

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at Commercial and Business Association in Juiz de Fora

Date of Speech: September 6, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Caio Emanuel Marques

Date of grading: January 30, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.2

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. “Brazil, why are we like this? We have to look for the origin of the problem, which is political education” “Let’s look for partnerships around the world, countries which have a better economy than ours”
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	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>ideas by tying them to national and religious leaders that are generally revered.</p> <p>“I am from a poor family, but from the good times, when there was no poverty like there is today”</p> <p>“They lost in 64, lost in 2016, and will lose in 2018”</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>“We have everything, but look at what we are not”</p> <p>“Either we change Brazil now, or we will not have another opportunity”</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>“...In the massacre the Left has done over the armed forces, since that is the last step before the instauration of Socialism”</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</p>	<p>The discourse does not argue for systemic</p>

<p>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>“We cannot continue with this division PT-PSDB”</p>	<p>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>“Brazil needs someone who takes the State away from the ones who produce, since because of that no one wants to be a producer anymore”</p> <p>“We can even make mistakes, but we will not be accused of information omission nor corruption”</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>“Let’s make a government where we will be slaves of the law and serve you, the population”</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This discourse mainly focuses on repetitions of things that have been said in previous speeches and talks mainly about campaign promises. However, there are a few populist elements present in Bolsonaro’s speech, such as the idea of the union of the people under a common cause (which could be understood as trying to drive the current ones in power away from it and making sure that their Socialist ideology does not spread throughout the nation). For this, Bolsonaro once more claims that he is not strong by himself, but again mentions he needs the union of the people (although using this idea in a more nationalist way).

“We have to unite, under one flag and one name”

“I am not this nation’s savior, I know my limits, but we can save the country if we work together. We can change Brazil’s destiny”

“The government does not allow the market to self-regulate. The countries who adopted free-market premises have worked out”

