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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 | 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.  *“I am proposing a new foreign policy focused on advancing America’s core national interests, promoting regional stability, and producing an easing of tensions in the world. This will require rethinking the failed policies of the past.”*  *“Unlike my opponent, my foreign policy will emphasize diplomacy, not destruction.”*  *“She can’t even remember whether she was trained in classified information, and said she didn’t even know the letter “C” means confidential.”* | 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 | 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. |
| Evil elite | 0,5 | 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.  *“Under*[*Barack Obama*](http://thehill.com/people/barack-obama)*and Hillary Clinton, defense spending is on track to fall to its lowest level as a share of the economy since the end of World War II. We currently have the smallest Army since 1940. The Navy is among the smallest it has been since 1915. And the Air Force is the smallest it has been since 1947.”* | 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.”  *“In the process, we will make government leaner and more responsive to the public.”*  *“Early in my term, I will also be requesting that all NATO nations promptly pay their bills, which many are not doing right now.”*  *“We will build an active Army of around 540,000, as the Army’s chief of staff has said he needs.”*  *“We will build a Marine Corps based on 36 battalions, which the Heritage Foundation notes is the minimum needed to deal with major contingencies – we have 23 now.”*  *“We will build a Navy of 350 surface ships and submarines, as recommended by the bipartisan National Defense Panel – we have 276 ships now.”*  *“And we will build an Air Force of at least 1,200 fighter aircraft, which the Heritage Foundation has shown to be needed to execute current missions – we have 1,113 now.”*  *“We will also seek to develop a state of the art missile defense system.”* |
|  |  | 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 la apelación al pueblo americano. Segundo, se reconoce de manera poco clara la identificación de una elite representada por la figura de Hillary Clinton y Barack Obama, como quienes han tomado malas decisiones y han desmantelado a los militares. De esta manera, el discurso construye dicotomías entre la forma vieja y nueva de hacer las cosas. En tercer lugar, no se reconoce cierta una noción de voluntad general como fuente de legitimidad política. Más bien aparece de forma fuerte la idea de soberanía nacional. Finalmente, el discurso se enfoca en ciertas políticas específicas de seguridad como potenciar a los militares y renegociar los acuerdos internacionales. A partir de los elementos anteriores es posible clasificar el discurso con una **nota de 0,4.**