

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Right after 1st round

Date of Speech: October 7, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Eduardo Ryo Tamaki

Date of grading: February 11, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.7

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>- “After all, there are only two paths left for us: prosperity, freedom, family, God's side with those who have religion and those who do not have religion but are responsible; and on the other side is the way of Venezuela. We do not want this for our Brazil”</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>

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.

- "Our country really is on the brink of Chaos, we can not take another step to the left"
- "We can not fade away, after all, what is at stake is our freedom"
- "We can change the destiny of this nation"

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.

- "We did not have personalities, we did not have a great apparatus on our side, we did have some good politicians, and the people, the citizen"

He does not highlight the popular will or the will of the people, instead, he says that they had the people at their side. In this case, he built the notion of people as being the embodiment of the good.

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.

It is not that populist, on a way that “popular will” would be, but it is something that needs to be acknowledged.

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.

- “What I want for the Northeast is really a region that, through its humble, conservative and hardworking people, is free of the lie, free of the coercion that always exists on the part of the PT, or rather has always existed on the part of the PT, for occasion of elections make **real terrorism** on top of those that belong in one of the regions of most humble people of our country. The Northeasterner is as Brazilian as any other”

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.

- “We have everything; everything to be a great nation, for this we have to unite our people, unite the pieces that the government of the left has made of us”

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.”

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.

Even though it is not explicit, he does not disrespect formal rights and liberties. He does not openly justify the use of non-democratic means. Nevertheless, his language shows bellicosity towards his opposition that is incendiary and condescending:

- “Let’s go together to the TSE demanding solutions to what just happened (problems at the polls and alleged frauds), and it was no small thing, it was a lot! I am sure that if this problem had not occurred and we had confidence in electronic voting, we would already have the name of the Future President of the Republic decided today”
- “We can not continue to flirt with socialism or communism” -> Talking about his opposition

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.

Even though it is not explicit, he does not disrespect formal rights and liberties. He does not openly justify the use of non-democratic means. Nevertheless, his language shows bellicosity towards his opposition that is incendiary and condescending.

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

It contains almost every populist elements but it lacks a consistent use of a few of them. The Manichaeian division is present but is not that strong or that present, you can see that there is a division, one that is mainly moral, but there are also efforts to unite the people despite their differences.

He does not highlight the popular will or the will of the people; instead, he says that they had the people at their side. In this case, he built the notion of people as being the embodiment of the good. It is not that populist, on a way that "popular will" would be, but it is something that needs to be acknowledged.

In addition, even though it is not explicit, he does not disrespect formal rights and liberties. He does not openly justify the use of non-democratic means. Nevertheless, his language shows bellicosity towards his opposition that is incendiary and condescending.

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