

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech after being stabbed

Date of Speech: September 16, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Caio Emanuel Marques

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 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>“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>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>“PT does not try to hide what it is doing anymore”</p> <p>“PT will go looking for a social control of the media”</p> <p>“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 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>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 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> <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”</p>

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.