

Country: Brazil

Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at the Business and Commercial association at Rio de Janeiro.

Date of Speech: September 6th, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Eduardo Ryô Tamaki

Date of grading: December 11, 2018

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
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. There is no Manichaeian nor dualistic vision. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “Enough of eroding family values, gender ideology, politically correct! No more dividing us”- “Let's make a Brazil equal for all of us, but looking upwards, not equal to misery as the left has always done in the whole world, and will not do in Brazil! They lost in 64, lost in 2016 and will lose in 2018”
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. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “Let's make a Brazil equal for all of us, but looking upwards, not equal to misery as the left has always done in the whole world, and will not do in Brazil! They lost in 64,	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>lost in 2016 and will lose in 2018.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Or we change Brazil now or we won’t have another opportunity” 	
<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>There are no clear reference to the “will of the people” as he does not utilize those words, <i>but</i> there are references to the “people” being in his favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “My identity, my virtue that is similar to that of you who are here, overcomes it all! We do not have partisan funds or television time, but we have the trust of the people and the faith in God that we can change the destiny of Brazil” - “God willing, and if this is his will, we will make a government where we will be slaves of the Law and employee of you” 	<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>There is no certain passage that can be used, but on his speech, he builds the idea that the evil is embodied in his mainstream opposition: The left and PT, and PSDB.</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</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>terms such as “revolution” or “liberation” of the people from their “immiseration” or bondage, even if technically it comes about through elections.</p> <p>There are arguments for systemic change even though he does not utilize words like “revolution” and “liberation”.</p> <p>He claims that he wants to change the politics and some ministries like when he says that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Ministry of the environment nowadays suffers influences from foreign NGOs. Everything the environment can do in one of the few things that works in Brazil, which is agribusiness, this Ministry does” - “Let us put in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, not Marighella's driver who is now there now, the (?) terrorist Aloisio Nunes Ferreira, but someone with an Open Business Vision, free trade, from pro-liberalism largely” 	
<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.</p> <p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “God willing, and if this is his will, we will make a government where we will be slaves of the Law and employee of you”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech contains a few populist elements but is highly tempered with nationalist elements (as I'll explain further on). There is no Manichaeic nor dualistic division, no "Black and white" division at all. As you follow his discourse it is possible to realize that he builds a division between him and his opposition, PSDB and the left, mainly the PT. But this division that is built it is not made in a way that there can't be anything in between.

There is the presence of Cosmic proportion, as he claims that there are things that the left does on the whole world - negative things - and even mentions that this is the time to change Brazil and that they won't have another chance. There is even this part:

"Why must we continue to think that we are going to hand over our arable land to foreign capital, which in this case is China, that is buying. We can not give up our food security. China is not buying in Brazil, it is buying Brazil. When we wake up it may be too late".

There is no mention to the "will of the people", "popular will" or things like that even though he mentions that they have the support of the people, that they have the people besides them. There are few passages that somewhat resemble Hugo Chávez speeches:

"God willing, and if this is his will, we will make a government where we will be slaves of the Law and employee of you".

The evil minority is clearly the opposition, the left, mainly PT, and PSDB, even though they are just framed as an evil, enemies, there is no use of Manichaeian division.

The systemic change arguments presents are not that strong, or not openly utilized by using words and terms like "revolution" and "liberation". Instead, there is the idea that the political system and some ministries need to change, but I think that the absence of those specific terms and words (or even similar) makes this trait not that much populist.

And there is no sign of an everything counts approach.

Now for the Nationalist traits:

from the rubric:

There is a subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation", on his discourse, he highlights the importance of respecting the family and upholding traditional values.

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.

At last, his speech looks more like a military leader instead of a political leader.

"The massacre made on the Armed Forces in recent years by PT and PSDB have created commissions of truth, among other aberrations, that attacks us because we Armed Forces are the last obstacle to socialism, we do not give ourselves because we have always been on the side of the Brazilian people" (Sounds confusing but that's how he said)

This particular passage is extremely important to illustrate what I've wrote because here you can see that there is also the presence of something that is the "enemy of the nation" not only the "enemy of the people" as those are different.

At finally yet importantly, the notion of "people" that he builds is different from the "people" on a populist way: it is built on a nationalist way, as it is broader, bigger, and seems to go beyond the government.