

Country: Brazil
Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro
Title of Speech: Bolsonaro's speech at Araçatuba
Date of Speech: August 23, 2018
Category: Campaign
Grader: Eduardo Ryo Tamaki
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
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.	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. This one does not have a particular passage that can be utilized, mostly because he does not focus on a narrow or particular issue that can divide the people nor he utilizes a Manichaeian vision with the implication that there are 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: <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, your hands the decision to put better people in Brasilia so that together with the President they can make laws, revoke others, aiming the common interest"
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	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

<p>(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>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 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. With us You will be in first place, you will be our bosses” - “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>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</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>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>About the left he even says that they kept Brazil “tied with Mercosul because of ideological principles”;</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"> - “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>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"> - “In 1955 when I was born on March 21 my father's neighbor screamed: it is male or 	<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>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> <p><i>Ponta da praia</i> is how the Military base at Restinga de Marambaia, on Rio de Janeiro: This place, which was located at the “tip of the beach” (<i>ponta da praia</i>) and was known as a torture and execution place for political detainees during the dictatorship.</p>	
--	--

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

Bolsonaro’s speech presents clear 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 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 being 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 is something that can be considered a "systemic change" but it's not utilized in a populist way. I'd say that it does have 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 clear adoption to 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 utilized in a Nationalist way. Now, about nationalist traits:

There is a 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, people who are patriotic";

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 have the ability to 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 as those present 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 believe 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 keypoint: " 'We' or the 'people' is equated with 'the nation' and repeated references are made to the name of the nation".