

**Country:** Brazil

**Leader:** Jair Bolsonaro

**Title of Speech:** Facebook live 1 day before the elections

**Date of Speech:** October 6, 2018

**Category:** Campaign

**Grader:** Eduardo Ryo Tamaki

**Date of grading:** February 8, 2019

**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
<p>It conveys a <b>Manichaeian vision of the world, that is, one that is moral</b> (every issue has a strong moral dimension) <b>and dualistic</b> (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"><li>- “But at the moment it is polarized: it is us and the PT; is green and yellow Brazil and they representing Cuba, representing the government of Venezuela, with its flag that is red and with the sickle and hammer on top of it. Let's change Brazil”</li><li>- “There are many people who voted for PT and are coming to our side, many people who back there decided not to vote anymore for P, that woke up and is on our side now”</li></ul>	<p><b>The discourse does not frame issues in moral terms or paint them in black-and-white.</b> 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- “Let's unite the Brazilian people. Our flag is green and yellow, our heart is green and yellow”</li><li>- “The union of all, my people. Let's unite, let's unite this Brazil here. [...] but to unite by example, by dedication, by love of the Fatherland, by respect for the family, for the desire to really move away from socialism, communism, and freedom from this ghost that happens in Venezuela(...). Let's move away from that”</li></ul>

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.**

He tries to justify the moral significance of his ideas by tying them to a religious book: the bible

- "The seed we preach through Brazil is the one that is in the book of John 8:32: And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"

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.

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.

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.

His speech doesn't seem to have any passage that indicates the importance of the "popular will". It does communicate a lot with the people since it is supposed to be a "live talk with the people" and he thanks the people for their support and acknowledges them but that is as far as it goes.

**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.

- “Let’s make Brazil big, Let’s be proud again of this Homeland, let’s move away from what did not work out: socialism, communism that is embodied in the PT, in the PC do B, and PSOL”

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.

**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.

- “Let’s make Brazil big, Let’s be proud again of this Homeland, let’s move away from what did not work out: socialism, communism that is embodied in the PT, in the PC do B, and PSOL”
- “But [Roraima’s potential] is suffocated by environment and indigenous issues. Let’s solve this, let’s fuse the ministries of agriculture and environment. It will end this fight”

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>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>There is no presence of an "everything counts" approach. Even though he disrespects his opposition a few times it does not escalate to a disrespect of liberties and formal rights.</p>
--	---

### Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

On this speech, he focuses a lot on the elections (that took place one day after) so in this case, he respects the election even though he claims that the ballots can be rigged his opinion on that subject is not that strong as it was on the day he got stabbed.

Moving on his speech contains a few traces of populism but they are tempered with some non-populist ones and presents a lot of nationalist traits. There is a clear distinction between them (his 'side' as he uses this word) and they (the PT). Even though there is a distinction that is somewhat Manichean, it is not that populist.

I didn't see any cosmic proportion that is worth highlighting and his speech doesn't seem to have any passage that indicates the importance of the "popular will". It does communicate a lot with the people since it is supposed to be a "live talk" and he thanks the people for their support and acknowledges them but that is as far as it goes.

Now for the nationalist traits:

- There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation";
- 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