

**Name of politician:** Sali Berisha

**Title of Speech:** Address by HE Sali Berisha, Prime Minister of Albania To the High-level Plenary Meeting of the UN General Assembly on Millennium Development Goals

**Date of Speech:** 22, September, 2010

**Category:** International

**Grader:** Sokol Lleshi

**Date of grading:** 25.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 Manichaeian worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.

### Populist

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.

### Pluralist

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.

*“Whereas today, again in this room, I am addressing this esteemed audience as the Prime Minister of a country in such a short period of time has increased tenfold the per capita income and belongs now to the group of the countries with middle upper income levels. Once the most hyper-collectivized countries on earth, more than 80% of Albania's GDP is now generated in the private sector. During the last 10 years, Albania has reduced absolute poverty from 25 to 12% and extreme poverty from 4.2 to 1.3%.”*

*“To this end, only in the last 4 years, Albania has increased budgetary spending for health care by over 40% for education by over 60% and for social assistance by over 50%. We take great pleasure in observing that over 90 per cent of the pupils who completed the 9-year basic education program*

	<p><i>continued their education by enrolling in high school,...”</i></p> <p><i>“The area of environmental protection has known tremendous progress. 98 % of electricity in Albania comes from renewable sources. Despite the major world financial crisis, our country's economy continued to maintain a positive growth of 3.5 percent, in 2009. This year, exports have grown by 62 percent.”</i></p> <p><i>“Albania has created a very friendly environment for business and investment and, in the last two years, has signed some 6 billion euro investments and concessions”.</i></p> <p><i>“Life expectancy increased in Albania to 77.96 years whereas maternal mortality is several times lower than that of certain amongst the most developed countries.”</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 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</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>

common man (urban or rural) seen as the embodiment of the national ideal.	
<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><i>“I believe that this phenomenon (corruption) is today the worst enemy of free people and free societies” (?)</i></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><i>“But, they were made possible due to also the deep and comprehensive reforms carried out in my country during these last years in the fields of economy, health, education, social policies in general, and, particularly, due to our uncompromising fight against corruption and the reforms linked with it”.</i></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>

**Overall Comments (just a few sentences):**

This international speech given at the Plenary Meeting of the UN General Assembly is focused on a particular topic that of Millennium Development Goals. In most of the speech the Prime Minister enumerates the particular policies that have been implemented and gives information and data on a variety of issues. There is no distinction between a good majority and a bad minority, and no reference to the will of the people. On the other hand, when the Prime Minister talks about corruption, he considers it as the 'utmost' evil that hampers development. Nonetheless, I would consider this speech as a pluralist speech. Final grade is a 0.