

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: One day before the second round of elections

Date of Speech: October 27, 2018

Category:

Grader: Caio Emanuel Marques

Date of grading: January 17, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 1.0

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.

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>“If someone does something bad using a t-shirt with my face, then I am associated as the one who is disseminating hatred in Brazil”</p> <p>“I have seen many banners against my ideas inside universities, but if someone hung up a banner with any of my ideas I would be hated for that”</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 only have two options: either go left or right. We know that going left means the return of PT and this is not what we want. We want a free Brazil, free of prejudices, a Brazil open to the world”</p> <p>“The great leadership of 1964”</p> <p>“I was stabbed by a follower of PSOL, the younger sibling of PT”, to which Bolsonaro continues to dramatically describe the recovery and the injury in details</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 Manichaean, 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>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>“I would like to thank the many voters who are at my side and fighting for a better Brazil”</p> <p>“We need to fight until the last minute and make sure the elections are democratic”</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>“We have fought against fascism and we are fighting PT now, which is a fascist party. They lie and try to blame me for things that are their faults”</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>“we want people to graduate being professionals and not fighters for the left side, which is what PT is doing now”</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>“I would like for the media to take a look on the Article 85 of the Constitution” “I am a slave of the Constitution and it is not up to me to write a new one” “Elections are not won, we need to fight until</p>

the last minute"

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): The discourse appeals to many populist elements by claiming that the people should unite themselves to take PT out of the power, so that this would be the only way for democracy to survive in Brazil. Bolsonaro accuses PT of being a fascist party, thus associating many negative feelings towards them, and reiterating the idea that the other candidate should not be taken into consideration and that he is the only possible salvation for the country. Not only, he dramatizes everything in his speech, making the opposition candidate seem worse than he is. There is some notion of nationalism in this speech, claiming that Brazil has to restructure himself and become a great nation again. He, thus, claims to have the solution to the current problems of the country and claims for the union of people to vote for him.