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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 | 0,2 | 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.  *“She will not be a great president. She will be a poor president.”*  *“She doesn’t understand trade. Her husband signed perhaps in the history of the world the single worst trade deal ever done. It’s called NAFTA.”*  *“And we’re going to have to take out ISIS and we’re going to have to take them out fast. We can’t allow that cancer to continue.”* | 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 | 0,5 | 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.  *“Let me tell you, the miners in West Virginia and Pennsylvania Which was so great to me last week and Ohio and all over, They’re going to strat to work again. Believe me. You’re going to be proud again to be miners.”*  *“And this country, which is very, very divided in so many different ways is going to become one beautiful loving country. And we’re going to love each other. We’re going to cherish each other. We’re going to take care each other. And we’re are going to have great economic development.”* | 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 | 1,0 | 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.  *“We´re not going to let Carreir ad all of these companies just think they can move –go to another country, make their products, sell it back to us, and we get only one thing. We get unemployment. Not going to happen anymore, folks, Not going to happen anymore.”*  *“They’re not going to be able to make great deals. We have such bad deals.*  *They’re not going to be able to do what we do with the military.*  *They’re not going to be able to do what we’re going to do on the border, including the wall.”* | 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’re going to bring back our jobs and we’re going to kkep our job. We’re not going to let companies leave.”*  *“And we have to build our infrastructure, or road. We have to rebuild our bridges, our airports, our hospitals in this country.”*  *“We´re going to build up our military bigger, better, stronger than ever before. Is the cheapest thing we can do.”* |
|  |  | 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 considerado como populista. En primer lugar, no se reconoce de manera clara alguna apelación al pueblo. Sin embargo, se observa una visión romántica de los mineros y la idea de nación americana. Segundo, se reconoce de manera clara la identificación de una elite representada por los políticos tradicionales y articulada con la figura de Hillary Clinton. Se puede observar un componente maniqueo cuando Trump se refiere a Clinton como alguien que no puede ser un buen presidente. Además, se observa un lenguaje belicoso cuando refiere a la necesidad de eliminar a ISIS. En tercer lugar, se no reconoce una noción de voluntad general como fuente de legitimidad política.

Finalmente, no se reconoce una noción de cambio radical, sino la identificación de temas específicos como el proteccionismo económico, la generación de empleo, la reconstrucción de la infraestructura del país e invertir en las fuerzas militares. A partir de los elementos anteriores es posible clasificar el discurso con una **nota de 0,5.**