

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Av. Paulista

Date of Speech: October 22, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Eduardo Ryo Tamaki

Date of grading: February 12, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 1

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “We are the majority. We are the real Brazil (...). Together with these Brazilian people, we will build a new nation”- “No one is going to leave this country, because this homeland is ours. It is not of this gang that has a red flag and has a sold/alienated head”	<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.

- "We believe in the future of our Brazil and together, as a team, we will build the future that we deserve. We have the best people in the world, the best land on the planet and we are going with this new political class to actually build what we deserve"

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.

Many references to "**our** country" and the use of expressions such as "**we**" and "**us**" but he builds them on a way where only the "true Brazilians" are part of it.

He does not mention the "will of the people" or talks about being the representative of such will instead, he talks about how the people are rising to defend and save the country by voting on him.

- "Without political indications, we will make a team of ministers that will truly

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>serve the needs of our people. You can be sure, you can trust us because we trust you”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “These people have always stood up in the most difficult times of the nation to save it. You of Paulista, you who do manifestations in all Brazil, you are saving our Homeland. You are saving mine, yours, our Brazil” 	
<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"> - “No one is going to leave this country, because this homeland is ours. It is not of this gang that has a red flag and has a sold/alienated head” - “‘Petralhada’, you all go to the ‘edge of the beach’, you will not have any more turns in our country, because I am going to cut off all your stewardships”. 	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We want free press, but with responsibility. Folha de São Paulo is the biggest Fake News of Brazil, you will not 	<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>have more advertising money from the government”</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Petralhada’, you all go to the ‘edge of the beach’, you will not have any more turns in our country, because I am going to cut off all your stewardships. You will not have more NGOs to satisfy your hunger for ‘mortadela’. It will be a cleaning never seen in the history of Brazil. Bums/Hobos will have to work, will stop demagoguery with the Brazilian people” -> Here ‘mortadela’ and “bums or hobos” are references to the people who support PT, as they are often referred to as “mortadelas” or “bun with mortadela” - “Soon you will have Lindbergh Farias to play dominoes in Chess (prison). Just wait, Haddad will get there too, but it will not be to visit you, no, it will be to stay a few years at your side. Since you love each other so much, you will rot in jail together. Because place of thief who steals the people is behind the bars” - “Petralhadas, You will see a civilian and military police officers with legal support to enforce the law on your back. Bandit 	<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>of the MST, thug of the MTST, your actions will be typified as terrorism; you will no longer take terror to the countryside or the cities. Either you fit in and submit to the laws, or you're going to keep company to the drunkard in Curitiba (Reference to Lula)"</p>	
--	--

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech contains a pretty much all the populist traits presents on this rubric. There is a clear division that is moral and Manichaeian: where there are good at one side and the evil, the bad at the other.

There are cosmic proportion and systemic change, but I don't feel like it is strong enough.

There are many references to "our country" and the use of expressions such as "we" and "us" but he builds them on a way where only the "true Brazilians" are part of it. He does not mention the "will of the people" or talks about being the representative of such will instead, he talks about how the people are rising to defend and save the country by voting on him. It's like he is the savior and the people are mobilizing to save the Fatherland by supporting him.

There is clearly an enemy (the PT) and he openly attacks them. Going even further, he also utilizes an "everything counts" approach.

The score was not higher because there are Nationalist elements as well. He makes a lot of references to Brazil, to "our Fatherland".

He praises the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation":
 "We are lovers of freedom, we want democracy and we want to live in peace. We love our families, we respect children, we respect all religions, we do not want socialism, we want distances from dictatorships all over the world"

There is also 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 refers 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