

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech the day before second turn elections (Live on Facebook)

Date of Speech:

Category:

Grader: Eduardo Ryo Tamaki

Date of grading: 06/11/2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.8 (after first review, talk) (see last page)

1 **A speech in this category includes strong, clearly populist elements but either does not use them consistently or tempers them by including non-populist elements. Thus, the discourse may have a romanticized notion of the people and the idea of a unified popular will (indeed, it must in order to be considered populist), but it avoids bellicose language or references to cosmic proportions or any particular enemy.**

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “We fight fascism, unlike this minority that, in defending the PT, which is fascist, because the PT is a state, right, ... it is not that they are mistaken, they lie and try to throw up the responsibility that it's not mine, it's theirs”- “The other side is the return of the past, it is corruption, it is the lie, it is disrespect for family, it is an approach to	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “Most of the University students, as far as I know, are of good, they are of Peace, the minority who is an activist who goes to violence”- “We want to pacify Brazil, end this thing of “black and white” (talking about ‘races’)” <p>This last passage does not frame the racial issue in moral terms, although this idea its only present at the end.</p>

<p>dictatorships”</p> <p>This idea of different sides is built, on his speech, as if there could be nothing in between: you’re either with us, the Brazilians who are decent and wants change, or you are with them, the left, the corrupts who wants to usurp the power and subvert our traditional values.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Where have we been for 13 years of PT? Imagine the PT coming back, it is really complicated to dream of a democratic Brazil, with a free Brazil, with a Brazil free of prejudice, with a Brazil that really wants to return to the leading position in the world” - “We know, if the PT returns to the day, this whole group, José Dirceu, Genoino, among many others, will all come back! Everyone will come back and that scheme that was dismantled back there by Joaquim Barbosa will return to occupy the center of Brazilian politics.” <p>He also links his opposition, PT, to dictatorships and those types of regimes affect people everywhere across the country, at least those who are not aligned to the government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “What is at stake is not the democracy, 	<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>

what is at stake is the perpetuation of this rotten machine that we have there, that lives from corruption to take away from you your medical care, education, security, is a rotten machine that survives, feeds on misfortune, corruption. What is at stake is corruption, it is the groups that do not want to leave because they live there, they live sucking on the tits of the state.”

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.

- “Let’s assert our will, we will not give the opportunity for another side to say “we won, it was the turn” we will not give this opportunity to them”

On his speech he utilizes, quite often, terms like “we” and “us” evoking the idea that he is not talking only about him, but that “they” are a sum of him plus the ones that support him, the ones that voted for him on the first turn and that are (on his words) “taking part on this fight for better days for our Brazil”:

- “We fight fascism (...)”
- “I want, then, to thank the millions of netizens. You are indeed the responsible for the situation that I’m currently at (2nd turn of the Presidential Election), that I represent you, that we indeed want changes, that we want to know that

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.

whoever studies, in special, at public schools, at the end of his studies, will be a good professional, not a leftist activist, defender of those ideologies that didn't work in any place of the world, and we do not want this for Brazil!"

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.

- "Where have we been for 13 years of PT? Imagine the PT coming back, it is really complicated to dream of a democratic Brazil, with a free Brazil, with a Brazil free of prejudice, with a Brazil that really wants to return to the leading position in the world"
- "We know, if the PT returns to the day, this whole group, José Dirceu, Genoino, among many others, will all come back! Everyone will come back and that scheme that was dismantled back there by Joaquim Barbosa will return to occupy the center of Brazilian politics."
- "We fight fascism, unlike this minority that, in defending the PT, which is fascist, because the PT is a state, right, ... it is not that they are mistaken, they lie and try to throw up the responsibility that it's not mine, it's theirs"
- "The other side is the return of the past, it is corruption, it is the lie, it is disrespect

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>for family, it is an approach to dictatorships”</p> <p>He also utilizes a strong bellicose language, even calling his opponents “Esquerdalha”. There is also conspiratorial tone when he calls the people (people here as “his supporters”) to verify and check ballots because he is “afraid” of fraud:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let’s vote, let’s participate, let’s help in the supervision” - “we cannot, cannot believe if 20 million votes changes in two days, this is impossible” 	
<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “You are indeed the responsible for the situation that I’m currently at (2nd turn of the Presidential Election), that I represent you, that we indeed want changes, that we want to know that whoever studies, in special, at public schools, at the end of his studies, will be a good professional, not a leftist activist, defender of those ideologies that didn’t work in any place of the world, and we do not want this for Brazil!” - “What is at stake is not the democracy, what is at stake is the perpetuation of this rotten machine that we have there, that lives from corruption to take away from you your medical care, education, security, is a rotten machine that survives, feeds on misfortune, corruption. What is at stake is corruption, it is the groups that do not want to leave because they live there, they live sucking on the tits of the state.” <p>He advocates for changes on the educational</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>system, currently responsible for molding students into “leftist activists”, and for changes on the “government machine” that is seen as rotten, corrupt and subverted by PT to its own benefit.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “I’m thankful to the constitution, because ‘she’ will indeed help us on our governance”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

I gave this speech a 1.3 but not higher because:

- There is the presence of “our will” as a reference to both Bolsonaro and his followers / supporters, **but** it lacks the unchanging essentialism, or at least it is not strongly present. Besides that he does not lean on the “popular will”, he does not build his discourse consistently around a “will of the people” – here I’m thinking about how Evo Morales did on his speech;
- There is also no “everything counts”, he does not disrespect rights and liberties of the opposition, he does not advocate, encourage or justify illegal and violent acts, even though he says “We have to fight till the last moment” it is more a figure of speech;

His discourse it’s clearly populist but lacks the consistent use of things like the Manichaeian division and the “will of the people”.

He builds up the idea that there are different sides and that you’re either with us, the Brazilians who are decent and want to change how things are, or you’re against us, with the PT, the left, the corrupts who wants to usurp the power and subvert our traditional values. But he does not openly utilize or lay down this idea.

However his speech still counts with an exaggerated cosmic proportion, an idea that he represents those who voted for him, the existence of an enemy, an evil that is morally wrong

and utilized democratic means to subvert the system to its own interests, thus, a systemic change is necessary to “save” the country.

AFTER REVISITING:

So, after reading the Nationalism Rubric and reading the paper that you, Bruno and Erin are writing I've realized that Bolsonaro's speech has some populist traits but it tempers with some nationalist ones.

The nationalist elements that are present are:

from the rubric:

There is a subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation", although there are no specific passages, this is something that can be perceived.

Even though there are no *family metaphors* as those present on the rubric, he utilizes words like "nation" and "we Brazilian people". Here is worth mentioning that I believe he does that mostly because words like "people" are heavily linked to the left, to the PT - his main opposition -, so I believe that this might be a strategy to distance himself from what he frames as the "enemies".

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.

The difference between this speech and his first one is pretty clear: here he adopts more populists traits and tends to "switch" or temper his discourse way lesser. Even the strongest element present on his first speech (we equated to nation) is not that strongly perceived, I would say that it is indeed present, but not on a explicit way.