

**Country: Brazil**

**Leader: Bolsonaro**

**Title of Speech:** Speech one day before the first round of elections

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

**Category: Campaign**

**Grader:** Caio Emanuel Marques

**Date of grading:** February 11, 2019

**Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.2**

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>He mentions many ways in which PT has divided the country and the people, and how this division is a symbol of Communism</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 <b>narrow, particular issues</b>. 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 <b>cosmic proportions</b> 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 <b>national and religious leaders</b> that are generally revered.</p> <p>“We will heal the ones who support ‘free Lula’ through work”</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 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.</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>“We lack compromised politicians with the country and not their political allies”</p> <p>“Our proposal shows that Brazil can work out”</p> <p>“Our ministries seek only fulfill their political parties’ interests. I promise to have my own freedom to choose ministries that I think will suit the country”</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</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>such as neoliberalism and capitalism.</p> <p>“We have to get away one and for all from Communism and Socialism, not to follow the same path that has haunted Venezuela. Let’s make Brazil big. Let’s be proud of this country anymore. Socialism and Communism did not work out, so let’s get away from it and not closer to it like PT wants to”</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.”</p> <p>The only change he mentions is that, by electing him, PT will not be in power anymore and this is already a change for the country</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>“If all of you get one more vote from someone you know, we will win this election in the first round”</p>

**Overall Comments (just a few sentences):** This is a very repetitive speech, and completely nationalist. There is no strong presence of Populist elements in this speech, as he is basically asking people to either vote for him or to convince others to vote for him so he can have a guaranteed win in this round in the elections. There are references to the candidate being Communist and Socialist and that they should not be trusted because their past administrations have drowned Brazil in the crisis that it is today. He claims for the union of the people to improve the general lives of Brazilians.

