

Name of politician: Sali Berisha

Title of Speech: Electoral meeting of the DP leader in the town of Korça

Date of Speech: 29, May, 2009

Category: Electoral

Grader: Sokol Lleshi

Date of grading: 21.April. 2013

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0

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

Populist	Pluralist
It conveys a Manichaean vision of the world, that is, one that is moral (every issue has a strong moral dimension) and dualistic (everything is in one category or the other, “right” or “wrong,” “good” or “evil”) The implication—or even the stated idea—is that there can be nothing in between, no fence-sitting, no shades of grey. This leads to the use of highly charged, even bellicose language.	<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>“Në katër vitet që vijnë, ne do të punësojmë mbi 160 mijë qytetarë, ndërkohe që nuk do të ketë shqiptar që të marrë nën 2 dollarë në ditë, kudo që ndodhet ai në Shqipëri”</i></p> <p><i>“In the next four years, we will have 160 thousand citizens employed, and no Albanian will not earn less than 2 U.S. dollars a day, wherever he lives in Albania”</i></p> <p><i>“Nuk mund të bëhet fjalë për qytetarë europianë në rast se qytetarët shqiptarë nuk kanë ujë në cdo shtëpi. Në katër vitet që vijnë do të ketë ujë brenda në shtëpinë e cdo familjeje shqiptare.”</i></p> <p><i>“If Albanian citizens do not have water in every apartment, then we cannot consider ourselves European citizens. Every Albanian family will have water in one's apartment within the next four years.”</i></p>

	<p><i>“Nuk mund të bëhet fjalë për qytetarë europianë në rast se rrogat nuk I afrohen atyre të Bashkimit European”.</i></p> <p><i>“We can't consider ourselves European citizens if the wages are not proportionally closer to the EU citizens' wages”</i></p> <p><i>“Në katër vite ne punësuam 80 mijë qytetarë, por në katër vitet që vijnë ne do të punësojmë mbi 160 mijë qytetarë”.</i></p> <p><i>“During these four years of the first mandate, 80 thousand citizens were employed. In the next four years, 160 thousand will be employed”</i></p> <p><i>“Punësimi është qëllimi më madhor për të luftuar varfërinë dhe se me rritjen e pagave, pensioneve, me dyfishimin e ndihmës ekonomike, qeveria ia ka dalë të nxjerrë nga varfëria 400 mijë shqiptarë”</i></p> <p><i>“Employment is our primary aim if we want to fight against poverty. Due to the increase in salaries, and pensions as well as due to the doubling of the economic aid, the government managed to pull out of poverty 400 thousand Albanians”</i></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 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</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>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 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 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>
<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><i>“Zoti Edvin, ti po tregon se je një shpirtzi I pashembullt në historinë e këtij vendi. Je një shpirtzi që nuk ke shok askënd. Ti nuk kandidove, sepse do t'ia prishësh shqiptarëve dasmën e demokracisë, por unë të jap fjalën ty se do të</i></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>

përfundosh në arkivat e turpit të historisë”

“Mr. Edvin [the Prime Minister is calling the leader of the opposition by his first name], you are showing that you have an evil character, unmatched in the history of this country. No one has such an evil character as you. You did not run for Parliament [the leader of the opposition in 2009 decided not to run as an MP, yet in case of winning the elections he would have been the Prime Minister], because you want to ruin the Albanians the wedding of democracy. I promise you that you will soon be relegated to the shameful dust/archives of history”.

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This electoral speech for the 2009 elections is given in one of the main cities of Albania. The Prime Minister is emphasizing what his government did for the first mandate, and how the economic and social situation will be improved according to him in the next mandate. The Prime Minister is mentioning in the speech mostly the Albanian citizens and comparing them with the EU citizens. He lists a number of issues such as employment, salaries, infrastructural issues and poverty. In this speech there is no division between a good majority and a bad minority. He does not identify an evil minority, regardless of the fact that he portrays his main opponent, the leader of the Socialist Party, as having an evil character. He belittles and uses a bellicose language towards the leader of the opposition, which definitely does not reflect a pluralist mindset. Nonetheless, the incumbent is not blaming the leader of the opposition for any wrongdoing, or any conspiracy.

I would consider this speech as not being populist. I give it a 0.