda, entre otras. A partir de los elementos anteriores es posible clasificar el discurso con una **nota de 1,3.**