

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

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

Date of Speech: October 7, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Caio Emanuel Marques

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>“We do not want Brazil to follow the same path of Venezuela, like the other candidate does”</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>“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>
<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>Various critiques towards the election process, such as faking of votes and lack of respect to the elderly when voting</p>

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.

