

Country: Brazil
Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro
Title of Speech: Speech after he was stabbed
Date of Speech: September 16th, 2018
Category: Campaign (?)
Grader: Eduardo Ryo 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 Manichaeon worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.**

Populist	Pluralist
It conveys a Manichaeon 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. - “What is at stake at the moment is the future of all of you who are there, even you who support the PT, you are a human being too. I see a lot of PT changing sides” There is no Manichaeon or Dualistic vision or approach to this speech. There is no black and white distinction either.
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.	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. There is no particular passage that can be used here, but his speech lacks the use of cosmic proportion. His main focus is the possibility of a fraud (that will be explained).
Although Manichaeon, 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	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

<p>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>man is not romanticized, and the notion of citizenship is broad and legalistic. There is no mention or whatsoever to a “popular will” or “will of the people”. There are only a few mentions to the people and even to Brazil.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The PT has discovered the path to power: electronic voting” - “If you read carefully these two documents, among other barbarities You will see there clearly written that the PT will seek the social control of the media. You will lose your freedom, I know that not everyone has nowadays, but I know that whoever has it will completely lose this freedom” 	<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 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.” His speech focuses on a particular issue that being the possibility of a fraud on the elections. Going further there is no argument for a systemic change. There is indeed the presence of an idea that “an evil minority who was recently in charge, subverted the system to its own interest”, but there is no systemic change.</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</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>the decorum that one shows a worthy opponent.</p> <p>It does not openly justifies non-democratic means, but it has a strong and constant conspiratorial tone, attacking his opposition, accusing them of plotting frauds. It is an attempt to call the people to fight against the opposition who is already plotting a electoral fraud to prevent him from winning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “That I ask you to put yourself in the place of the convict who is there in Curitiba, with all his popularity, with all his possible wealth, with all his traffic along with dictatorships of the whole world that support themselves, especially in Cuba. Would you passively accept, bovinely go to jail, you would not try an escape? Well if you did not try to run away with everything at your side it's because you have a plan B. What is plan B of this convict, that poor man back there who stole all our hopes? I can not think of anything else unless Plan B materializes in a fraud unfavorable to Lula, or better in favor of Lula. We have elections now. When I saw Dilma Rousseff's reinstatement in 2014, I thought to myself: "We can not wait for 2018 because Lula will be a candidate, they will not leave. Look how Brazil is, where we are going, in every aspect without exception and I always used to say, and I still say, that as serious as corruption is the ideological question” - “So this possibility of fraud in the second round is concrete” 	
---	--

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech contains contains a few populist elements, but it lacks the presence of a Dualistic or Manichaeian division, a division that has nothing in between, it lacks the use of cosmic proportion and the argument for systemic changes.

On the other side, there is a clear presence of an enemy, an evil minority who has "figured" the path to power and that is "now" (on his words) openly plotting an electoral fraud to prevent him from being elected. There is a strong and constant bellicose and conspiratorial tone, in that way his speech is highly conspiratorial. There is this idea that the enemy, an evil ruling minority who was recently in charge, subverted and usurped the power from the people.

This speech lacks also nationalist traits, even though he claims that Brazil needs to be saved, it is just not constant nor strong enough.

In overall, this speech is more conspiratorial and I personally think it marks a passage between his "less radical" self to a more radical one - to better understand this we need to also know the background: it was a speech that he gave on his hospital bed, right after being stabbed during a political event where he walked among the electorate from Juiz de Fora.