



TEAM POPULISM

TEAM POPULISM – LEADER PROFILE SERIES

A Drop in the Ocean or a Change in the Weather? Populism in Bolsonaro's Campaign Revisited

Eduardo Ryô Tamaki
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

Cezar A. P. Braga
Central European University

Mario Fuks
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

DECEMBER / 2021

PRESENTED BY:
Team Populism
teampopulism.com

WHAT IS TEAM POPULISM?

Team Populism brings together renowned scholars from Europe and the Americas to study the causes and consequences of populism. We seek to answer why some populist parties, leaders or movements are more successful than others.

Our general argument is that populism is best understood as a combination of individual and contextual issues ("demand side") and the availability of successful leaders ("supply side").

We expand on this broad framework by studying multiple levels of analysis, and we draw on different methodological tools, including experiments, surveys, and comparative analysis. To facilitate this work, individual teams are organized around functional tasks.

TEAM POPULISM
teampopulism.com

DIRECTOR:

Kirk A. Hawkins
Brigham Young University, USA
kirk.hawkins@byu.edu

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT:

Daniel Rios-Lazo
teampopulism@byu.edu

TEAM LEADERS:

Ioannis Andreadis
Aristotle University, Greece

Ryan E. Carlin
Georgia State University, USA

Bruno Castanho Silva
University of Cologne

Angelos Chrysosgelos
London Metropolitan University

David Doyle
University of Oxford

Erin K. Jenne
Central European University

Levente Littvay
CEU, Budapest

Jennifer McCoy
Georgia State University

Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser
U. Diego Portales, Chile

Saskia P. Ruth-Lovell
Radboud University

Steven M. Van Hauwaert
University of Surrey

Nina Wiesehomeier
IE University, Spain

A Drop in the Ocean or a Change in the Weather? Populism in Bolsonaro’s Campaign Revisited

Eduardo Ryô Tamaki¹

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

Cezar A. P. Braga²

Central European University

Mario Fuks³

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

Abstract: This paper analyzes the discourse of Jair Bolsonaro during his winning bid for Brazil’s presidency in 2018. The research follows the holistic grading method, through which 10 campaign speeches were independently assessed by two graders. These measures were accounted as reliable following Krippendorff’s alpha coefficient, and their total average accounted for 0.5, meaning that Bolsonaro’s discourse is to be considered “moderately populist” according to the scale developed by Kirk Hawkins. The present study argues that much of this result owes to Bolsonaro’s use of nationalism and patriotism in his speeches, so that patriotic appeals through the use of a nationalist “we” replaces, in many instances, the use of a populist “us”, thus resulting in a lower score for populism. The paper concludes by arguing that this lower score in no way should be interpreted as meaning that Bolsonaro is less of an illiberal, or of a populist actor. On the contrary, what the results show is that Bolsonaro is a populist-nationalist, rather than merely a mild populist.

Keywords: Populism; Brazilian Elections; Far-Right, Jair Bolsonaro; Nationalism; Patriotism;

¹ Graduate Student in Political Science at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG). E-mail: eduardo.rtamaki@gmail.com

² Graduate Student in Political Science at the Central European University (CEU). E-mail: braga_cezar@phd.ceu.edu

³ Department of Political Science at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG). E-mail: mariofuks@gmail.com

Introduction

On October 28, 2018, Brazilians elected their 38th president, four years after its last general election, as commanded by the constitution. Seen from this angle, one might be allured into thinking the election reflected the overall stability of the political system. It was anything but. The president-elect, Jair Bolsonaro, is the country's first far-right leader selected by suffrage and arguably the first South American far-right leader since Pinochet. In the four years preceding his triumph, Brazil went through a large-scale economic crisis, the second presidential impeachment in a generation, and witnessed the conviction of influential politicians in corruption-related charges – including former president Lula da Silva.

Given the significant implications of Bolsonaro's election and the relevant lessons to be learned by Political Science from the recent episodes in Brazilian political life, a thorough analysis of these events is due. This paper contributes to this analytical effort, focusing on Bolsonaro's 2018 electoral victory – more specifically, on the populist character thereof.

The following work investigates the campaign discourse of Bolsonaro, and it evaluates how populist it is based on ten campaign speeches. Discourses are measured objectively, according to the holistic grading method of textual analysis for a six-dimensional scale of populism, following Hawkins (2009).

The results might strike as surprising: Bolsonaro's overall score is relatively low (0.5) - just enough to classify his campaign discourse as "somewhat populist." As the paper will argue, Bolsonaro's populism finds itself entangled with nationalism and patriotism, with "the people" playing second fiddle to other preferred terms. Furthermore, the very idea of "the people" is

construed in a way that is more influenced by the use of patriotic and nationalist rhetoric as opposed to Manichean discourse at times.

As the paper asserts in its conclusion, however, this relatively low score should not be taken as indicating that Bolsonaro's speech is any less illiberal than it would be expected from a leader who places great emphasis on majoritarianism. Indeed, Bolsonaro's attacks on minorities and institutions show that substituting patriotism and nationalism for specific aspects of populism does not lead to a more constructive result in terms of deviation from liberal democracy.

Brazil and Populism

Amongst the various definitions of populism from the specialized literature, most of the contemporary empirical research on populism in Political Science has converged towards the so-called “ideational” definition of populism (e.g., Hawkins et al., 2018; Mudde and Rovira Kaltwasser, 2017). This approach sees populism as a set of ideas held by individuals and political actors, who, ultimately, perceive society as separated into two antagonistic and homogeneous groups: “the people” - the good - and “the elite” - the evil.

In recent years, Brazil was hit by a “perfect storm,” comprised of four simultaneous crises: economic, political, corruption, and public security (Hunter and Power, 2019). This made the country a likely candidate for the emergence of populism - both from the demand and supply sides (Castanho Silva, Fuks, and Tamaki, 2021). In times of crises, populism flourishes (Moffitt, 2015), and during moments of widespread distrust and crisis of representation, with the entire political class discredited, the sight of populism as a “redemptive face of democracy” is due to emerge (Canovan, 1999; Urbinati, 2019). In this sense, the populist agency plays a pivotal role, as it is

responsible for creating and employing a rhetoric frame that mobilizes and activates a set of latent dispositions, besides politicizing salient issues (Elchardus and Spruyt, 2016).

The populist message is argued to be highly persuasive as it relies on personal emotions (such as fear, anger, and even hope) while favoring easy, simple solutions to political and societal problems (Hameleers, Bos and de Vreese, 2017; Rooduijn, 2014). Although it is a moral discourse potentially used by different actors such as politicians, the media, or the common citizen, populist ideas are often studied in the rhetoric of political leaders, parties, and movements. In this sense, the present study revisits Bolsonaro's campaign speeches, offering an updated analysis based on the authors' collected data.

In the remainder of this article, we measure populism using a form of content analysis first introduced to measure political speeches by Hawkins (2009). Also known as holistic grading, it asks graders to interpret whole texts instead of breaking content to the level of words and phrases (Hawkins, 2009: 1049). This technique is suitable for diffuse, latent textual meaning common in political discourse, especially those related to latent issues and ideologies such as populism.

To give some context on the range of populism as coded by holistic grading, the subsequent leaders were all classified following the same method, taken from Hawkins (2009) and Hawkins et al. (2019). In Latin America, Hugo Chávez, in Venezuela, received an average score of 1.9 (1999 – 2006), while Evo Morales, in Bolivia, scored 1.6 (2006 – 2009). As for Europe, Hungary's Orbán scored 0.9 (2010 – 2014), while, in the United States, Donald Trump received an average score of 0.8 (2017 – 2018).

Methodology

Following the characterization of populism as a discourse (Hawkins, 2010), we coded and analyzed Jair Bolsonaro's campaign speeches relying on the holistic grading method of textual analysis. We paired it with a rubric designed by Hawkins (2009) that identifies the qualities associated with the different dimensions of populism: the overall Manichaeian frame and its branches on people-centrism and anti-elitism. In total, the rubric is based on these three main dimensions, which are then expanded to a total of six populist traits⁴. However, they do not work as a checklist. People-centrism and anti-elitism are necessary, while other elements help address the intensity of populism.

Grades follow a ratio level scale ranging from 0 to 2, where 0 indicates a speech with few if any populist elements and two a highly populist speech close to a "perfect" discourse (Hawkins, 2009: 1062)⁵. Regarding the corpus, we selected 10 speeches from both official events and Facebook live streams. Except for July (which had fewer official pronouncements), we picked at least two speeches per month: one from July, two from August, three from September (one before Bolsonaro's stabbing and two after this attack), and four from October, the month of the elections⁶. Lastly, we recognize that the usual procedure would be to code written speeches in which the grader cannot evaluate emotions and, therefore, cannot receive all the non-verbal communication from the speaker. However, as Hawkins and Silva (2018) demonstrated, graders exposed to video do not differ significantly in their grading from coders who have access to written speeches only; this indicates that grading videos do not affect our average score.

⁴ For more information, see the complete rubric in Appendix A.

⁵ Detailed information is in Supplementary Appendix B.

⁶ Speeches and Rubrics can be accessed at <https://bit.ly/A_Drop_In_the_Ocean>

We opt for utilizing official live streams due to Bolsonaro's strategy of delegitimizing traditional media as information providers. He presented his official social media as the only legitimate source of information - his weekly videos as an alternative to traditional daily news. Overall, this is a channel in which Bolsonaro has unrestricted control of his on-stage character while avoiding the gate-keeping imposed by mainstream media outlets (Burni and Tamaki, 2021). Finally, coding was conducted by two graders⁷, and intercoder reliability was calculated along the process to ensure the reliability of our results.

Analysis and Discussion

To calculate intercoder reliability, we employ Krippendorff's alpha. This coefficient measures the level of agreement between observers and indicates whether results are random. It ranges from 0 to 1, with an α of 1 indicating "perfect reliability," and of 0 the absence of reliability (Krippendorff, 2011). We opt for this method as it suits any number of observers, categories, scale values, or measures; it can also work with nominal and ordinal data, as well as intervals (Krippendorff, 2011). We calculate an $\alpha = 0.88$, which is above the threshold recommended⁸and, therefore, indicates that our data and analysis are trustworthy.

Table 1 shows the individual score given to each discourse by each grader, as well as their average score. A quick analysis indicates that Bolsonaro's speeches grow in populism as the campaign progresses, from an average of 0.5 to one of 0.9, an 80% increase. Our analysis will be limited to the average score of his campaign speeches, which is 0.5.

⁷ We thank former research assistant Caio Emanuel Marques, from IE University, Spain, for acting as grader number 2.

⁸ Krippendorff (2004) suggests that we should rely only on variables with reliability above $\alpha = 0.8$. A value between $0.667 < \alpha < 0.8$ should be used only for drawing "tentative conclusions" (Krippendorff, 2004: 241).

Table 1 Bolsonaro's Campaign Speech Scores

Title	Date	Grader A	Grader B	Average Score (Rounded)
1 - Official launch of his political campaign.	July 22, 2018	0.4	0.5	0.5
2 – Araçatuba.	August 23, 2018	0.6	0.5	0.6
3 – Porto Velho.	August 31, 2018	0.1	0.0	0.1
4 – Rio de Janeiro.	September 06, 2018	0.3	0.2	0.3
5 – After being Stabbed.	September 16, 2018	0.3	0.3	0.3
6 – Av. Paulista.	September 30, 2018	0.5	0.3	0.4
7 – One day before the first round of elections.	October 06, 2018	0.3	0.2	0.3
8 – Right after the first round of elections.	October 07, 2018	0.7	0.6	0.7
9 – Av. Paulista.	October 22, 2018	1.0	0.8	0.9
10 – The day before the second round of elections.	October 27, 2018	0.8	1.0	0.9
Total Average:		0.5	0.44	0.5

Source: Authors coding; speeches and the coding rubrics are included in the Appendix.

As a moderate populist, Bolsonaro scores noticeably low at some points - particularly between late August and early October. However, after the first round of the Brazilian presidential elections (October 7), his discourse became gradually more populist, going from an average of 0.3 on October 6 to one of 0.9 on October 27, one day before the second round of elections. It is clear,

therefore, that Bolsonaro's populism is inconsistent. In what follows, we analyze vignettes from his campaign speeches that support our statement and show that nationalist traits prevent him from scoring higher.

People-Centrism

One of the main dimensions of populism is the belief in and praise of popular sovereignty. In this sense, populists view ordinary citizens as good, pure, and homogeneous. This, consequently, entails the existence of a unified "popular will," (Jagers and Walgrave, 2007) stemming from an "essential harmony of interests among "the people" (Stanley, 2008: 101). Ultimately, populists see politics as the expressions of the "volonté générale" (the general will of the people).

Bolsonaro: *"We are different from those who ruled over us for the past 20 years – Workers' Party and Brazilian Social Democracy Party. With us, you [the people] will be in the first place; you will be our bosses! Together we can change Brazil; we won't have another opportunity!"*⁹

The implications of this vignette are twofold. While standing apart from the opposition, Bolsonaro evokes the idea of "the people" as a homogeneous group - to which he vouches to return the power once he wins the elections. With him, "the people" will be in charge, their sovereignty will be restored. Consequently, it is this simultaneous reference to "the people" as both "ordinary people," and the politically sovereign demos that, we argue, makes up for the constitutive element of populism's people-centrism.

"The people" is a concept that acts like an "empty signifier" (Laclau, 2005), which means that it is malleable, an "in-group" that changes and reshapes according to the context (Laclau, 2005; Reinemann et al., 2017). With that in mind, during his campaign, Bolsonaro builds the notion of

⁹ Bolsonaro (2) – Araçatuba (2018).

“the people” from a cultural and religious perspective, romanticizing the “common man” and equating the in-group to religious and moral standards depicted as the “good.”

Bolsonaro: *“Brazil is ours, ‘good citizens,’ hard workers, conservatives, Christians that maintain family values; that don’t want ‘gender ideology’¹⁰ in classrooms.”¹¹*

At the same time, “the people” is equated to the nation, and Bolsonaro is prone to make multiple references to "Brazil" and the Brazilian people as a way to create proximity between him and his supporters, which could also reflect an attempt to strengthen their identification with an “imagined” group.

However, “the people” occupies a secondary position in Bolsonaro’s discourse; it is not always construed through an “up/down” antagonism proper to populism, and besides a few occasions, it is rarely referenced as simultaneously plebs and politically sovereignty-bearing demos. Its use is inconsistent and often implicit, leaving his people-centrism to support other preferred nodal points that constitute different signifiers “us.” Therefore, his populism’s people-centrism is overshadowed by other elements discussed soon.

Anti-Elitism

For “us” to exist, there must be a “them.” In this vein, what groups different demands and identities together in an “in-group” is that they are all frustrated and threatened by an evil-ruling “elite” (de Cleen, 2017) whose ultimate goal is to maintain its power. In other words, “the people” is considered to constitute a “silent majority” and, while its “volonté générale” should rightly be the basis of politics, it is frustrated and co-opted by a self-serving homogeneous entity, “the elite.”

¹⁰ “Gender Ideology” is a pejorative term coined by the Catholic Church to fight against gender issues and related subjects. Widely influential in Latin America, the term is often used by those who fear that discussing sexuality in school will induce homosexuality and erode the traditional family (Biroli, 2017).

¹¹ Bolsonaro (6) – Av. Paulista (September, 2018).

Essentially, a populist discourse constructs two homogeneous groups, “the people” and “the elite,” through a down/up Manichean antagonism which frames “the people” as a virtuous and large, yet powerless, group, and “the elite” as an evil and small, yet illegitimately powerful up-group (see De Cleen, 2017: 346). In Bolsonaro’s discourse, “the elite” takes the shape of its political opposition: the Left (ideology) and especially the Worker’s Party (PT):

Bolsonaro: *“Petralhada¹², you will go to the ‘edge of the beach*,’ you won’t have any more chances in our homeland, because I will cut off all your luxuries. You won’t have any more NGOs to satisfy your hunger for mortadella¹³. It will be a purge never seen in the history of Brazil!¹⁴”*

Although often using “PT” and “the Left”, Bolsonaro also employs a range of other labels and pejorative terms. Here, he references a widely known torture site during Brazil’s military dictatorship (1964 - 1985) - the “Edge of the Beach” (“Ponta da Praia”). He thus openly alludes to non-democratic means of dealing with his opposition.

During his campaign, Bolsonaro openly addresses the PT and its government as corrupt, inefficient, and responsible for executing a plan to spread left-wing ideology. Furthermore, he holds the PT accountable for undermining traditional family values - often relating his opponents to “gender ideology” and using this association to further his anti-minorities agenda. To deal with this situation, Bolsonaro openly defends non-democratic means as a way to fight his political enemy. His overall tone is aggressive, and it relies heavily on inflammatory and belligerent language; as the elections approach, his aggressiveness increases:

¹² Reference to those affiliated with the Workers’ Party; a wordplay with the words “Metralha” from the Brazilian Portuguese translation of the Beagle Boys (mobsters) and “Petista” (affiliated with the Workers’ Party).

¹³ Leftist activists are also referenced as “mortadella sandwiches.”

¹⁴ Bolsonaro (9) – Av. Paulista (October, 2018).

Bolsonaro: *“You, Petralhas [derogatory term for PT supporters], will see Civil and Military police with a legal rearguard to uphold the law on your back [sic]. Bandits from MST¹⁵, bandits from MTST¹⁶, your actions will be typified as terrorism; you will not terrorize the countryside and the cities anymore! Either you fit in and fall in line, or you will accompany the “drunkard” in Curitiba¹⁷”*

Nationalism and Patriotism (And Why It Is Not Populism)

So far, we showed how populist elements are articulated in Bolsonaro’s campaign speeches; however, most of the time, the idea of “the people” is more influenced by nationalistic rhetoric than by Manichean discourse. Although intertwined in practice, populism and nationalism are two distinct discursive traditions (Brubaker, 2019), and in this sense, though not fully overlapping, they are better understood if construed as intersecting and mutually implicated (de Cleen and Stavrakakis, 2020: 2).

Following this idea, we depart from the existing literature and propose that for an “us” to be appropriately considered “populist,” “the people” must be invoked in a twofold way: it needs to be simultaneously part and whole. In other words, it needs to refer to the common or ordinary people at the same time it is designating a political sovereignty-bearing demos (in the terms used by Brubaker, 2019)¹⁸. In this regard, as we will demonstrate, Bolsonaro’s discourse is often devoid of references to “us” in any of these part-whole categories, relying primarily (and almost uniquely) on the construction of the in-group as a cultural community, constituted by shared citizenship and inheritable fictive kinship. He is prone to using “we” and “our” to denote shared ownership of the

¹⁵ Brazilian Landless Workers’ Movement.

¹⁶ Brazilian Homeless Workers Movement.

¹⁷ Bolsonaro (9) – Av. Paulista (October, 2018).

¹⁸ Although we do not follow Brubaker (2019) in adopting a vertical and horizontal division to populism’s idea of “the people,” we are also not getting into the details surrounding this dispute. For a detailed discussion, see Brubaker (2019); de Cleen and Stavrakakis (2020); Rooduijn, de Lange and van der Brug (2014).

country, its symbols, and culture. In the end, even though populist people-centrism is present, it plays second fiddle to other preferred terms.

Nationalism is not intrinsically incompatible with populism. Besides being described as thin-centered ideologies (Freeden, 1996; Jenne, Hawkins, and Silva, 2021; Singh, 2021), both rely on a sense of social division, which entails a group behavior that separates society into “us” versus “them,” inscribing and delimiting the boundaries of an imagined sovereignty across salient socio-cultural issues. In this sense, being part of an “in-group” entails the construction of and categorical distinction from an “out-group” (e.g., Tajfel, 1982; Mouffe, 2019). Therefore, as Michael Billig similarly stated, both populism and nationalism are ideologies of the first- and third-person plural: it tells “us” who “we” are in a world where there can be no “us” without a “them” (Billig, 1995: 78).

Despite sharing commonalities, nationalism and populism are different political discourses. As stated previously, populism praises the “good” and virtuous people; however, who the people are and what they demand are historically contingent and difficult to identify very far in advance. It is ultimately very proximate to the individuals that constitute the people. In contrast, the national identity tends to be less malleable or connected to the individuals that are part of it. It revolves around an implied idea of fictive kinship that is inheritable – it is part of “our” blood, our culture¹⁹. It is all about “our” ways of life and “our” values (Billig, 1995: 71) - even if it is limited to pre-existing, historically inherited ideas that are most often transformed radically (Gellner, 1983). In

¹⁹ If we think of culture in terms of a system of ideas and signs and associations and ways of behaving and communicating (Gellner, 1983: 7).

this sense, “we” must be categorized with a distinctive label, a national label that does not only separate “us” from “them” but carries with itself a precious genetic inheritance.

Unlike populism, nationalists extol the "good and virtuous" nation (Jenne, Hawkins and Silva, 2021). It is itself an idea connected to a physical space with physical borders; it has to do with "territoriality" and the idea of a space, related to us in a "primordial way." In this sense, while populism is structured around a "down-up" frame that advocates for popular sovereignty, nationalism follows an "in-out" with "in" being the members of the nation and the "out" encompassing different non-members (de Cleen and Stavrakakis, 2017, 2020).

Bolsonaro: *“We speak what Brazil needs to hear, we show that Brazil has a solution, but this solution obviously passes through the hands of each one of you. Our big problem in Brazil is a political issue: Or we put people like us in politics, or we have no future, and people like us are honest people, people who believe in God, patriotic people!”*²⁰

To understand this vignette, we need to break it down into small parts. First, the subject of his rhetoric is the nation as a whole. It represents an underlying idea of an all-encompassing community that is brought together by this implicit notion of shared and inherited historical national values. Those values, however, are shaped, transformed freely to fit into Bolsonaro’s narrative; the community, therefore, is limited to those who are “like us.” Finally, by claiming that “people like us” are “honest people,” who “believe in God,” and people who are “patriotic,” Bolsonaro is delineating the nation’s core religious and conservative values as a representation of the virtues and distinctiveness that compose the Brazilian national identity.

Bolsonaro: *“Together we have the ability to unite our Brazilian people who have been divided (...) by the left in the last years. We are one country, one fatherland, one nation, one green and yellow heart! Together we can really make Brazil a great nation!”*²¹

²⁰ Bolsonaro (2) – Araçatuba (2018).

²¹ Bolsonaro (1) – Formal public launch of his political campaign (2018).

Interestingly, even though Bolsonaro may at times use “people,” “nation” (or in this case, “Brazil”), “Brazilians,” and even “fatherland” interchangeably, he does so without actually evoking those terms in a Manichean frame. In other words, this is to say that they do not refer to “the people” as a part of a wider political community, nor as a political whole that is construed as a sovereignty-bearing demos (Brubaker, 2019: 7). Instead, those are just different ways to reference a national community united by pre-existing symbols that reflect “our” way of life. There, "green and yellow heart" is a wordplay with the colors of the Brazilian flag.

Slightly different is patriotism. It comes closer to nationalism as it also alludes to the “celebration of the nationalistic virtues of patriotic fervor” (Smith and Sells, 2005), however, if nationalism praises the nation, patriotism praises the State (with capital “s”).

Bolsonaro: *“My brothers in the navy, army, and air force (...) you are attacked daily, accused of the greatest absurdities by this Left (Left-wing in general). Do you know why? Because you are the last obstacle to socialism²²”*

It also alludes to its institutions, symbols - such as flags and national anthems -, the government, and the military. As seen above, by portraying the military as the ultimate gatekeepers against socialism, Bolsonaro delineates his opposition as a political threat and links the PT to a resurrected socialist menace.

Consequently, it is all about the defense of the “fatherland” - A Pátria - and, when it comes to it, nothing stands above (O’Donnel, 1979; Hawkins, Amado, and Cranney, 2010). As Brian Loveman states, persons, groups, movements, and behaviors that threaten the fatherland’s

²² Bolsonaro (1) – Formal public launch of his political campaign (2018).

“permanent interests” “cannot be tolerated, even if their actions are formally legal” (Loveman, 1994: 109).

The subject of patriotic rhetoric is not “the people” or “the nation,” but rather a quasi-religious belief of an unwavering commitment to the defense of the “Pátria.” The fatherland, therefore, is a “sacred concept; it [is] an ‘entity of destiny,’ a transcendental basis of identity and solidarity, flexible in form but unchanging at its core” (Smith and Sells, 2005: 59). It is in this sense that Bolsonaro embodies the idea of guardianship - he acts as a guardian defending the “Western Christian way of life” (Loveman, 1994) against its perceived enemies from within and without. His mission is to save the fatherland and meet with “decisive retribution” those who endanger it.

Bolsonaro: *“Right now [society] is polarized? it’s us and the PT; It’s Brazil, green and yellow, and they that represent Cuba, [that] represent the Venezuelan government, with its flag that is red and has a hammer and sickle on top of it.”²³*

Bolsonaro: *“[I have to] thank God for this opportunity [to] govern Brazil. If that is God’s will, together with these beautiful people, we are ready to fulfill this mission [ruling Brazil]. (...) I thank God for this mission; if this is His will, we will get there!”²⁴*

His rationale rests on: (1) defending the fatherland against communism (and the Left), against what Loveman called “more Cubas” (Loveman, 1994: 133), and preventing the rise of more “Venezuelas;” and, lastly, (2) defending the national sovereignty against external threats.

Similarly to populism and nationalism, patriot rhetoric also separates “us” from “them,” and while “us” takes the shape of one’s fatherland, “them” are forces of subversion threatening it. It is also important to highlight that, although obscure, “Brazil” is often used to reference different

²³ Bolsonaro (7) - One day before the first round of Brazil’s presidential elections (2018).

²⁴ Bolsonaro (7) - One day before the first round of Brazil’s presidential elections (2018).

ideas (be it populist, nationalist, or patriotic). In this specific context, it works interchangeably with “fatherland;” what will distinguish its meaning is the communicative context in which Bolsonaro uses those words.

As shown, nationalist and patriotic elements coexist with populism in Bolsonaro’s campaign discourses but do not necessarily combine with it. Although his score of 0.5 classifies him as “somewhat populist,” his people-centrism is inconsistent and is often obscured by nodal points that revolve around different signifiers.

A Drop in the Ocean or a Change in the Weather?

Bolsonaro’s discourse, therefore, presents moderate populism and highly exclusionary, aggressive forms of nationalism and patriotism. The former army captain demonized his political opponents, framing them as enemies of “the people” and threats to the nation and the State. Albeit treated as a quintessential case of right-wing populism, Bolsonaro’s discourse is just another drop in the ocean - “somewhat populist” and not strong enough to properly change the “populist” weather. All in all, his discourse embodied the idea of guardianship to safeguard the fatherland and, consequently, to deal with the perceived threats. This resulted in a staunch defense of illiberalism, which is manifest in attacks on minorities, on opposition’s rights, and on institutions such as the independent judiciary and the media.

This illiberal rhetoric, however, did not arise out of thin air. It emerged to the forefront of the national political scene partly due to what we propose are two sides of the same coin: (i) first, the demand on the part of voters. As Esther Solano puts it, “for those who support Bolsonaro, the belief is that collective struggle does not guarantee the conquest of more rights; rather, personal effort and meritocracy do so” (Solano, 2020: 216). Although this rejection of “collective struggle”

might hold for the most devoted among Bolsonaro's supporters, it can hardly be generalized without raising a series of issues – chief among them the fact that merely four years before Bolsonaro's rise, Brazilians gave PT its fourth presidential mandate in a row. The puzzle, thus, remains as to how Bolsonaro's discourse managed to amass support from a majority of voters. To solve this, one should look at what scholars have called the (ii) “perfect storm”. Starting in 2013, economic and political crises, corruption scandals, and security issues amounted to a multidimensional crisis that plunged government and regime legitimacy. Witnessing an all-time low level of regime legitimacy, democracy satisfaction, and support for democracy (according to 2018's Latinobarómetro), Brazil was engulfed in a toxic political atmosphere which displayed the political class at its worst (Hunter and Power, 2019). This was the perfect scenario for Bolsonaro's carnivalesque mockery and illiberal flaunting.

Finally, this paper has contributed to expounding the populist, nationalist, and patriotic strands which unite in Bolsonaro's discourse, providing quantifiable figures. This opens possibilities for future scholarship to research how and under what conditions each of these strands finds echo in the electorate. It also quantifies Bolsonaro's populism. Despite his often being regarded as a prototypical case of a far-right populist, the present study casts some shadow on this idea by revealing that, during the 2018 presidential campaign, Bolsonaro's discourse can only be classified as “somewhat populist.” His rhetoric displays inconsistent use of “in-group” signifiers, often fluctuating between nationalist, patriotic, and populist constructions of “the people.”

References

- Billig, Michael. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. SAGE Publications.
- Biroli, Flávia. (2017). “Gender, ‘Family Values,’ and Democracy.” In *Gênero, Neoconservadorismo e Democracia: Disputas e Retrocessos na América Latina*, ed. Flávia Biroli, Maria das D. C. Machado, and J. M. Vaggione. Brazil: Boitempo (in Portuguese).
- Brubaker, Rogers. (2019). “Populism and Nationalism.” *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 56.
- Burni, Aline and Eduardo R. Tamaki. (2021). “Populist Communication During the Covid-19 Pandemic: the Case of Brazil’s President Bolsonaro.” *Partecipazione e Conflitto*, Vol. 14(1).
- Canovan, Margaret. (1999). “Trust the People! Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy.” *Political Studies*, Vol. 47(1): 2–16.
- Castanho Silva, Bruno, Mario Fuks, and Eduardo R. Tamaki. (2021). “So Thin It’s Almost Invisible: Populist Attitudes and Voting Behavior in Brazil.” *Electoral Studies*, forthcoming.
- de Cleen, Benjamin. (2017). “Populism and Nationalism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*, ed. Paulina Ochoa Espejo Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser, Paul Taggart, and Pierre Ostiguy. Oxford University Press.
- de Cleen, Benjamin and Yannis Stavrakakis. (2017). “Distinctions and Articulations: A Discourse Theoretical Framework for the Study of Populism and Nationalism.” *Journal of the European Institute for Communication and Culture, Javnost - The Public*.
- de Cleen, Benjamin and Yannis Stavrakakis. (2020). “How Should we Analyze the Connections Between Populism and Nationalism: A Response to Rogers Brubaker.” *Nations and Nationalism*.
- Elchardus, Mark and Bram Spruyt. (2016). “Populism, Persistent Republicanism and Declinism: An Empirical Analysis of Populism as a Thin Ideology.” *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 51(1): 111 – 133.
- Freeden, Michael. (1996). *Ideology in Political Theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Gellner, Ernest. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press.
- Hameleers, Michael, Linda Bos, and Claes H. de Vreese. (2017). “‘They Did It’: The Effects of Emotionalized Blame Attribution in Populist Communication.” *Communication Research* pp. 870–900.
- Hawkins, Kirk A. (2009). “Is Chávez populist? Measuring populist discourse in comparative perspective.” *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 42(8): 1040–1067.

- Hawkins, Kirk A. (2010). *Venezuela's Chavismo and Populism in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, Kirk A., and Bruno Castanho Silva. (2018). "Textual Analysis: Big Data Approaches." In *The Ideational Approach to Populism: Theory, Method & Analysis*, ed. Kirk A. Hawkins, Ryan Carlin, Levente Littvay, and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser. Routledge.
- Hawkins, Kirk A., Mayavel Amado, and Stephen Cranney. (2010). "Beyond Populism: A Typology of Elite Political Discourse with Some Examples." *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association*.
- Hawkins, Kirk A., Rosario Aguilar, Bruno Castanho Silva, Erin K Jenne, Bojana Kocijan and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser. (2019). "Measuring Populist Discourse: The Global Populism Database." *Presented at the 2019 EPSA Annual Conference in Belfast, UK, June 22-24*.
- Hawkins, Kirk A., Ryan Carlin, Levente Littvay, and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser. (2018). *The Ideational Approach to Populism: Theory, Method & Analysis*. Routledge.
- Hunter, Wendy and Timothy J Power. (2019). "Bolsonaro and Brazil's illiberal backlash." *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 30(1): 68–82.
- Jagers, Jan and Stefaan Walgrave. (2007). "Populism as a Political Communication Style: An Empirical Study of Political Parties' Discourse in Belgium." *European Journal of Political Science*.
- Jenne, Erin K., Kirk A. Hawkins, and Bruno Castanho Silva. (2021). "Mapping Populism and Nationalism in Leader Rhetoric Across North America and Europe." *Studies in Comparative International Development*. Forthcoming.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. SAGE.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. (2011). "Computing Krippendorff's Alpha-reliability." *University of Pennsylvania Scholarly Commons Departmental Papers (ASC)*.
- Laclau, Ernesto. (2005). *On populist reason*. Verso.
- Loveman, Brian. (1994). "'Protected Democracies' and Military Guardianship: Political Transitions in Latin America, 1978 – 1993." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, Vol. 36(2): 105–189.
- Moffitt, Benjamin. (2015). "How to perform crisis: A model for understanding the key role of crisis in contemporary populism." *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 50(2): 189–217.
- Mouffe, Chantal. (2019). *Por um Populismo de Esquerda*. Autonomia Literaria (in Portuguese).

- Mudde, Cas and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser. (2017). *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- O'Donnel, Guillermo. (1979). "Tensions in the Bureaucratic-authoritarian State and the Question of Democracy." In *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America*, ed. David Collier. Princeton University Press.
- Reinemann, Carsten, Toril Aalberg, Frank Esser, Jesper Strömback, and Claes H. de Vreese. (2017). "Populist Political Communication: Toward a Model of Its Causes, Forms, and Effects." In *Populist Political Communication in Europe*, ed. Toril Aalberg, Frank Esser, Carsten Reinemann, Jesper Strömback, and Claes H. de Vreese. Routledge.
- Rooduijn, Matthijs. (2014). "The Mesmerising Message: The Diffusion of Populism in Public Debates in Western European Media." *Political Studies*, Vol. 62: 726–744.
- Rooduijn, Matthijs, Sarah L. de Lange, and Wouter van der Brug. (2014). "A Populist Zeitgeist? Programmatic Contagion by Populist Parties in Western Europe." *Party Politics*, Vol. 20(4).
- Singh, Prerna. (2021). "Populism, Nationalism, and Nationalist Populism." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, Vol. 56: 250–269.
- Smith, Peter H., and Cameron J. Sells. (2005). *Democracy in Latin America. Political Change in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Solano, Esther. (2020). "'It's all corrupt': The Roots of Bolsonarism in Brazil." In *The Emergence of Illiberalism: Understanding a Global Phenomenon*, ed. Boris Vormann and Michael D. Weinman. Routledge.
- Stanley, Ben. (2008). "The thin ideology of populism." *Journal of Political Ideologies*, Vol. 13(1): 95–110.
- Tajfel, Henri. (1982). *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Urbinati, Nadia. (2019). "Political Theory of Populism." *Annual Review of Political Science*. Vol. 22(1): 111–127.

A Drop in the Ocean or a Change in the Weather? Populism in Bolsonaro’s Campaign Revisited

Supplementary Materials

Table of Contents

A. Populism Rubric	24
B. Populism Scores	27
C. Rubrics.....	28
Speech 1	28
Speech 2	39
Speech 3	49
Speech 4	56
Speech 5	65
Speech 6	73
Speech 7	82
Speech 8	91
Speech 9	101
Speech 10	112

A. Populism Rubric

Populism Scores – Taken from the “Populism Rubric” (Hawkins, 2009):

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>Although Manichaeic, 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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.”</p>

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.

B. Populism Scores

Populism Scores – Taken from the “Populism Rubric” (Hawkins, 2009):

2. A speech in this category is extremely populist and comes very close to the ideal populist discourse. Specifically, the speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal populist discourse, and has few elements that would be considered non-populist.
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.
0. A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

References

Hawkins, Kirk A. (2009). “Is Chávez Populist? Measuring Populist Discourse in Comparative Perspective.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(8): 1040 – 1067.

C. Rubrics

Speech 1

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Campaign Launch

Date of Speech: July 07, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: 16/01/2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.5

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <p>“On one side, the left, and on the other the center. I would like to thank Geraldo Alckmin to have gathered what is the worst in Brazil. Something even worse than corruption, which is the ideological question that took part of Brazil”</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>“I would like to talk about Dilma’s reelection, her past and her party’s, or even better, her faction’s past, and I saw that we had to do something to change the future of this country”</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>“We have no television time, but we have something other parties don’t, and that’s you, my electors”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Although Manichaeic, 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.</p> <p>“The majority of the deputies were against me and tried to take me away from power”</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“we have to value this ministry (Sciences and Technology)”</p>

<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <p>“in this amazing fatherland we used to all live at harmony: the Jews, the Arabs, the French, the Germans and many Asian countries, but PT tried to split us apart”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.”</p>

<p>“the Parliament is the problem, they want to do something different that has to be done. They are syndicate leaders and should not be there, and have to be removed”</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Even though the discourse is pretty critic and uses harsh language, democratic principles are respected.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): The speech starts with a little introduction about Bolsonaro’s political career then slips into a short but strong populism, with mentions to the many things that have subverted the previous government into failure while he mentions some things, he thought should be done to improve the country. However, this Populism quickly transforms into Nationalism since the previous government has tried to harm the nation, and he presents many solutions to save the people from this current state. Thus, this speech presents us both ideas of Populism and Nationalism, but the latter being more prevalent to the former.

Nationalist elements: “I might have Messiah (Messiah) in my middle name but I am not the one who will save this fatherland; we all will”

“we know what’s in game: the future of this nation”

“to look for a different Brazil, a Brazil we deserve”

“to take this part of the population out of misery, to get them out of colonialism”

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: PSL conference: Official launch of his candidacy for President

Date of Speech: July 22th, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: 03/11/2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.4 (after first review, talk) (see last page)

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. **Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeic worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.**

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeic 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “On one side would be the left, on the other, the center. I even want to thank Geraldo Alckmin for having combined the elite of the worst in Brazil with him” - “Here in this wonderful homeland all live in harmony: Jews; Arabs; French; Germans; countries; all live 	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “(we) have to appoint Ministry by the criterion of competence. It does not matter who it is, its mission, its color, its religion (...)” - “Once again thank you Geraldo Alckmin for uniting the scum of Brazilian politics. Without saying that I am accusing all the deputies of this party. At least 40% of these deputies are with us and do not agree

<p>in harmony here, it's a wonderful homeland that the PT tried to divide us”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “(...) that we, take out the unrecoverable, but us humans and most of the parliamentarians (...)” <p>Makes clear that he thinks some of the “humans”, who are deeply aligned to the opposition, are unrecoverable.</p> <p>Although, as it’s written on the opposite box, he claims that ‘not all the deputies of PSDB are the scum of Brazilian politics, claiming too that at least 40% of them are with him because they do not agree with the actions taken by the party leaders’, he adopts an intolerant position towards his opposition.</p>	<p>with the actions taken by these leaders”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let's unite white and black people, homos and straight, also trans, no problem. Each one does what it wants, be happy. Let's unite the Northeastern and Southern people. Let's stifle these small separatist movements that we see in Brazil. Unite rich and poor. It has become a crime in Brazil to be rich! Let's unite employers and employees, not sow discord between them. One needs the other” <p>This part seems to represent an idea that there’s the possibility of natural, justifiable differences of opinion, <i>but</i> he does not mention the opposition, the left or the PT.</p>
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Brazil can’t take other 4 years of PT or PSDB! Together, let’s recover our Brazil, let’s give hope to everyone, let’s unite this people” <p>He tries to tie his ideas to figures like his</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>economist Paulo Guedes, the general Augusto Eleno, and publisher and businessman Roberto Marinho who was responsible for the creation of Grupo Globo (one of the biggest media conglomerates)</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>The “common, religious and from the traditional family” men are seen as the embodiment of the national idea. There is no single, strong and evident passage that sustains this idea, but it’s something that becomes clear as we advance through his speech. There is also a clear distinction between this “common man” and his “leftist counterpart”.</p> <p>But there is no reference to the “popular will”, to the “will of the people” as being something that drives him.</p>	<p>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.”</p> <p>The majority shifts and changes across issues. The common man is not romanticized, and the notion of citizenship is broad and legalistic.</p> <p>Even though he accepts the majority as being a sum of different people, from different places and with different backgrounds (economically and socially), it is not something that changes across issues. It’s a solid construction with almost no space to maneuver</p>

The evil is embodied in a minority 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.

- “On one side would be the left, on the other, the center. I even want to thank Geraldo Alckmin for having combined the elite of the worst in Brazil with him”
- “As for the other side, I say, it is something as or more serious than corruption, which is the ideological issue that took part, which took over much of Brazil”
- “Here everyone lives in harmony, it’s a wonderful homeland that the PT tried to divide”
- “I use to say that most parliamentarians want to act differently than how partisan leaders, who are actually union leaders, act. Let’s get the union out of the national congress” (**Union here is the same as workers’ organizations**)
- “You (militaries from the navy and air force) are attacked daily, accused of the greatest Absurd by that left that is there, you know why? Because you are the last obstacle to socialism!”
- “We will not accept Socialism!”

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.

<p>When talking about the opposition, about PT and the left, he uses bellicose terms like “factions”. In addition, he ties the opposition, the left and PT, to Socialism and Communism, framing them as enemies as well.</p> <p>His enemies are also traditional parties like PSDB, even though he mentions it only 2 times.</p>	
<p>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. He does not utilize terms such as “revolution” or “liberation”, but the evil minority that was recently in charge, subverted the system to its own interests (ideological interests), against those of the good, traditional people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Brazil can’t take another 4 years of PT or PSDB. Together let’s rescue our Brazil, let’s give hope to everyone, let’s unite this people!” - “We will seek to revoke the constitutional amendment 81 which relativized private property. Rural landowners, urban landowners, pay attention to this: the left over the course of its thirteenth year has been seeking ways through legislation to impose its will, and private property has never been respected by the left 	<p>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.”</p>

<p>because there nobody ever worked, always living from work of others”</p> <p>- “We want, dear economist Paulo Guedes, to really seek the liberation of our economy to pursue liberalism. We want to privatize, maybe even extinguish most of the state”</p> <p>He utilizes term as “recover” when mentioning Brazil, as if he is promising and calling the “people” to save, to rescue Brazil.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>At this point, there is no encouragement to illegal or violent actions. He seems to “respect” the formal rights and liberties of the opposition, even though he attacks them during most of his discourse. There are no mentions of non-democratic means nor mentions of any attack on natural rights of his opposition.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

Overall, his discourse presents clear populist elements. Even though he has a clear enemy, traditional parties (PSDB and PT) with more vigorous opposition to PT and the left, he does not refer to the "popular will" or the "will of the people." The common person is romanticized, but there is no mention or attempt to build a notion of "popular will." He tries, though, to create an image of "us" as being a sum of him and the ones who support him; in this notion, he talks in a way where it creates an idea that "everyone" (his followers) are together and will act together on his government. He does not exaggerate the use of cosmic proportions, not openly, but when he talks about what the opposition has done during the last 13 years of government, there is a faint

trace of cosmic proportions that can be perceived. There are also arguments for systemic change, but no "everything counts" approach or mention: he does not encourage illegal or violent acts and does not disrespect formal rights and liberties, not even when talking about the opposition.

I gave 0.9 to it because it's closer to 1, as it presents strong, clearly populist elements, but it is not above 1, closer to 2, because it has no strong presence of an apparent "popular will." It's closer to 0 than to 2 because it lacks some notion of a popular will.

AFTER REVISITING:

So, after reading the Nationalism Rubric and reading the paper that Kirk, Bruno, and Erin are writing, I've realized that Bolsonaro's speech has some populist traits, but it tempers with some nationalist ones.

The nationalist elements that are present are:

from the rubric:

There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation," an example:

"(...)we the Brazilian people (*brasileiros*) say that there is something more, way more important than our lives: our freedom! Because the men or women arrested, have no life! Let's make Brazil different with your strength! I am here because I believe in you; you are here because you believe in Brasil; this Brasil is ours! Our flag is green and yellow!"

Even though there are no *family metaphors* on the rubric, he utilizes words like "nation" and "we Brazilian people." Here is worth mentioning that I believe he does that mostly because words like "people" are heavily linked to the left, to the PT - his main opposition -, so I think that this might be a strategy to distance himself from what he frames as the "enemies."

from the article:

There is the presence of a rhetorical frame that argues for protecting the status of the dominant nation at home to save the nation: Here is worth highlighting that the group that he makes reference to, the ones that he talks to, are not the currently political dominant ones, but instead, they are seen as the ones with the true "values," the ones who are in favor and fight for the traditional family - on a heavily conservative way.

And here is the key point: " 'We' or the 'people' is equated with 'the nation' and repeated references are made to the name of the nation"; examples are:

"I know what is at stake in this approaching moment: is the destiny of this great nation called Brazil."

"I do this for the children of Brazil; I do it for the women of Brazil."

Speech 2

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Bolsonaro’s speech at Araçatuba

Date of Speech: August 23, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: January 23, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.5

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <p>“With us there will not be the political criminality we see today because we will not give them public money”</p> <p>“we need someone to approach democratic countries and not Mercosur countries because of an ideologic question. We need</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>someone who understands the ideas of free market”</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>No important historical references made</p>
<p>Although Manichaeian, 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.</p> <p>“everyone here believes in the future of Brazil”</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <p>“We here do not want Brazil to approach what has been happening to Venezuela, which was one of the richest countries in South America, and from where people are fleeing it due to the dictatorship”</p> <p>“we cannot take another mandate of either PT or PSDB. We need someone who respects the Brazilian family values”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>“yes, we are different from these who have governed us from the past 20 years”</p>	<p>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.”</p>

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.

“we represent a new form of politics, we say what Brazil needs to hear, we show that Brazil has a way of getting better”

“we are one people, one only nation. Together we can make Brazil a great nation again”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): Despite many populist ideas being present in his speech, they are used to emphasize the importance of Brazil to the Brazilian people and how the government cannot fail the people. This speech is basically a repetition of many speeches he gave around the country, with references to some things he would like to see changing in the nation and trying to please his voters, as well as convincing people to vote for him. However, as it is common with this leader, we can see that he embodies the evil minority into the former leaders that preceded him, and blames them for everything that has been going wrong with the country.

Country: Brazil

Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Bolsonaro’s speech at Araçatuba

Date of Speech: August 23, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: 03/12/2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.6

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>This one does not have a particular passage that can be utilized, mostly because he does not focus on a narrow or specific issue that can divide the people, nor does he use a Manichaeian vision with the implication that there is nothing in between. Even though – at times – he focuses on certain things like the police, he does not “separate” the people. Although there are passages that, even if not the best, can help us:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “And what I want, if that’s God’s will, is to be from next January onwards, not an army captain no longer, but a soldier of our Brazil” - “Brazil has everything, everything, to be a great nation, but it goes through, and I repeat, <i>your</i> hands the decision to

	<p>put better people in Brasilia so that together with the President they can make laws, revoke others, aiming the common interest”</p>
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Our big problem in Brazil is a political issue: Or we put people like us in politics or we have no future, and people like us are honest people, people who believe in God, people who are patriotic” - “The great example we get out of there is that we can not play games with politics. We in Brazil will not be able to take another PT or PSDB cycle” 	<p>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.</p>
<p>Although Manichaeic, 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We are different from those that govern us over 20 years PT and PSDB. 	<p>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.</p>

<p>With us You will be in first place, you will be our bosses”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Take the supreme federal court, which has declared unconstitutional my law of printed vote, even so, even with distrust we will keep going till the end. They continue to attack us daily, but we have something that other parties do not have: we have the people on our side. Good men and women who want a better future for their country, let's unite all of you in this common cause”. 	
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “With us there will be no such human rights politicking. This banditry is going to die because we will not release union resources to them. To a great extent these NGOs do a disservice to our Brazil” - “Together we have how to unite our Brazilian people, who have been disunited in particular by the left in recent years” <p>Regarding the left, he even says that they kept Brazil “tied with Mercosul because of ideological principles”;</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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.”</p>

<p>their “immiseration” or bondage, even if technically it comes about through elections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Together we have how to unite our Brazilian people, who have been disunited in particular by the left in recent years” - “Change radically this way of doing politics” - We are different from those that govern us over 20 years PT and PSDB. With us You will be in first place, you will be our bosses. Together we have how to change Brazil, we will get no other opportunity!” 	
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “In 1955 when I was born on March 21 my father's neighbor screamed: it is male or female?”. At that time it was not prejudice. And it will continue being: born as either male or female, period! Gender ideology is the “<i>ponta da praia</i>”! With us it is man or woman and period. <p><i>Ponta da praia</i> is a reference to the Military base at Restinga de Marambaia, in Rio de Janeiro: This place, which was located at the “tip of the beach” (<i>ponta da praia</i>) and was a known as a torture and execution place for political detainees during the dictatorship.</p>	<p>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.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

Bolsonaro's speech presents evident populist traits, although it tempers with a few nationalist ones. There is cosmic proportion, even if not highly exaggerated or constant. There is the presence of a "will of the people," a "common will" that unites his supporters. In this case:

"We are different from those that govern us over 20 years PT and PSDB. With us, You will be in the first place, you will be our bosses" his phrase is very similar to what Hugo Chavez once said: "You, the people, are the giant that has awoken. I, your humble soldier, will do only what you say".

He frames his opposition, the left, and even mainstream party PSDB as the enemy, the evil that was destroying Brazil and his people. At this speech, he goes even further, attacking NGOs and the "people from Human Rights."

He calls for changes; he claims that "the left and PSDB (mainstream right-wing party)" has destroyed our country and made the people suffer, so he advocates for changes on "the way of doing politics," even though he does not specify which particular changes and how to do them.

That being said, this can be considered a "systemic change," but it's not utilized in a populist way. I'd say it has some traces of populism - like when he says that they will/they need to radically change this current way of doing politics - but it's not that much.

There is no evident adoption of an "everything counts" approach. He does say that "With us, there will be no such human rights politicking. This banditry is going to die because we will not release union resources to them," but it's not openly anti-democratic or going against liberties and civil rights. There is this thing about "Ponta da Praia" which I mentioned in the last box. Besides that, he does utilize bellicose language when referring to the opposition, saying words like "this banditry is going to die."

Even if he utilizes words like "homeland" and "nation," it is not used in a Nationalist way. Now, about nationalist traits:

There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation," an example:

- "We speak what Brazil needs to hear, we show that Brazil has a way, but this solution obviously passes through the hands of each one of you. Our big problem in Brazil is a political issue: Or we put people like us in politics, or we have no future, and people like us are honest people, people who believe in God, patriotic people";

He claims that the Brazilian people, the "core nation," would be people that are in favor of the "traditional family" and that "praise God."

- "Together, we can unite our Brazilian people who have been disunited in particular by the left in the last years. We are one country, one nation, one nation, one green, and yellow heart. Together we can really make Brazil a great nation.

Even though there are no family metaphors on the rubric, he utilizes words like "nation" and "we Brazilian people." Here is worth mentioning that I believe he does that mostly because words like "people" are heavily linked to the left, to the PT - his main opposition -, so I think that this might be a strategy to distance himself from what he frames as the "enemies."

There is the presence of a rhetorical frame that argues for protecting the status of the dominant nation at home to save the nation: Here is worth highlighting that the group that he makes reference to, the ones that he talks to, are not the currently political dominant ones, but instead they are seen as the ones with the true "values," the ones who are in favor and fight for the traditional family - on a heavily conservative way:

- "We need someone sitting in the presidential chair, as I said, to respect the traditional Brazilian family. We will have God above all as our motto. We need someone who really restores the power of teacher authority in the classroom".

And here is the key point: " 'We' or the 'people' is equated with 'the nation' and repeated references are made to the name of the nation."

Speech 3

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at Porto Velho

Date of Speech: August 31, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: February 14, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.0

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“We want to unite Brazil from North to South, East to West”</p> <p>“For that to happen, we need a State that does not intervene, one that charges less taxes, one that respects who wants to work”</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>mystical connections.</p> <p>No historical references mentioned in his speech nor any cosmic proportion concept applied</p>
<p>Although Manichaeism, 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.</p> <p>“We will kick gender ideology and Communism out of here”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“They [congressman] want to contribute to the growth of Brazil”</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>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.”</p> <p>“The people cannot continue being poor because of the lack of good politicians” “The mission to save Brazil has to do with all of us” “... a country where the family values are respected”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“We have everything to become a great nation, we just need to vote consciously to do so”</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This is a short speech lacking many of the common elements of the other speeches he delivered, such as the lack of any mention of his competitors or blaming PT for having doomed the country. Nevertheless, the only populist element present here is the attack to the Communist ideology. The rest of the speech is basically a support to the remaining candidates of the state that belong to the same party as Bolsonaro does.

Country: Brazil

Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Bolsonaro’s speech at Porto Velho, Roraima

Date of Speech: August 31, 2018.

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: 03/12/2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.1

0 **A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.**

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “There are a lot of good people in another party. We want to unite and unite Brazil.” - “We respect everyone who supports other candidates: they are welcome” - “We have how to change the destiny of Brazil we want to unite all from north to south from East to West”.
<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “17 years that I stayed in our beloved Brazilian army” - “Four years ago I decided to run for the presidency of the republic. We had no

<p>his or her ideas by tying them to national and religious leaders that are generally revered.</p>	<p>party, we knew that no one would want to join us and we would practically have to rely only on you”</p>
<p>Although Manichaeism, 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.</p>	<p>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. There is no reference to the popular will or something close to that. He does say that he has something that the others do not: The people; but that is as far as it goes.</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let us classify the actions of the MST as terrorism. Those who invade property in the countryside or in the city are not citizens and has to be treated with the rigors of the law” - “Let's boot the gender ideology, let's sweep away communism and the São Paulo forum” 	<p>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.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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.”</p>

<p>the people from their “immiseration” or bondage, even if technically it comes about through elections.</p> <p>There is the presence of an evil minority who was recently in charge and subverted the system to its own interests, but it does not go as far as arguing for a systemic change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “This Brazil besides being great is a rich country and its people cannot continue being poor for lack of politicians who are not ashamed” 	
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let us classify the actions of the MST as terrorism. Those who invade property in the countryside or in the city are not citizens and has to be treated with the rigors of the law” 	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let’s vote well, with all the respect that everyone deserves”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

That was a short speech, and there were only a few populist elements. He does identify and frame a minority as being the "evil," the "enemy," but it is only on a certain part of his discourse. There is the presence of an evil minority who was recently in charge and subverted the system to its own interests, but it does not go as far as arguing for a systemic change. It does argue for a change when he says things like "save our Brazil," but that is it; there is no clear nor explicit strategy of how to change the system – besides voting for him. There is a somewhat subtle presence of an "everything counts" approach, but as I said, it is rather subtle. When talking to the opposition, he utilizes bellicose language, even further referring to terrorism.

That is all. There are no references to the popular will, to a "general will," no use of cosmic proportion, and no Manichaeian distinction nor a dualistic one.

Speech 4

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at Commercial and Business Association in Juiz de Fora

Date of Speech: September 6, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: January 30, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.2

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“Brazil, why are we like this? We have to look for the origin of the problem, which is political education”</p> <p>“Let’s look for partnerships around the world, countries which have a better economy than ours”</p>
<p>The moral significance of the items mentioned in the speech is heightened by</p>	<p>The discourse will probably not refer to any reified notion of history or use any cosmic</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>“I am from a poor family, but from the good times, when there was no poverty like there is today” “They lost in 64, lost in 2016, and will lose in 2018”</p>	<p>proportions. References to the spatial and temporal consequences of issues will be limited to the material reality rather than any mystical connections.</p>
<p>Although Manichaeic, 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.</p> <p>“We have everything, but look at what we are not” “Either we change Brazil now, or we will not have another opportunity”</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <p>“...In the massacre the Left has done over the armed forces, since that is the last step before the instauration of Socialism”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>“We cannot continue with this division PT-PSDB”</p>	<p>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.”</p> <p>“Brazil needs someone who takes the State away from the ones who produce, since because of that no one wants to be a producer anymore”</p> <p>“We can even make mistakes, but we will not be accused of information omission nor corruption”</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>

shows a worthy opponent.

“Let’s make a government where we will be slaves of the law and serve you, the population”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This discourse mainly focuses on repetitions of things that have been said in previous speeches and talks mainly about campaign promises. However, there are a few populist elements present in Bolsonaro’s speech, such as the idea of the union of the people under a common cause (which could be understood as trying to drive the current ones in power away from it and making sure that their Socialist ideology does not spread throughout the nation). For this, Bolsonaro once more claims that he is not strong by himself, but again mentions he needs the union of the people (although using this idea in a more nationalist way).

“We have to unite, under one flag and one name”

“I am not this nation’s savior, I know my limits, but we can save the country if we work together. We can change Brazil’s destiny”

“The government does not allow the market to self-regulate. The countries who adopted free-market premises have worked out”

Country: Brazil

Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at the Business and Commercial association at Rio de Janeiro.

Date of Speech: September 6th, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: December 11, 2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>There is no Manichaeian nor dualistic vision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Enough of eroding family values, gender ideology, politically correct! No more dividing us” - “Let's make a Brazil equal for all of us, but looking upwards, not equal to misery as the left has always done in the whole world, and will not do in Brazil! They lost in 64, lost in 2016 and will lose in 2018”
<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let's make a Brazil equal for all of us, but looking upwards, not equal to misery as the left has always done in the whole world, and will not do in Brazil! They lost in 64, lost in 2016 and will lose in 2018.” - “Or we change Brazil now or we won't have another opportunity” 	
<p>Although Manichaeian, 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.</p> <p>There is no clear reference to the “will of the people” as he does not utilize those words, <i>but</i> there are references to the “people” being in his favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “My identity, my virtue that is similar to that of you who are here, overcomes it all! We do not have partisan funds or television time, but we have the trust of the people and the faith in God that we can change the destiny of Brazil” - “God willing, and if this is his will, we will make a government where we will be slaves of the Law and employee of you” 	<p>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.</p>

<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <p>There is no certain passage that can be used, but in his speech, he builds the idea that the evil is embodied in his mainstream opposition: The left and PT, and PSDB.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>There are arguments for systemic change even though he does not utilize words like “revolution” and “liberation”.</p> <p>He claims that he wants to change the politics and some ministries like when he says that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Ministry of the environment nowadays suffers influences from foreign NGOs. Everything the environment can do in one of the few things that works in Brazil, which is agribusiness, this Ministry does” - “Let us put in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, not Marighella's driver who is now there now, the (?) terrorist Aloisio Nunes Ferreira, but someone with an Open Business Vision, free trade, from pro-liberalism largely” 	<p>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.”</p>
<p>Because of the moral baseness of the threatening minority, non-democratic means</p>	<p>Formal rights and liberties are openly respected, and the opposition is treated with</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>courtesy and as a legitimate political actor.</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "God willing, and if this is his will, we will make a government where we will be slaves of the Law and employee of you"
--	--

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech contains a few populist elements but is highly tempered with nationalist elements (as I'll explain further). There is no Manichaeian nor dualistic division, no "Black and white" division at all. As you follow his discourse, it is possible to realize that he divides him and his opposition, PSDB and the left, mainly the PT. But this division that is built is not made in a way that there can't be anything in between.

There is the presence of Cosmic proportion, as he claims that there are things that the left does on the whole world - negative things - and even mentions that this is the time to change Brazil and that they won't have another chance.

There is even this part:

"Why must we continue to think that we are going to hand over our arable land to foreign capital, which in this case is China, that is buying. We can not give up our food security. China is not buying in Brazil; it is buying Brazil. When we wake up, it may be too late".

There is no mention of the "will of the people," "popular will," or things like that even though he mentions that they have the support of the people, that they have the people beside them. There are a few passages that somewhat resemble Hugo Chávez speeches:

"God willing, and if this is his will, we will make a government where we will be slaves of the Law and employee of you."

The evil minority is clearly the opposition, the left, mainly PT and PSDB; even though they are just framed as evil enemies, there is no use of Manichaeian division.

The systemic change arguments presented are not that strong or not openly utilized by using words and terms like "revolution" and "liberation." Instead, there is the idea that the political system and some ministries need to change, but I think that the absence of those specific terms and words (or even similar) makes this trait not that much populist.

And there is no sign of an everything counts approach.

Now for the Nationalist traits:

from the rubric:

There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation" in his discourse; he highlights the importance of respecting the family and upholding traditional values.

from the article:

There is the presence of a rhetorical frame that argues for protecting the status of the dominant nation at home to save the nation: Here is worth highlighting that the group that he makes reference to, the ones that he talks to, are not the currently political dominant ones, but instead, they are seen as the ones with the true "values," the ones who are in favor and fight for the traditional family - on a heavily conservative way.

At last, his speech looks more like a military leader instead of a political leader.

"The massacre made on the Armed Forces in recent years by PT and PSDB have created commissions of truth, among other aberrations, that attacks us because we Armed Forces are the last obstacle to socialism, we do not give ourselves because we have always been on the side of the Brazilian people" (Sounds confusing but that's how he said)

This particular passage is extremely important to illustrate what I've written because here, you can see that there is also the presence of something that is the "enemy of the nation," not only the "enemy of the people" as those are different.

Finally, the notion of "people" that he builds is different from the "people" in a populist way: it is made in a nationalist way, broader, bigger, and seems to go beyond the government.

Speech 5

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech after being stabbed

Date of Speech: September 16, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: January 30, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <p>“This in Brazil is a game of power, the domination of a nation”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>“What is in question here is not my future; it’s the future of the 200-something million Brazilians. To where is Brazil going?”</p>	<p>mystical connections.</p>
<p>Although Manichaeism, 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.</p> <p>“PT does not try to hide what it is doing anymore” “PT will go looking for a social control of the media” “If Haddad is elected, democracy will be over”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>or the capitalist, industrialized nations or international financiers or simply an ideology such as neoliberalism and capitalism.</p> <p>“Put yourselves in the place of the prisoner there in Curitiba, with all of his wealth and all of his supporters; would you passively accept to be thrown in jail and not try to break out? Since he hasn’t, we can assume that it is because he has a Plan B ... I cannot see this coming out any other way that is not favorable to him”</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>“The real question, maybe even more severe than corruption, is the ideological positioning”</p>	<p>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.”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

“The great fear now is not to lose against a candidate, but to lose because of a fraud”
He talks a lot about possible frauds in the elections due to the voting system, but he positions himself against it”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): In this speech, Bolsonaro talks to the people days after being stabbed and going through surgery. Thus, he speaks slowly and with a lot of pause, with what could be a sign of pain. He mostly talks about the possibility of frauds in the elections due to the voting system being electronic and how Dilma Rousseff vetoed his proposal for paper votes in 2016. For the rest of the speech, he claims that Brazil cannot go forward with PT in power, but his speech is more aggressive on this point than what is normal and expected of him. He mentions with some obscurity the ideas that democracy would be over if Haddad (his competitor) won the elections and mentions that Brazil is a constant change of powers hinting that the two main parties are always in command to fulfill their interests. There are no other populist elements apart from these two mentioned.

Country: Brazil

Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech after he was stabbed

Date of Speech: September 16th, 2018

Category: Campaign (?)

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: December 11, 2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

0 **A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.**

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “What is at stake at the moment is the future of all of you who are there, even you who support the PT, you are a human being too. I see a lot of PT changing sides” <p>There is no Manichaeian or Dualistic vision or approach to this speech. There is no black and white distinction either.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>There is no particular passage that can be used here, but his speech lacks the use of cosmic</p>

<p>his or her ideas by tying them to national and religious leaders that are generally revered.</p>	<p>proportion. His main focus is the possibility of fraud (that will be explained).</p>
<p>Although Manichaeism, 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.</p>	<p>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. There is no mention or whatsoever of a “popular will” or “will of the people.” There are only a few mentions to the people and even to Brazil.</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The PT has discovered the path to power: electronic voting” - “If you read carefully these two documents, among other barbarities You will see there clearly written that the PT will seek the social control of the media. You will lose your freedom, I know that not everyone has nowadays, but I know that whoever has it will completely lose this freedom” 	<p>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.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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.”</p>

<p>“revolution” or “liberation” of the people from their “immiseration” or bondage, even if technically it comes about through elections.</p>	<p>His speech focuses on a particular issue: the possibility of fraud in the elections. Going further, there is no argument for a systemic change. There is indeed the presence of an idea that “an evil minority who was recently in charge, subverted the system to its own interest,” but there is no systemic change.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>It does not openly justify non-democratic means, but it has a solid and constant conspiratorial tone, attacking his opposition, accusing them of plotting frauds. It is an attempt to call the people to fight against the opponent who is already plotting an electoral fraud to prevent him from winning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “That I ask you to put yourself in the place of the convict who is there in Curitiba, with all his popularity, with all his possible wealth, with all his traffic along with dictatorships of the whole world that support themselves, especially in Cuba. Would you passively accept, bovinely go to jail, you would not try an escape? Well if you did not try to run away with everything at your side it's because you have a plan B. What is plan B of this convict, that poor man back there who stole all our hopes? I can not think of anything else unless Plan B materializes in a fraud unfavorable to 	<p>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.</p>

<p>Lula, or better in favor of Lula. We have elections now. When I saw Dilma Rousseff's reinstatement in 2014, I thought to myself: "We can not wait for 2018 because Lula will be a candidate, they will not leave. Look how Brazil is, where we are going, in every aspect without exception and I always used to say, and I still say, that as serious as corruption is the ideological question"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- "So this possibility of fraud in the second round is concrete"	
---	--

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech contains a few populist elements, but it lacks the presence of a Dualistic or Manichaeic division, a division that has nothing in between; it lacks the use of cosmic proportion and the argument for systemic changes.

On the other side, there is a clear presence of an enemy, an evil minority who has "figured" the path to power, and that is "now" (in his words) openly plotting an electoral fraud to prevent him from being elected. There is a solid and constant bellicose and conspiratorial tone; in that way, his speech is highly conspiratorial. There is this idea that the enemy, an evil ruling minority who was recently in charge, subverted and usurped the power from the people.

This speech also lacks nationalist traits; even though he claims that Brazil needs to be saved, it is not constant nor strong enough.

Overall, this speech is more conspiratorial, and I personally think it marks a passage between his "less radical" self to a more radical one - to better understand this, we need to also know the background: it was a speech that he gave on his hospital bed, right after being stabbed during a political event where he walked among the electorate from Juiz de Fora.

Speech 6

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at Avenida Paulista

Date of Speech: September 30, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: February 10, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <p>“A change of ‘PT not anymore, PT not ever again’.”</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“Brazil is ours, the good people, workers, who do not want gender ideology in classrooms”</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“We will fight until the last minute, this is the last chance we have to get away from this 30-yr old politics of PT and PSDB”</p>
<p>Although Manichaeic, 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.</p> <p>“We want change: get away from Communism and from the form of Politics in Venezuela”</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <p>“We will fight until the last minute, this is the last chance we have to get away from this 30-yr old politics of PT and PSDB”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>“This movement comes from the ones who have suffered and want changes” “We are different from them, we are not Left, we abhor Communism, we abhor Socialism”</p>	<p>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.”</p>

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.

“We want a president who can appoint compromised and competent ministers, according to what is best to Brazilians”
“This is our country”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): The discourse, although short, presents us an intense use of Populist elements, but all of them making reference to a more nationalistic approach of things, giving the idea that the will of the Brazilians has to be the ruling ideology in a government. This is what Bolsonaro is proposing to the people in this speech, thus claiming to be the change and the rupture with past forms of government and presenting a government focused on giving the people what they want. There are not many strong Populist elements present that have nothing to do with Nationalism.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Av. Paulista

Date of Speech: September 30, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: February 8, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): **0.5**

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Brazil is ours, good people, workers, conservatives, Christians who preserve family values, who do not want gender ideology in classrooms, who want Brazil doing business with the whole world, without ideological bias” - “Brazil is ours. We are different from them, we are not leftists, we abhor communism, we abhor socialism” 	<p>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.</p>

<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “It’s the last chance we have to get away from this politics that have been plundering the Brazilian people for 30 years so far” 	<p>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.</p>
<p>Although Manichaeic, 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.</p> <p>Even though he doesn’t say “popular will” directly, this passage evokes the idea of something close to that: the interests of the people.</p> <p>It is not that populist, in a way that “popular will” would be, but it is something that needs to be acknowledged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We want a president with 	<p>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.</p>

<p>exemption, who is free to appoint a team of ministers, technical and competent, and committed to the interests of the Brazilian people and not of political parties”</p>	
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “It’s the last chance we have to get away from this politics that have been plundering the Brazilian people for 30 years so far” - “Enough of PT and PSDB, Brazil is ours, it’s mine, it’s yours” 	<p>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.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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.”</p>

<p>technically it comes about through elections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We want change, we want to move away from communism, give a brush of the politics that exist in Venezuela. We do not want this for our Brazil” - “Let's fight until the last second! It's the last chance we have to get away from this politics that have been plundering the Brazilian people for 30 years so far” 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>There is nothing that goes with the “everything counts approach,” but he does not say anything that suggests that he respects the rights and liberties of the opposition, but he also does not say anything that let us think otherwise.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech is very short, so I tried to think of intensity over quantity. I then searched how intense the populist traits were in his speech.

There is a clear Manichaeian distinction when he talks about the "good people," there is also cosmic proportion even though it is not that intense.

There are also a few mentions to the people and what he calls "the interest of the people": Even though he doesn't say "popular will" in a direct way, that passage in question evokes the idea of something close to that. It is not that populist, in a way that "popular will" would be, but it needs to be acknowledged.

The enemy is not that present in his speech. It is something more subtle, but that can be perceived.

There is nothing that goes with the "everything counts" approach.

He does not say anything that suggests that he respects the rights and liberties of the opposition, but he also does not say anything that lets us think otherwise.

In terms of Nationalist traits, there are a few things that are worth highlighting:

- There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation";
- There is the presence of a rhetorical frame that argues for protecting the status of the dominant nation at home to save the nation: Here is worth highlighting that the group that he makes reference to, the ones that he talks to, are not the currently political dominant ones, but instead they are seen as the ones with the true "values," the ones who are in favor and fight for the traditional family - on a heavily conservative way.

Speech 7

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech one day before the first round of elections

Date of Speech: October 6, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: February 11, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.2

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <p>He mentions many ways in which PT has divided the country and the people, and how this division is a symbol of Communism</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>“We will heal the ones who support ‘free Lula’ through work”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Although Manichaeic, 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“We lack compromised politicians with the country and not their political allies”</p> <p>“Our proposal shows that Brazil can work out”</p> <p>“Our ministries seek only fulfill their political parties’ interests. I promise to have my own freedom to choose ministries that I think will suit the country”</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority whose specific identity will vary according to context. Domestically, in Latin America it is often an economic elite, perhaps the</p>	<p>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</p>

<p>“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.</p> <p>“We have to get away one and for all from Communism and Socialism, not to follow the same path that has haunted Venezuela. Let’s make Brazil big. Let’s be proud of this country anymore. Socialism and Communism did not work out, so let’s get away from it and not closer to it like PT wants to”</p>	<p>to maintain a positive tone and keep passions low.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.”</p> <p>The only change he mentions is that, by electing him, PT will not be in power anymore and this is already a change for the country</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

	<p>“If all of you get one more vote from someone you know, we will win this election in the first round”</p>
--	--

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This is a very repetitive speech, and completely nationalist. There is no strong presence of Populist elements in this speech, as he is basically asking people to either vote for him or to convince others to vote for him so he can have a guaranteed win in this round in the elections. There are references to the candidate being Communist and Socialist and that they should not be trusted because their past administrations have drowned Brazil in the crisis that it is today. He claims for the union of the people to improve the general lives of Brazilians.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Facebook live 1 day before the elections

Date of Speech: October 6, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: February 8, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “But at the moment it is polarized: it is us and the PT; is green and yellow Brazil and they representing Cuba, representing the government of Venezuela, with its flag that is red and with the sickle and hammer on top of it. Let's change Brazil” - “There are many people who voted for PT and are coming to our side, many people who back there decided 	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let's unite the Brazilian people. Our flag is green and yellow, our heart is green and yellow” - “The union of all, my people. Let's unite, let's unite this Brazil here. [...] but to unite by example, by dedication, by love of the Fatherland, by respect for the family, for the desire to really move away from socialism, communism, and freedom from this ghost that happens in Venezuela(...). Let's move away from that”

<p>not to vote anymore for P, that woke up and is on our side now”</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>He tries to justify the moral significance of his ideas by tying them to the bible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “The seed we preach through Brazil is the one that is in the book of John 8:32: And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free”	<p>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.</p>

<p>Although Manichaeism, 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>His speech doesn’t seem to have any passage that indicates the importance of the “popular will.” It does communicate a lot with the people since it is supposed to be a “live talk with the people,” and he thanks the people for their support and acknowledges them, but that is as far as it goes.</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let's make Brazil big, Let's be proud again of this Homeland, let's move away from what did not work out: socialism, communism that is embodied in the PT, in the PC do B, and PSOL” 	<p>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.</p>

<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let's make Brazil big, Let's be proud again of this Homeland, let's move away from what did not work out: socialism, communism that is embodied in the PT, in the PC do B, and PSOL” - “But [Roraima’s potential] is suffocated by environment and indigenous issues. Let’s solve this, let’s fuse the ministries of agriculture and environment. It will end this fight” 	<p>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.”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>There is no presence of an “everything counts” approach. Even though he disrespects his opposition a few times, it does not disrespect liberties and formal rights.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

In this speech, he focuses a lot on the elections (that took place one day after), so in this case, he respects the election even though he claims that the ballots can be rigged, his opinion on that subject is not that strong as it was on the day he got stabbed.

His speech contains a few traces of populism, but they are tempered with some non-populist ones and present a lot of nationalist traits. There is a clear distinction between them (his 'side' as he uses this word) and they (the PT). Even though a distinction is somewhat Manichean, it is not that populist.

I didn't see any cosmic proportion that is worth highlighting, and his speech doesn't seem to have any passage that indicates the importance of the "popular will." It does communicate a lot with the people since it is supposed to be a "live talk." He thanks the people for their support and acknowledges them, but that is as far as it goes.

Now for the nationalist traits:

- There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation";
- There is the presence of a rhetorical frame that argues for protecting the status of the dominant nation at home to save the nation: Here is worth highlighting that the group that he makes reference to, the ones that he talks to, are not the currently political dominant ones, but instead, they are seen as the ones with the true "values," the ones who are in favor and fight for the traditional family - on a heavily conservative way.

Speech 8

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech right after the first round of elections

Date of Speech: October 7, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: February 10, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.6

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <p>“Brazil is about to collapse. We have to value our Armed forces and family values”</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>He mentions many things he would like to improve regarding civilian safety, as well as many improvements regarding the reduction of the State power over businesses</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“Brazil had a 13-yr experience with what has been the worst in politics”</p>
<p>Although Manichaeism, 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“We have to rescue our Parliament, working to improve the conditions to all Brazilians. We have all to become a great nation. We have to unite all Brazilians”</p> <p>“We must value what is ours”</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>“We do not want Brazil to follow the same path of Venezuela, like the other candidate does”</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>“Brazil is drowning in a deep ethical and moral crisis. We cannot give any other step towards the left, but we have to walk to the center-right”</p> <p>“We cannot continue flirting with Socialism and Communism”</p> <p>“What is waiting for us if PT returns to power? According to their government plan: media control”</p>	<p>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.”</p> <p>“I want the Northeast to be free of lies and coercion by PT over the humblest ones”</p>

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.

Various critiques towards the election process, such as faking of votes and lack of respect to the elderly when voting

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This speech is a repetition of his campaign in a more summarized way, where he mentions again the things he promises to do for the nation, and he again attacks the opposition while also criticizing their presence in power. Moreover, he mentions the country cannot keep on flirting with Socialism and Communism, as the past administrations have done. He then goes on to talk about the potential that Brazil has as a country and how he plans to evidence that around the world, but he needs the people by his side to guarantee he can become the president to do so. What is new in this speech is that he mentions possible frauds in the election process, and subtly mentions that, if it weren't for that, he would have probably won by this moment. This affirmation is debatable as none of the supposed "fraud in the voting booth" were proven.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Right after 1st round

Date of Speech: October 7, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: February 11, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.7

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “After all, there are only two paths left for us: prosperity, freedom, family, God's side with those who have religion and those who do not have religion but are responsible; and on the other side is the way of Venezuela. We do not want this for our Brazil” 	<p>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.</p>

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.

- “Our country really is on the brink of Chaos, we can not take another step to the left”
- “We can not fade away, after all, what is at stake is our freedom”
- “We can change the destiny of this nation”

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.

Although Manichaeism, 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.

- “We did not have personalities, we did not have a great apparatus on our side, we did have some good politicians, and the people, the citizen”

He does not highlight the popular will or the

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.

<p>will of the people; instead, he says that they had the people at their side. In this case, he built the notion of people as being the embodiment of the good.</p> <p>It is not that populist, in a way that “popular will” would be, but it needs to be acknowledged.</p>	
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “What I want for the Northeast is really a region that, through its humble, conservative and hardworking people, is free of the lie, free of the coercion that always exists on the part of the PT, or rather has always existed on the part of the PT, for occasion of elections make real terrorism on top of those that belong in one of the regions of most humble people of our country. The Northeasterner is as Brazilian as any other” 	<p>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.</p>

<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We have everything; everything to be a great nation, for this we have to unite our people, unite the pieces that the government of the left has made of us” 	<p>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.”</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Even though it is not explicit, he does not disrespect formal rights and liberties. He does not openly justify the use of non-democratic means. Nevertheless, his language shows bellicosity towards his opposition that is incendiary and condescending:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let’s go together to the TSE demanding solutions to what just happened (problems at the polls and alleged frauds), and it was no small thing, it was a lot! I am sure that if this problem had not occurred and we 	<p>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.</p> <p>Even though it is not explicit, he does not disrespect formal rights and liberties. He does not openly justify the use of non-democratic means. Nevertheless, his language shows bellicosity towards his opposition that is incendiary and condescending.</p>

had confidence in electronic voting, we would already have the name of the Future President of the Republic decided today”

- “We can not continue to flirt with socialism or communism” -> Talking about his opposition

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

It contains almost every populist element, but it lacks a consistent use of a few of them. The Manichaeian division is present but is not that strong or that present; you can see that there is a mainly moral division, but there are also efforts to unite the people despite their differences.

He does not highlight the popular will or the will of the people; instead, he says that they had the people at their side. In this case, he built the notion of people as being the embodiment of the good. It is not that populist, in a way that "popular will" would be, but it needs to be acknowledged.

In addition, even though it is not explicit, he does not disrespect formal rights and liberties. He does not openly justify the use of non-democratic means.

Nevertheless, his language shows bellicosity towards his opposition that is incendiary and condescending.

Nationalist traits:

- There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation";
- There is the presence of a rhetorical frame that argues for protecting the status of the dominant nation at home to save the nation: Here is worth highlighting that the group that he makes reference to, the ones that he talks to, are not the currently political dominant ones, but instead they are seen as the ones with the true "values," the ones who are in favor and fight for the traditional family - on a heavily conservative way.

Speech 9

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at Avenida Paulista

Date of Speech: October 22, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: February 8th, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.8

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.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“Institutions will be recognized. Armed forces will be made powerful”</p> <p>“The police will have the backup from the justice to destroy PT. Criminals from MST and MTST, you will be considered as terrorists”</p>

	<p>“We are majority, we are the truth. Together with the Brazilians we will build a new nation”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“PT, you will all go to the tip of the beach. I will cut all your benefits. You won’t have anything else. It will be a cleansing never before seen in Brazil”</p> <p>“we want free press, but Folha de S. Paulo is the biggest diffusor of fake news in the country”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“Without any political indications, we will establish a team that will attend to the necessities of our people”</p>

	<p>“Brazil will be respected outside and will not be made fun of as it is now. Corruption will not be a problem anymore”</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <p>“They lost yesterday, they lost in 2016 and they will lose again next week. Only this time the cleansing will be more widespread: these people, if they want to stay here, will have to be under the rule that everyone has to follow.”</p> <p>“These red criminals shall be banned from our country. We believe in the future of Brazil”</p> <p>“With this new political class, we are going to build what we deserve”</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>“Lula, you wanted to see Haddad president. But you will rot in jail, and Haddad will join you soon. Though he will not be visiting you, he will be by your side. Since you love each other so much, you can rot in jail together”</p> <p>“Whoever steals from the people will be put behind bars. This people has always stood up in the harshest moment of this nation to save it. All of you making a protest today are trying to save the country. You are saving mine, yours, our Brazil”</p>	<p>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.”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“Together we will make a different Brazil” “I invite you all to mobilize the people and to actively participate in the elections in the next Sunday in a democratic way: no lies, no fake news, no Folha de S. Paulo [newspaper]”</p>

“We love liberty: we want democracy and we want to live in peace”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This is a pretty radical speech of the soon-to-be president, where he mentions that Brazil has to restructure itself. He openly attacks the ones he considers to be the source of the problem of the country and mentions they will not have a place anymore. Moreover, the language he uses at all time gives the impression of a semi-revolution in a certain way, where he proposes a disconnection with the past and the building of a new nation based on democratic values. He mentions also the importance of the people for this to happen and calls everyone to vote in the upcoming elections. Not only, but he again repeats the same arguments and campaign promises used in various of his speeches to make a better Brazil.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Av. Paulista

Date of Speech: October 22, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: February 12, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 1

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.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We are the majority. We are the real Brazil (...). Together with these Brazilian people, we will build a new nation” - “No one is going to leave this country, because this homeland is ours. It is not of this gang that has a 	<p>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.</p>

<p>red flag and has a sold/alienated head”</p>	
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We believe in the future of our Brazil and together, as a team, we will build the future that we deserve. We have the best people in the world, the best land on the planet and we are going with this new political class to actually build what we deserve” 	<p>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.</p>
<p>Although Manichaeism, 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.</p> <p>Many references to "our country" and the</p>	<p>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.</p>

use of expressions such as "we" and "us," but he builds them in a way where only the "true Brazilians" are part of it.

He does not mention the "will of the people" or talks about being the representative of such will; instead, he talks about how the people are rising to defend and save the country by voting on him.

- “Without political indications, we will make a team of ministers that will truly serve the needs of our people. You can be sure, you can trust us because we trust you”
- “These people have always stood up in the most difficult times of the nation to save it. You of Paulista, you who do manifestations in all Brazil, you are saving our Homeland. You are saving mine, yours, our Brazil”

The evil is embodied in a minority 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.

- “No one is going to leave this country, because this homeland is ours. It is not of this gang that has a red flag and has a sold/alienated head”
- “‘Petralhada’, you all go to the *‘edge of the beach’*, you will not have any more turns in our country, because I

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.

<p>am going to cut off all your stewardships”.</p>	
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We want free press, but with responsibility. Folha de São Paulo is the biggest Fake News of Brazil, you will not have more advertising money from the government” 	<p>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.”</p>
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “‘Petralhada’, you all go to the <i>‘edge of the beach’</i>, you will not have any more turns in our country, because I 	<p>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.</p>

am going to cut off all your stewardships. You will not have more NGOs to satisfy your hunger for 'mortadela'. It will be a cleaning never seen in the history of Brazil. Bums/Hobos will have to work, will stop demagoguery with the Brazilian people" -> **Here 'mortadela' and "bums or hobos" are references to the people who support PT, as they are often referred to as "mortadelas" or "bun with mortadela"**

- "Soon you will have Lindbergh Farias to play dominoes in Chess (prison). Just wait, Haddad will get there too, but it will not be to visit you, no, it will be to stay a few years at your side. Since you love each other so much, you will rot in jail together. Because place of thief who steals the people is behind the bars"
- "Petralhadas, You will see a civilian and military police officers with legal support to enforce the law on your back. Bandit of the MST, thug of the MTST, your actions will be typified as terrorism; you will no longer take terror to the countryside or the cities. Either you fit in and submit to the laws, or you're going to keep company to the drunkard in Curitiba (Reference to Lula)"

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech contains pretty much all the populist traits present on this rubric. There is a clear division, moral and Manichaeian.

There are cosmic proportions and systemic change, but it doesn't feel strong enough.

There are many references to "our country" and the use of expressions such as "we" and "us," but he builds them in a way where only the "true Brazilians" are part of it. He does not mention the "will of the people" or talks about being the representative of such will; instead, he talks about how the people are rising to defend and save the country by voting on him. It's like he is the savior, and the people are mobilizing to save the Fatherland by supporting him.

There is clearly an enemy (the PT), and he openly attacks them. Going even further, he also utilizes an "everything counts" approach.

The score was not higher because there are Nationalist elements as well. He makes a lot of references to Brazil, to "our Fatherland."

He praises the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation":
"We are lovers of freedom, we want democracy, and we want to live in peace. We love our families, we respect children, we respect all religions, we do not want socialism, we want distances from dictatorships all over the world."

There is also a rhetorical frame that argues for protecting the status of the dominant nation at home to save the nation.

Here is worth highlighting that the group that he refers to, the ones that he talks to, are not the currently political dominant ones, but instead they are seen as the ones with the true "values," the ones who are in favor and fight for the traditional family - on a heavily conservative way.

Speech 10

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: One day before the second round of elections

Date of Speech: October 27, 2018

Category:

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: January 17, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 1.0

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.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <p>“If someone does something bad using a t-shirt with my face, then I am associated as the one who is disseminating hatred in Brazil”</p> <p>“I have seen many banners against my ideas</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>inside universities, but if someone hung up a banner with any of my ideas I would be hated for that”</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>“We only have two options: either go left or right. We know that going left means the return of PT and this is not what we want. We want a free Brazil, free of prejudices, a Brazil open to the world”</p> <p>“The great leadership of 1964”</p> <p>“I was stabbed by a follower of PSOL, the younger sibling of PT”, to which Bolsonaro continues to dramatically describe the recovery and the injury in details</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>Although Manichaeic, 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“I would like to thank the many voters who are at my side and fighting for a better Brazil”</p> <p>“We need to fight until the last minute and make sure the elections are democratic”</p>
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <p>“We have fought against fascism and we are fighting PT now, which is a fascist party. They lie and try to blame me for things that are their faults”</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>“we want people to graduate being professionals and not fighters for the left side, which is what PT is doing now”</p>	<p>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.”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>“I would like for the media to take a look on the Article 85 of the Constitution” “I am a slave of the Constitution and it is not up to me to write a new one” “Elections are not won, we need to fight until the last minute”</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): The discourse appeals to many populist elements by claiming that the people should unite themselves to take PT out of the power, so that this would be the only way for democracy to survive in Brazil. Bolsonaro accuses PT of being a fascist party, thus associating many negative feelings towards them, and reiterating the idea that the other candidate should not be taken into consideration and that he is the only possible salvation for the country. Not only, he dramatizes everything in his speech, making the opposition candidate seem worse than he is. There is some notion of nationalism in this speech, claiming that Brazil has to

restructure himself and become a great nation again. He, thus, claims to have the solution to the current problems of the country and claims for the union of people to vote for him.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech the day before second turn elections (Live on Facebook)

Date of Speech:

Category:

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: 06/11/2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.8 (after first review, talk) (see last page)

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.

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeian 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We fight fascism, unlike this minority that, in defending the PT, which is fascist, because the PT is a 	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Most of the University students, as far as I know, are of good, they are of Peace, the minority who is an activist who goes to violence” - “We want to pacify Brazil, end this thing of “black and white” (talking

<p>state, right, ... it is not that they are mistaken, they lie and try to throw up the responsibility that it's not mine, it's theirs”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The other side is the return of the past, it is corruption, it is the lie, it is disrespect for family, it is an approach to dictatorships” <p>This idea of different sides is built, on his speech, as if there could be nothing in between: you’re either with us, the Brazilians who are decent and wants change, or you are with them, the left, the corrupts who intends to usurp the power and subvert our traditional values.</p>	<p>about ‘races’)”</p> <p>This last passage does not frame the racial issue in moral terms, although this idea is only present at the end.</p>
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Where have we been for 13 years of PT? Imagine the PT coming back, it is really complicated to dream of a democratic Brazil, with a free Brazil, with a Brazil free of prejudice, with a Brazil that really wants to return to the leading position in the world” - “We know, if the PT returns to the day, this whole group, José Dirceu, Genoino, among many others, will all come back! Everyone will come back 	<p>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.</p>

<p>and that scheme that was dismantled back there by Joaquim Barbosa will return to occupy the center of Brazilian politics.”</p> <p>He also links his opposition, PT, to dictatorships and those types of regimes affect people everywhere across the country, at least those who are not aligned with the government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “What is at stake is not the democracy, what is at stake is the perpetuation of this rotten machine that we have there, that lives from corruption to take away from you your medical care, education, security, is a rotten machine that survives, feeds on misfortune, corruption. What is at stake is corruption, it is the groups that do not want to leave because they live there, they live sucking on the tits of the state.” 	
<p>Although Manichaeism, 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let's assert our will, we will not 	<p>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.</p>

<p>give the opportunity for another side to say "we won, it was the turn" we will not give this opportunity to them”</p> <p>In his speech he utilizes, quite often, terms like “we” and “us,” evoking the idea that he is not talking only about him, but that “they” are a sum of him plus the ones that support him, the ones that voted for him on the first turn and that are (on his words) “taking part on this fight for better days for our Brazil”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We fight fascism (...)” - “I want, then, to thank the millions of netizens. You are indeed the responsible for the situation that I’m currently at (2nd turn of the Presidential Election), that I represent you, that we indeed want changes, that we want to know that whoever studies, in special, at public schools, at the end of his studies, will be a good professional, not a leftist activist, defender of those ideologies that didn’t work in any place of the world, and we do not want this for Brazil!” 	
<p>The evil is embodied in a minority 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Where have we been for 13 years of 	<p>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.</p>

PT? Imagine the PT coming back, it is really complicated to dream of a democratic Brazil, with a free Brazil, with a Brazil free of prejudice, with a Brazil that really wants to return to the leading position in the world”

- “We know, if the PT returns to the day, this whole group, José Dirceu, Genoino, among many others, will all come back! Everyone will come back and that scheme that was dismantled back there by Joaquim Barbosa will return to occupy the center of Brazilian politics.”
- “We fight fascism, unlike this minority that, in defending the PT, which is fascist, because the PT is a state, right, ... it is not that they are mistaken, they lie and try to throw up the responsibility that it's not mine, it's theirs”
- “The other side is the return of the past, it is corruption, it is the lie, it is disrespect for family, it is an approach to dictatorships”

He also utilizes a strong bellicose language, even calling his opponents “Esquerdalha.” There is also a conspiratorial tone when he calls the people (people here as “his supporters”) to verify and check ballots because he is “afraid” of fraud:

- “Let's vote, let's participate, let's help in the supervision”
- “we cannot, cannot believe if 20 million votes changes in two days, this is impossible”

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.

- “You are indeed the responsible for the situation that I’m currently at (2nd turn of the Presidential Election), that I represent you, that we indeed want changes, that we want to know that whoever studies, in special, at public schools, at the end of his studies, will be a good professional, not a leftist activist, defender of those ideologies that didn’t work in any place of the world, and we do not want this for Brazil!”
- “What is at stake is not the democracy, what is at stake is the perpetuation of this rotten machine that we have there, that lives from corruption to take away from you your medical care, education, security, is a rotten machine that survives, feeds on misfortune, corruption. What is at stake is corruption, it is the groups that do not want to leave because they live there, they live sucking on the tits of the state.”

He advocates for changes on the educational system, currently responsible for molding students into “leftist activists”, and for

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.”

<p>changes on the “government machine” that is seen as rotten, corrupt and subverted by PT to its own benefit.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “I’m thankful to the constitution, because ‘she’ will indeed help us on our governance”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

I gave this speech a 1.3 but not higher because:

- There is the presence of “our will” as a reference to both Bolsonaro and his followers/supporters, *but* it lacks the unchanging essentialism, or at least it is not strongly present. Besides that, he does not lean on the “popular will,” he does not build his discourse consistently around a “will of the people” – here I’m thinking about how Evo Morales did in his speech;
- There is also no “everything counts,” he does not disrespect the rights and liberties of the opposition, he does not advocate, encourage or justify illegal and violent acts, even though he says, “We have to fight till the last moment” it is more a figure of speech;

His discourse it’s clearly populist but lacks the consistent use of things like the Manichaeian division and the “will of the people.”

He builds up the idea that there are different sides and that you’re either with us, the Brazilians who are decent and want to change how things are, or you’re against us, with the PT, the left, the corrupts who intends to usurp the power and subvert our traditional values. But he does not openly utilize or lay down this idea.

However, his speech still counts with an exaggerated cosmic proportion, an idea that he represents those who voted for him, the existence of an enemy, an evil that is morally wrong and utilized democratic means to subvert the system to its own interests; thus, a systemic change is necessary to “save” the country.

AFTER REVISITING:

So, after reading the Nationalism Rubric and reading the paper that Kirk, Bruno, and Erin are writing, I've realized that Bolsonaro's speech has some populist traits, but it tempers with some nationalist ones.

The nationalist elements that are present are:

from the rubric:

There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation," although there are no specific passages; this can be perceived.

Even though there are no *family metaphors* on the rubric, he utilizes words like "nation" and "we Brazilian people." Here is worth mentioning that I believe he does that mostly because terms like "people" are heavily linked to the left, to the PT - his main opposition -, so I think that this might be a strategy to distance himself from what he frames as the "enemies."

from the article:

There is the presence of a rhetorical frame that argues for protecting the status of the dominant nation at home to save the nation: Here is worth highlighting that the group that he makes reference to, the ones that he talks to, are not the currently political dominant ones, but instead, they are seen as the ones with the true "values," the ones who are in favor and fight for the traditional family - on a heavily conservative way.

The difference between this speech and his first one is pretty straightforward: here, he adopts more populist traits and tends to "switch" or temper his discourse way less. Even the strongest element present in his first speech (we equated to nation) is not that strongly perceived; I would say that it is indeed present, but not in a straightforward way.