

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Campaign Launch

Date of Speech: July 07, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Caio Emanuel Marques

Date of grading: 16/01/2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.5

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>“On one side, the left, and on the other the center. I would like to thank Geraldo Alckmin to have gathered what is the worst in Brazil. Something even worse than corruption, which is the ideological question that took part of Brazil”</p> <p>“I would like to talk about Dilma’s reelection, her past and her party’s, or even better, her faction’s past, and I saw that we had to do something to change the future of this country”</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>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>“We have no television time, but we have something other parties don’t, and that’s you, my electors”</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>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>“The majority of the deputies were against me and tried to take me away from power”</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 value this ministry (Sciences and Technology)”</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 this amazing fatherland we used to all live at harmony: the Jews, the Arabs, the French, the Germans and many Asian countries, but PT tried to split us apart”</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>“the Parliament is the problem, they want to do something different that has to be done. They are syndicate leaders and should not be there, and have to be removed”</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>Even though the discourse is pretty critic and uses harsh language, democratic principles are respected.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): The speech starts with a little introduction about Bolsonaro's political career then slips into a short but strong populism, with mentions to the many things that have subverted the previous government into failure while he mentions some things, he thought should be done to improve the country. However, this Populism quickly transforms into Nationalism since the previous government has tried to harm the nation, and he presents many solutions to save the people from this current state. Thus, this speech presents us both ideas of Populism and Nationalism, but the latter being more prevalent to the former.

Nationalist elements: "I might have Messias (Messiah) in my middle name but I am not the one who will save this fatherland; we all will"

"we know what's in game: the future of this nation"

"to look for a different Brazil, a Brazil we deserve"

"to take this part of the population out of misery, to get them out of colonialism"