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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.  *“When the powerful can get away with anything, because they have the money and the connections to rig the system, then people lose confidence in our laws and in our future.”*  *“We will end illegal immigration, deport every last criminal alien, and save American lives.”*  *“Our failed establishment has betrayed the American worker and family. They've dragged us into foreign wars that have made us less safe, they have left our borders wide open at home, and they've shipped our jobs and wealth to other countries.”*  *“We are fighting for every citizen who believes that government should serve the people – not the donors and special interests.”* | 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 | 1,3 | 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 silent majority is back. In 10 days, we are going to win the state of Arizona and we are going to win back the White House.”*  *“This will be the year the American people say: enough is enough.*  *This will be the year the American people break with the bitter failures of the past and embrace a new and optimistic future.”*  *“We are fighting to unlock the potential of every American community, and every American family, who yearns for a better future.”* | 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 WikiLeaks revelations have exposed criminal corruption at the highest levels of our government.”*  *“A vote for Hillary is a vote to surrender our government to public corruption, graft and cronyism that threatens the survival of our Constitutional system itself.”*  *“Government corruption spreads outward, like a cancer, infecting the whole operation of our government.”* | 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.  *“Real change also means getting rid of the corruption in Washington.”* | 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 are going to have the biggest tax cut since Ronald Reagan; eliminate every unnecessary job-killing regulation; cancel every illegal Obama executive order; stop the massive inflow of refugees and keep Radical Islamic Terrorist out of our country; rebuild our military and take care of our Vets; reduce surging crime and support the men and women of law enforcement; provide school choice and put an end to Common Core; save the 2nd amendment; and appoint Justices to the Supreme Court who will uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States”* |
|  |  | 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 que se define en oposición a un gobierno y una elite política corrupta. Segundo, se reconoce la identificación de una elite representada por Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, el establishment político y los intereses especiales. 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 creado por Trump superar la crisis en la que se encuentra EEUU y volver a ser una gran nación. Finalmente, el discurso se enfoca en algunas políticas publicas específicas como la reducción de impuestos, eliminar las regulaciones estatales, dejar de recibir refugiados desde medio oriente, 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 1,4.**