

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: PSL conference: Official launch of his candidacy for President

Date of Speech: July 22th, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Eduardo Ryo Tamaki

Date of grading: 03/11/2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): **0.4 (after first review, talk) (see last page)**

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “On one side would be the left, on the other, the center. I even want to thank Geraldo Alckmin for having combined the elite of the worst in Brazil with him”- “Here in this wonderful homeland all live in harmony: Jews; Arabs; French; Germans; countries; all live in harmony here, it's a wonderful homeland that the PT tried to divide us”- “(...) that we, take out the unrecoverable, but us humans and most of the parliamentarians (...)” <p>Makes clear that he thinks some of the “humans”, who are deeply aligned to the</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “(we) have to appoint Ministry by the criterion of competence. It does not matter who it is, its mission, its color, its religion (...)”- “Once again thank you Geraldo Alckmin for uniting the scum of Brazilian politics. Without saying that I am accusing all the deputies of this party. At least 40% of these deputies are with us and do not agree with the actions taken by these leaders”- “Let's unite white and black people, homos and straight, also trans, no problem. Each one does what it wants, be happy. Let's unite the Northeastern and Southern people. Let's stifle these

<p>opposition, are unrecoverable.</p> <p>Although, as it's written on the opposite box, he claims that 'not all the deputies of PSDB are the scum of Brazilian politics, claiming too that at least 40% of them are with him because they do not agree with the actions taken by the party leaders', he adopts a intolerant position towards his opposition.</p>	<p>small separatist movements that we see in Brazil. Unite rich and poor. It has become a crime in Brazil to be rich! Let's unite employers and employees, not sow discord between them. One needs the other"</p> <p>This part seems to represent an idea that there's the possibility of natural, justifiable differences of opinion, but he does not mention the opposition, the left or the PT.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Brazil can't take other 4 years of PT or PSDB! Together, let's recover our Brazil, let's give hope to everyone, let's unite this people" <p>He tries to tie his ideas to figures like his economist Paulo Guedes, the general Augusto Eleno, and publisher and businessman Roberto Marinho who was the responsible for the creation of Grupo Globo (one of the biggest media conglomerate)</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>

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.**

The "common, religious and from the traditional family" man is seen as the embodiment of the national idea. There is no single, strong and evident passage that sustains this idea, but it's something that becomes clear as we advance through his speech. There is also a clear distinction between this "common man" and his "leftist counterpart".

But there is no reference to the "popular will", to the "will of the people" as being something that drives him.

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.

- "On one side would be the left, on the other, the center. I even want to thank Geraldo Alckmin for having combined the elite of the worst in Brazil with him"
- "As for the other side, I say, it is something as or more serious than corruption, which is the ideological issue that took part, which took over much of Brazil"
- "Here everyone lives in harmony, it's a wonderful homeland that the PT tried to

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.

Even though he accepts the majority as being a sum of different people, from different places and with different backgrounds (economically and socially), it is not something that changes across issues. It's a solid construction with almost no space to maneuver

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>divide”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “I use to say that most parliamentarians want to act differently than how partisan leaders, who are actually union leaders, act. Let's get the union out of the national congress” (Union here is the same as workers’ organizations) - “You (militaries from the navy and air force) are attacked daily, accused of the greatest Absurd by that left that is there, you know why? Because you are the last obstacle to socialism!” - “We will not accept Socialism!” <p>When talking about the opposition, about PT and the left, he uses bellicose terms like “factions”. In addition, he ties the opposition, the left and PT, to Socialism and Communism, framing them as enemies as well.</p> <p>His enemies are also traditional parties like PSDB, even though he mentions it only 2 times.</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.</p> <p>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>He does not utilize terms such as “revolution” or “liberation”, but the evil minority that was recently in charge, subverted the system to its own interests (ideological interests), against those of the good, traditional people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Brazil can’t take another 4 years of PT or PSDB. Together let’s rescue our Brazil, let’s give hope to everyone, let’s unite this people!” - “We will seek to revoke the constitutional amendment 81 which relativized private property. Rural landowners, urban landowners, pay attention to this: the left over the course of its thirteenth year has been seeking ways through legislation to 	<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>impose its will, and private property has never been respected by the left because there nobody ever worked, always living from work of others”</p> <p>- “We want, dear economist Paulo Guedes, to really seek the liberation of our economy to pursue liberalism. We want to privatize, maybe even extinguish most of the state”</p> <p>He utilizes term as “recover” when mentioning Brazil, as if he is promising and calling the “people” to save, to rescue Brazil.</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>At this point, there is no encouragement to illegal or violent actions. He seems to “respect” the formal rights and liberties of the opposition, even though he attacks them during most part of his discourse. There are no mentions to non-democratic means nor mentions to any attack to natural rights of his opposition.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

Overall, his discourse presents clear populist elements. Even though he has a clear enemy, traditional parties (PSDB and PT) with a stronger opposition to PT and the left, he does not refer to the “popular will” or the “will of the people”. The common person is romanticized, but, again, there is no mention nor attempt to build a notion of “popular will”. He tries though, to create a notion of “us” as being a sum of him and the ones who support him, in this notion, he talks on a way where it creates an idea that “everyone” (his followers) are together and will act together on his government. He does not exaggerate the use of cosmic proportions, not openly, but when he talks about what the opposition has done during the last 13 years of government, there is a faint trace of cosmic proportions that can be perceived. There are also arguments for systemic change, but no “everything counts” approach or mention: he does not encourage illegal or violent acts and does not disrespect formal rights and liberties, not even when talking about the opposition.

I gave 0.9 to it because it's closer to 1, as it presents strong, clearly populist elements, but it is no above 1, closer to 2, because it has no strong presence of a clear "popular will". It's closer to 0 than to 2 because it lacks some notion of a popular will.

AFTER REVISITING:

So, after reading the Nationalism Rubric and reading the paper that you, Bruno and Erin are writing I've realized that Bolsonaro's speech has some populist traits but it tempers with some nationalist ones.

The nationalist elements that are present are:

from the rubric:

There is a subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation", an example:

"(...)we the Brazilian people (*brasileiros*) say that there is something more, way more important than our lives: our freedom! Because the men or women arrested have no life! Let's make Brazil different with your strength! I am here because I believe in you, you are here because you believe in Brasil, this Brasil is ours! Our flag is green and yellow!"

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".

from the article:

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.

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"; examples are:

"I know what is at stake in this approaching moment: is the destiny of this great nation called Brazil"

"I do this for the children of Brazil, I do it for the women of Brazil"