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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 | 0,5 | 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.  *“We have tremendous power over everybody because we are really the source. We have great, great power. The problem is we have politicians that truly, truly, truly don’t know what they’re doing. So we’re going to work really, really hard.”*  *“You look at what's going on with everything. It's a disaster. So we're going to have an interesting period of time. I don't know that she's going to be allowed to run. What she did is a criminal act. If she's allowed to run, I would be very, very surprised.”* | 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 | 0,3 | 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.  *“You know, it's very hard. I really think that one of the biggest things that everybody is seeing happening - and everybody - is the Republican Party has become more dynamic. It's become more diverse. We're taking from the Democrats. We're taking from the independents. We have a lot more people. We have a lot more people.”* | 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.  *“And you know, I watched Hillary’s speech and she’s talking about wages, and being poor, and everything’s poor and everything’s doing badly but we’re going to make it — she’s been there for so long. I mean, if she hasn’t straighten it out by now, she’s not going to straighten it out in the next four years. It’s just going to become worse and worse.”*  *“We’ve got about a 20 point lead. I know that a lot of groups, a lot of the special interests and a lot of the lobbyists and the people that want to have their little senator do exactly as they want, they’re going to put $20 million to $25 million into it over the next two weeks from what just came over the wires.”*  *“The president can't make a deal. The reason is he doesn't know how to make a deal. Probably doesn't work at it. Probably doesn't care. But you're talking about tremendous numbers of - tremendous amounts of money. So when you have something that everybody wants and you can't make a deal, there's something going on that's really wrong. And what it means is you have the wrong leader.”*  *“Politicians are all talk no action.”* | 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 create jobs like you’ve never seen. We’re going to lower taxes.”*  *“We're going to make our military bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and nobody, nobody, nobody is going to mess with us, folks. Nobody.”*  *“We are going to have a wall.”* |
|  |  | 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 en oposición a una elite que atenta contra sus intereses. Segundo, se reconoce de manera clara la identificación de una elite representada por los políticos tradicionales, los lobistas, los medios de comunicación y un especial ataque a la figura de Hillary Clinton y el presidente Obama. En tercer lugar, no se reconoce una noción de voluntad general como fuente de legitimidad política. No obstante, se observa la búsqueda de articular diferentes sujetos políticos como los republicanos, demócratas e independientes a partir de algo más grande.

Finalmente, no se reconoce una noción de cambio radical, sino la identificación de temas específicos como la creación de empleo, bajar impuestos, potenciar a los militares y construir la muralla en la frontera con México. A partir de los elementos anteriores es posible clasificar el discurso con una **nota de 0,5.**