

**Country: Brazil**

**Leader: Bolsonaro**

**Title of Speech:** Speech at Avenida Paulista

**Date of Speech: October 22, 2018**

**Category: Campaign**

**Grader:** Caio Emanuel Marques

**Date of grading:** February 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.8**

1        A speech in this category includes strong, clearly populist elements but either does not use them consistently or tempers them by including non-populist elements. Thus, the discourse may have a romanticized notion of the people and the idea of a unified popular will (indeed, it must in order to be considered populist), but it avoids bellicose language or references to cosmic proportions or any particular enemy.

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.	<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 <b>narrow, particular issues</b>. The discourse will emphasize or at least not eliminate the possibility of natural, justifiable differences of opinion.</p> <p>“Institutions will be recognized. Armed forces will be made powerful”</p> <p>“The police will have the backup from the justice to destroy PT. Criminals from MST and MTST, you will be considered as terrorists”</p> <p>“We are majority, we are the truth. Together with the Brazilians we will build a new nation”</p>

<p>The moral significance of the items mentioned in the speech is heightened by ascribing <b>cosmic proportions</b> 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 <b>national and religious leaders</b> 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>“PT, you will all go to the tip of the beach. I will cut all your benefits. You won’t have anything else. It will be a cleansing never before seen in Brazil”</p> <p>“we want free press, but Folha de S. Paulo is the biggest diffuser of fake news in the country”</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>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>“Without any political indications, we will establish a team that will attend to the necessities of our people”</p> <p>“Brazil will be respected outside and will not be made fun of as it is now. Corruption will not be a problem anymore”</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>“They lost yesterday, they lost in 2016 and they will lose again next week. Only this time</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>the cleansing will be more widespread: these people, if they want to stay here, will have to be under the rule that everyone has to follow.”</p> <p>“These red criminals shall be banned from our country. We believe in the future of Brazil”</p> <p>“With this new political class, we are going to build what we deserve”</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>“Lula, you wanted to see Haddad president. But you will rot in jail, and Haddad will join you soon. Though he will not be visiting you, he will be by your side. Since you love each other so much, you can rot in jail together”</p> <p>“Whoever steals from the people will be put behind bars. This people has always stood up in the harshest moment of this nation to save it. All of you making a protest today are trying to save the country. You are saving mine, yours, our Brazil”</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>“Together we will make a different Brazil”</p>

	<p>“I invite you all to mobilize the people and to actively participate in the elections in the next Sunday in a democratic way: no lies, no fake news, no Folha de S. Paulo [newspaper]”</p> <p>“We love liberty: we want democracy and we want to live in peace”</p>
--	--

**Overall Comments (just a few sentences):** This is a pretty radical speech of the soon-to-be president, where he mentions that Brazil has to restructure itself. He openly attacks the ones he considers to be the source of the problem of the country and mentions they will not have a place anymore. Moreover, the language he uses at all time gives the impression of a semi-revolution in a certain way, where he proposes a disconnection with the past and the building of a new nation based on democratic values. He mentions also the importance of the people for this to happen and calls everyone to vote in the upcoming elections. Not only, but he again repeats the same arguments and campaign promises used in various of his speeches to make a better Brazil.