

**A Drop in the Ocean or a Change in the Weather?
Populism in Bolsonaro’s Campaign Revisited**

Supplementary Materials

Table of Contents

A. Populism Rubric	2
B. Populism Scores	5
C. Rubrics.....	6
Speech 1	6
Speech 2	17
Speech 3	27
Speech 4	34
Speech 5	43
Speech 6	51
Speech 7	60
Speech 8	69
Speech 9	79
Speech 10	90

A. Populism Rubric

Populism Scores – Taken from the “Populism Rubric” (Hawkins, 2009):

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>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>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 Manichaeic, 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>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>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>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>

TEAM POPULISM | Leader Profile Series

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.

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.

B. Populism Scores

Populism Scores – Taken from the “Populism Rubric” (Hawkins, 2009):

2. A speech in this category is extremely populist and comes very close to the ideal populist discourse. Specifically, the speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal populist discourse, and has few elements that would be considered non-populist.
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.

References

Hawkins, Kirk A. (2009). “Is Chávez Populist? Measuring Populist Discourse in Comparative Perspective.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(8): 1040 – 1067.

C. Rubrics

Speech 1

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Campaign Launch

Date of Speech: July 07, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: 16/01/2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.5

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>“On one side, the left, and on the other the center. I would like to thank Geraldo Alckmin to have gathered what is the worst in Brazil. Something even worse than corruption, which is the ideological question that took part of 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>

TEAM POPULISM | Leader Profile Series

<p>“I would like to talk about Dilma’s reelection, her past and her party’s, or even better, her faction’s past, and I saw that we had to do something to change the future of this country”</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 have no television time, but we have something other parties don’t, and that’s you, my electors”</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>“The majority of the deputies were against me and tried to take me away from power”</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 have to value this ministry (Sciences and Technology)”</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>“in this amazing fatherland we used to all live at harmony: the Jews, the Arabs, the French, the Germans and many Asian countries, but PT tried to split us apart”</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>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>

TEAM POPULISM | Leader Profile Series

<p>“the Parliament is the problem, they want to do something different that has to be done. They are syndicate leaders and should not be there, and have to be removed”</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>Even though the discourse is pretty critic and uses harsh language, democratic principles are respected.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): The speech starts with a little introduction about Bolsonaro’s political career then slips into a short but strong populism, with mentions to the many things that have subverted the previous government into failure while he mentions some things, he thought should be done to improve the country. However, this Populism quickly transforms into Nationalism since the previous government has tried to harm the nation, and he presents many solutions to save the people from this current state. Thus, this speech presents us both ideas of Populism and Nationalism, but the latter being more prevalent to the former.

Nationalist elements: “I might have Messiah (Messiah) in my middle name but I am not the one who will save this fatherland; we all will”

“we know what’s in game: the future of this nation”

“to look for a different Brazil, a Brazil we deserve”

“to take this part of the population out of misery, to get them out of colonialism”

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: PSL conference: Official launch of his candidacy for President

Date of Speech: July 22th, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: 03/11/2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.4 (after first review, talk) (see last page)

0 A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements. **Note that even if a speech expresses a Manichaeic worldview, it is not considered populist if it lacks some notion of a popular will.**

Populist	Pluralist
<p>It conveys a Manichaeic 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"> - “On one side would be the left, on the other, the center. I even want to thank Geraldo Alckmin for having combined the elite of the worst in Brazil with him” - “Here in this wonderful homeland all live in harmony: Jews; Arabs; French; Germans; countries; all live 	<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"> - “(we) have to appoint Ministry by the criterion of competence. It does not matter who it is, its mission, its color, its religion (...)” - “Once again thank you Geraldo Alckmin for uniting the scum of Brazilian politics. Without saying that I am accusing all the deputies of this party. At least 40% of these deputies are with us and do not agree

<p>in harmony here, it's a wonderful homeland that the PT tried to divide us”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “(...) that we, take out the unrecoverable, but us humans and most of the parliamentarians (...)” <p>Makes clear that he thinks some of the “humans”, who are deeply aligned to the opposition, are unrecoverable.</p> <p>Although, as it’s written on the opposite box, he claims that ‘not all the deputies of PSDB are the scum of Brazilian politics, claiming too that at least 40% of them are with him because they do not agree with the actions taken by the party leaders’, he adopts an intolerant position towards his opposition.</p>	<p>with the actions taken by these leaders”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let's unite white and black people, homos and straight, also trans, no problem. Each one does what it wants, be happy. Let's unite the Northeastern and Southern people. Let's stifle these small separatist movements that we see in Brazil. Unite rich and poor. It has become a crime in Brazil to be rich! Let's unite employers and employees, not sow discord between them. One needs the other” <p>This part seems to represent an idea that there’s the possibility of natural, justifiable differences of opinion, <i>but</i> he does not mention the opposition, the left or the PT.</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"> - “Brazil can’t take other 4 years of PT or PSDB! Together, let’s recover our Brazil, let’s give hope to everyone, let’s unite this people” <p>He tries to tie his ideas to figures like his</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>economist Paulo Guedes, the general Augusto Eleno, and publisher and businessman Roberto Marinho who was responsible for the creation of Grupo Globo (one of the biggest media conglomerates)</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>The “common, religious and from the traditional family” men are seen as the embodiment of the national idea. There is no single, strong and evident passage that sustains this idea, but it’s something that becomes clear as we advance through his speech. There is also a clear distinction between this “common man” and his “leftist counterpart”.</p> <p>But there is no reference to the “popular will”, to the “will of the people” as being something that drives him.</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.”</p> <p>The majority shifts and changes across issues. The common man is not romanticized, and the notion of citizenship is broad and legalistic.</p> <p>Even though he accepts the majority as being a sum of different people, from different places and with different backgrounds (economically and socially), it is not something that changes across issues. It’s a solid construction with almost no space to maneuver</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.

- “On one side would be the left, on the other, the center. I even want to thank Geraldo Alckmin for having combined the elite of the worst in Brazil with him”
- “As for the other side, I say, it is something as or more serious than corruption, which is the ideological issue that took part, which took over much of Brazil”
- “Here everyone lives in harmony, it’s a wonderful homeland that the PT tried to divide”
- “I use to say that most parliamentarians want to act differently than how partisan leaders, who are actually union leaders, act. Let’s get the union out of the national congress” (**Union here is the same as workers’ organizations**)
- “You (militaries from the navy and air force) are attacked daily, accused of the greatest Absurd by that left that is there, you know why? Because you are the last obstacle to socialism!”
- “We will not accept Socialism!”

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>When talking about the opposition, about PT and the left, he uses bellicose terms like “factions”. In addition, he ties the opposition, the left and PT, to Socialism and Communism, framing them as enemies as well.</p> <p>His enemies are also traditional parties like PSDB, even though he mentions it only 2 times.</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. He does not utilize terms such as “revolution” or “liberation”, but the evil minority that was recently in charge, subverted the system to its own interests (ideological interests), against those of the good, traditional people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Brazil can’t take another 4 years of PT or PSDB. Together let’s rescue our Brazil, let’s give hope to everyone, let’s unite this people!” - “We will seek to revoke the constitutional amendment 81 which relativized private property. Rural landowners, urban landowners, pay attention to this: the left over the course of its thirteenth year has been seeking ways through legislation to impose its will, and private property has never been respected by the left 	<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 there nobody ever worked, always living from work of others”</p> <p>- “We want, dear economist Paulo Guedes, to really seek the liberation of our economy to pursue liberalism. We want to privatize, maybe even extinguish most of the state”</p> <p>He utilizes term as “recover” when mentioning Brazil, as if he is promising and calling the “people” to save, to rescue Brazil.</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>At this point, there is no encouragement to illegal or violent actions. He seems to “respect” the formal rights and liberties of the opposition, even though he attacks them during most of his discourse. There are no mentions of non-democratic means nor mentions of any attack on natural rights of his opposition.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

Overall, his discourse presents clear populist elements. Even though he has a clear enemy, traditional parties (PSDB and PT) with more vigorous opposition to PT and the left, he does not refer to the "popular will" or the "will of the people." The common person is romanticized, but there is no mention or attempt to build a notion of "popular will." He tries, though, to create an image of "us" as being a sum of him and the ones who support him; in this notion, he talks in a way where it creates an idea that "everyone" (his followers) are together and will act together on his government. He does not exaggerate the use of cosmic proportions, not openly, but when he talks about what the opposition has done during the last 13 years of government, there is a faint

trace of cosmic proportions that can be perceived. There are also arguments for systemic change, but no "everything counts" approach or mention: he does not encourage illegal or violent acts and does not disrespect formal rights and liberties, not even when talking about the opposition.

I gave 0.9 to it because it's closer to 1, as it presents strong, clearly populist elements, but it is not above 1, closer to 2, because it has no strong presence of an apparent "popular will." It's closer to 0 than to 2 because it lacks some notion of a popular will.

AFTER REVISITING:

So, after reading the Nationalism Rubric and reading the paper that Kirk, 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 subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation," an example:

"(...)we the Brazilian people (*brasileiros*) say that there is something more, way more important than our lives: our freedom! Because the men or women arrested, have no life! Let's make Brazil different with your strength! I am here because I believe in you; you are here because you believe in Brasil; this Brasil is ours! Our flag is green and yellow!"

Even though there are no *family metaphors* 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 think 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.

And here is the key point: " 'We' or the 'people' is equated with 'the nation' and repeated references are made to the name of the nation"; examples are:

"I know what is at stake in this approaching moment: is the destiny of this great nation called Brazil."

"I do this for the children of Brazil; I do it for the women of Brazil."

Speech 2

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Bolsonaro’s speech at Araçatuba

Date of Speech: August 23, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: January 23, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.5

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>“With us there will not be the political criminality we see today because we will not give them public money”</p> <p>“we need someone to approach democratic countries and not Mercosur countries because of an ideologic question. We need</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>someone who understands the ideas of free market”</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>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>No important historical references made</p>
<p>Although Manichaeian, 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>“everyone here believes in the future of Brazil”</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>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 here do not want Brazil to approach what has been happening to Venezuela, which was one of the richest countries in South America, and from where people are fleeing it due to the dictatorship” “we cannot take another mandate of either PT or PSDB. We need someone who respects the Brazilian family values”</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>“yes, we are different from these who have governed us from the past 20 years”</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>

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.

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.

“we represent a new form of politics, we say what Brazil needs to hear, we show that Brazil has a way of getting better”

“we are one people, one only nation. Together we can make Brazil a great nation again”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): Despite many populist ideas being present in his speech, they are used to emphasize the importance of Brazil to the Brazilian people and how the government cannot fail the people. This speech is basically a repetition of many speeches he gave around the country, with references to some things he would like to see changing in the nation and trying to please his voters, as well as convincing people to vote for him. However, as it is common with this leader, we can see that he embodies the evil minority into the former leaders that preceded him, and blames them for everything that has been going wrong with the country.

Country: Brazil

Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Bolsonaro’s speech at Araçatuba

Date of Speech: August 23, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: 03/12/2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.6

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>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>This one does not have a particular passage that can be utilized, mostly because he does not focus on a narrow or specific issue that can divide the people, nor does he use a Manichaeian vision with the implication that there is nothing in between. Even though – at times – he focuses on certain things like the police, he does not “separate” the people. Although there are passages that, even if not the best, can help us:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “And what I want, if that’s God’s will, is to be from next January onwards, not an army captain no longer, but a soldier of our Brazil” - “Brazil has everything, everything, to be a great nation, but it goes through, and I repeat, <i>your</i> hands the decision to

	<p>put better people in Brasilia so that together with the President they can make laws, revoke others, aiming the common interest”</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"> - “Our big problem in Brazil is a political issue: Or we put people like us in politics or we have no future, and people like us are honest people, people who believe in God, people who are patriotic” - “The great example we get out of there is that we can not play games with politics. We in Brazil will not be able to take another PT or PSDB cycle” 	<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 Manichaeic, 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We are different from those that govern us over 20 years PT and PSDB. 	<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>With us You will be in first place, you will be our bosses”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Take the supreme federal court, which has declared unconstitutional my law of printed vote, even so, even with distrust we will keep going till the end. They continue to attack us daily, but we have something that other parties do not have: we have the people on our side. Good men and women who want a better future for their country, let's unite all of you in this common cause”. 	
<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"> - “With us there will be no such human rights politicking. This banditry is going to die because we will not release union resources to them. To a great extent these NGOs do a disservice to our Brazil” - “Together we have how to unite our Brazilian people, who have been disunited in particular by the left in recent years” <p>Regarding the left, he even says that they kept Brazil “tied with Mercosul because of ideological principles”;</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</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>their “immiseration” or bondage, even if technically it comes about through elections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Together we have how to unite our Brazilian people, who have been disunited in particular by the left in recent years” - “Change radically this way of doing politics” - We are different from those that govern us over 20 years PT and PSDB. With us You will be in first place, you will be our bosses. Together we have how to change Brazil, we will get no other opportunity!” 	
<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"> - “In 1955 when I was born on March 21 my father's neighbor screamed: it is male or female?”. At that time it was not prejudice. And it will continue being: born as either male or female, period! Gender ideology is the “<i>ponta da praia</i>”! With us it is man or woman and period. <p><i>Ponta da praia</i> is a reference to the Military base at Restinga de Marambaia, in Rio de Janeiro: This place, which was located at the “tip of the beach” (<i>ponta da praia</i>) and was a known as a torture and execution place for political detainees during the dictatorship.</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>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

Bolsonaro's speech presents evident populist traits, although it tempers with a few nationalist ones. There is cosmic proportion, even if not highly exaggerated or constant. There is the presence of a "will of the people," a "common will" that unites his supporters. In this case:

"We are different from those that govern us over 20 years PT and PSDB. With us, You will be in the first place, you will be our bosses" his phrase is very similar to what Hugo Chavez once said: "You, the people, are the giant that has awoken. I, your humble soldier, will do only what you say".

He frames his opposition, the left, and even mainstream party PSDB as the enemy, the evil that was destroying Brazil and his people. At this speech, he goes even further, attacking NGOs and the "people from Human Rights."

He calls for changes; he claims that "the left and PSDB (mainstream right-wing party)" has destroyed our country and made the people suffer, so he advocates for changes on "the way of doing politics," even though he does not specify which particular changes and how to do them.

That being said, this can be considered a "systemic change," but it's not utilized in a populist way. I'd say it has some traces of populism - like when he says that they will/they need to radically change this current way of doing politics - but it's not that much.

There is no evident adoption of an "everything counts" approach. He does say that "With us, there will be no such human rights politicking. This banditry is going to die because we will not release union resources to them," but it's not openly anti-democratic or going against liberties and civil rights. There is this thing about "Ponta da Praia" which I mentioned in the last box. Besides that, he does utilize bellicose language when referring to the opposition, saying words like "this banditry is going to die."

Even if he utilizes words like "homeland" and "nation," it is not used in a Nationalist way. Now, about nationalist traits:

There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation," an example:

- "We speak what Brazil needs to hear, we show that Brazil has a way, but this solution obviously passes through the hands of each one of you. Our big problem in Brazil is a political issue: Or we put people like us in politics, or we have no future, and people like us are honest people, people who believe in God, patriotic people";

He claims that the Brazilian people, the "core nation," would be people that are in favor of the "traditional family" and that "praise God."

- "Together, we can unite our Brazilian people who have been disunited in particular by the left in the last years. We are one country, one nation, one nation, one green, and yellow heart. Together we can really make Brazil a great nation.

Even though there are no family metaphors 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 think that this might be a strategy to distance himself from what he frames as the "enemies."

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:

- "We need someone sitting in the presidential chair, as I said, to respect the traditional Brazilian family. We will have God above all as our motto. We need someone who really restores the power of teacher authority in the classroom".

And here is the key point: " 'We' or the 'people' is equated with 'the nation' and repeated references are made to the name of the nation."

Speech 3

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at Porto Velho

Date of Speech: August 31, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: February 14, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.0

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>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>“We want to unite Brazil from North to South, East to West”</p> <p>“For that to happen, we need a State that does not intervene, one that charges less taxes, one that respects who wants to work”</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</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</p>

<p>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>mystical connections.</p> <p>No historical references mentioned in his speech nor any cosmic proportion concept applied</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>“We will kick gender ideology and Communism out of here”</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>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>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>“They [congressman] want to contribute to the growth of Brazil”</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 people cannot continue being poor because of the lack of good politicians” “The mission to save Brazil has to do with all of us” “... a country where the family values are respected”</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>“We have everything to become a great nation, we just need to vote consciously to do so”</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This is a short speech lacking many of the common elements of the other speeches he delivered, such as the lack of any mention of his competitors or blaming PT for having doomed the country. Nevertheless, the only populist element present here is the attack to the Communist ideology. The rest of the speech is basically a support to the remaining candidates of the state that belong to the same party as Bolsonaro does.

Country: Brazil

Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Bolsonaro’s speech at Porto Velho, Roraima

Date of Speech: August 31, 2018.

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: 03/12/2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.1

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>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"> - “There are a lot of good people in another party. We want to unite and unite Brazil.” - “We respect everyone who supports other candidates: they are welcome” - “We have how to change the destiny of Brazil we want to unite all from north to south from East to West”.
<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</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “17 years that I stayed in our beloved Brazilian army” - “Four years ago I decided to run for the presidency of the republic. We had no

<p>his or her ideas by tying them to national and religious leaders that are generally revered.</p>	<p>party, we knew that no one would want to join us and we would practically have to rely only on you”</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. There is no reference to the popular will or something close to that. He does say that he has something that the others do not: The people; but that is as far as it goes.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let us classify the actions of the MST as terrorism. Those who invade property in the countryside or in the city are not citizens and has to be treated with the rigors of the law” - “Let's boot the gender ideology, let's sweep away communism and the São Paulo forum” 	<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</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 people from their “immiseration” or bondage, even if technically it comes about through elections.</p> <p>There is the presence of an evil minority who was recently in charge and subverted the system to its own interests, but it does not go as far as arguing for a systemic change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “This Brazil besides being great is a rich country and its people cannot continue being poor for lack of politicians who are not ashamed” 	
<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"> - “Let us classify the actions of the MST as terrorism. Those who invade property in the countryside or in the city are not citizens and has to be treated with the rigors of the law” 	<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"> - “Let’s vote well, with all the respect that everyone deserves”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

That was a short speech, and there were only a few populist elements. He does identify and frame a minority as being the "evil," the "enemy," but it is only on a certain part of his discourse. There is the presence of an evil minority who was recently in charge and subverted the system to its own interests, but it does not go as far as arguing for a systemic change. It does argue for a change when he says things like "save our Brazil," but that is it; there is no clear nor explicit strategy of how to change the system – besides voting for him. There is a somewhat subtle presence of an "everything counts" approach, but as I said, it is rather subtle. When talking to the opposition, he utilizes bellicose language, even further referring to terrorism.

That is all. There are no references to the popular will, to a "general will," no use of cosmic proportion, and no Manichaeian distinction nor a dualistic one.

Speech 4

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at Commercial and Business Association in Juiz de Fora

Date of Speech: September 6, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: January 30, 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>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>“Brazil, why are we like this? We have to look for the origin of the problem, which is political education”</p> <p>“Let’s look for partnerships around the world, countries which have a better economy than ours”</p>
<p>The moral significance of the items mentioned in the speech is heightened by</p>	<p>The discourse will probably not refer to any reified notion of history or use any cosmic</p>

<p>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>“I am from a poor family, but from the good times, when there was no poverty like there is today” “They lost in 64, lost in 2016, and will lose in 2018”</p>	<p>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 Manichaeic, 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>“We have everything, but look at what we are not” “Either we change Brazil now, or we will not have another opportunity”</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>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>“...In the massacre the Left has done over the armed forces, since that is the last step before the instauration of Socialism”</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 cannot continue with this division PT-PSDB”</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>“Brazil needs someone who takes the State away from the ones who produce, since because of that no one wants to be a producer anymore”</p> <p>“We can even make mistakes, but we will not be accused of information omission nor corruption”</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</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>

shows a worthy opponent.

“Let’s make a government where we will be slaves of the law and serve you, the population”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This discourse mainly focuses on repetitions of things that have been said in previous speeches and talks mainly about campaign promises. However, there are a few populist elements present in Bolsonaro’s speech, such as the idea of the union of the people under a common cause (which could be understood as trying to drive the current ones in power away from it and making sure that their Socialist ideology does not spread throughout the nation). For this, Bolsonaro once more claims that he is not strong by himself, but again mentions he needs the union of the people (although using this idea in a more nationalist way).

“We have to unite, under one flag and one name”

“I am not this nation’s savior, I know my limits, but we can save the country if we work together. We can change Brazil’s destiny”

“The government does not allow the market to self-regulate. The countries who adopted free-market premises have worked out”

Country: Brazil

Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at the Business and Commercial association at Rio de Janeiro.

Date of Speech: September 6th, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: December 11, 2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

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>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>There is no Manichaeian nor dualistic vision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Enough of eroding family values, gender ideology, politically correct! No more dividing us” - “Let's make a Brazil equal for all of us, but looking upwards, not equal to misery as the left has always done in the whole world, and will not do in Brazil! They lost in 64, lost in 2016 and will lose in 2018”
<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</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>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"> - “Let's make a Brazil equal for all of us, but looking upwards, not equal to misery as the left has always done in the whole world, and will not do in Brazil! They lost in 64, lost in 2016 and will lose in 2018.” - “Or we change Brazil now or we won't have another opportunity” 	
<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>There is no clear reference to the “will of the people” as he does not utilize those words, <i>but</i> there are references to the “people” being in his favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “My identity, my virtue that is similar to that of you who are here, overcomes it all! We do not have partisan funds or television time, but we have the trust of the people and the faith in God that we can change the destiny of Brazil” - “God willing, and if this is his will, we will make a government where we will be slaves of the Law and employee of you” 	<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>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>There is no certain passage that can be used, but in his speech, he builds the idea that the evil is embodied in his mainstream opposition: The left and PT, and PSDB.</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>There are arguments for systemic change even though he does not utilize words like “revolution” and “liberation”.</p> <p>He claims that he wants to change the politics and some ministries like when he says that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Ministry of the environment nowadays suffers influences from foreign NGOs. Everything the environment can do in one of the few things that works in Brazil, which is agribusiness, this Ministry does” - “Let us put in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, not Marighella's driver who is now there now, the (?) terrorist Aloisio Nunes Ferreira, but someone with an Open Business Vision, free trade, from pro-liberalism largely” 	<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</p>	<p>Formal rights and liberties are openly respected, and the opposition is treated with</p>

<p>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>courtesy and as a legitimate political actor.</p> <p>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"> - "God willing, and if this is his will, we will make a government where we will be slaves of the Law and employee of you"
--	--

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech contains a few populist elements but is highly tempered with nationalist elements (as I'll explain further). There is no Manichaeian nor dualistic division, no "Black and white" division at all. As you follow his discourse, it is possible to realize that he divides him and his opposition, PSDB and the left, mainly the PT. But this division that is built is not made in a way that there can't be anything in between.

There is the presence of Cosmic proportion, as he claims that there are things that the left does on the whole world - negative things - and even mentions that this is the time to change Brazil and that they won't have another chance.

There is even this part:

"Why must we continue to think that we are going to hand over our arable land to foreign capital, which in this case is China, that is buying. We can not give up our food security. China is not buying in Brazil; it is buying Brazil. When we wake up, it may be too late".

There is no mention of the "will of the people," "popular will," or things like that even though he mentions that they have the support of the people, that they have the people beside them. There are a few passages that somewhat resemble Hugo Chávez speeches:

"God willing, and if this is his will, we will make a government where we will be slaves of the Law and employee of you."

The evil minority is clearly the opposition, the left, mainly PT and PSDB; even though they are just framed as evil enemies, there is no use of Manichaeian division.

The systemic change arguments presented are not that strong or not openly utilized by using words and terms like "revolution" and "liberation." Instead, there is the idea that the political system and some ministries need to change, but I think that the absence of those specific terms and words (or even similar) makes this trait not that much populist.

And there is no sign of an everything counts approach.

Now for the Nationalist traits:

from the rubric:

There is subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation" in his discourse; he highlights the importance of respecting the family and upholding traditional values.

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.

At last, his speech looks more like a military leader instead of a political leader.

"The massacre made on the Armed Forces in recent years by PT and PSDB have created commissions of truth, among other aberrations, that attacks us because we Armed Forces are the last obstacle to socialism, we do not give ourselves because we have always been on the side of the Brazilian people" (Sounds confusing but that's how he said)

This particular passage is extremely important to illustrate what I've written because here, you can see that there is also the presence of something that is the "enemy of the nation," not only the "enemy of the people" as those are different.

Finally, the notion of "people" that he builds is different from the "people" in a populist way: it is made in a nationalist way, broader, bigger, and seems to go beyond the government.

Speech 5

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech after being stabbed

Date of Speech: September 16, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: January 30, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

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>“This in Brazil is a game of power, the domination of a nation”</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</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</p>

<p>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>“What is in question here is not my future; it’s the future of the 200-something million Brazilians. To where is Brazil going?”</p>	<p>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>“PT does not try to hide what it is doing anymore” “PT will go looking for a social control of the media” “If Haddad is elected, democracy will be over”</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>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</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>or the capitalist, industrialized nations or international financiers or simply an ideology such as neoliberalism and capitalism.</p> <p>“Put yourselves in the place of the prisoner there in Curitiba, with all of his wealth and all of his supporters; would you passively accept to be thrown in jail and not try to break out? Since he hasn’t, we can assume that it is because he has a Plan B ... I cannot see this coming out any other way that is not favorable to him”</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 real question, maybe even more severe than corruption, is the ideological positioning”</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>

“The great fear now is not to lose against a candidate, but to lose because of a fraud”
He talks a lot about possible frauds in the elections due to the voting system, but he positions himself against it”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): In this speech, Bolsonaro talks to the people days after being stabbed and going through surgery. Thus, he speaks slowly and with a lot of pause, with what could be a sign of pain. He mostly talks about the possibility of frauds in the elections due to the voting system being electronic and how Dilma Rousseff vetoed his proposal for paper votes in 2016. For the rest of the speech, he claims that Brazil cannot go forward with PT in power, but his speech is more aggressive on this point than what is normal and expected of him. He mentions with some obscurity the ideas that democracy would be over if Haddad (his competitor) won the elections and mentions that Brazil is a constant change of powers hinting that the two main parties are always in command to fulfill their interests. There are no other populist elements apart from these two mentioned.

Country: Brazil

Name of politician: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech after he was stabbed

Date of Speech: September 16th, 2018

Category: Campaign (?)

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: December 11, 2018

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

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>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"> - “What is at stake at the moment is the future of all of you who are there, even you who support the PT, you are a human being too. I see a lot of PT changing sides” <p>There is no Manichaeian or Dualistic vision or approach to this speech. There is no black and white distinction either.</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</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>There is no particular passage that can be used here, but his speech lacks the use of cosmic</p>

<p>his or her ideas by tying them to national and religious leaders that are generally revered.</p>	<p>proportion. His main focus is the possibility of fraud (that will be explained).</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. There is no mention or whatsoever of a “popular will” or “will of the people.” There are only a few mentions to the people and even to Brazil.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The PT has discovered the path to power: electronic voting” - “If you read carefully these two documents, among other barbarities You will see there clearly written that the PT will seek the social control of the media. You will lose your freedom, I know that not everyone has nowadays, but I know that whoever has it will completely lose this freedom” 	<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</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>“revolution” or “liberation” of the people from their “immiseration” or bondage, even if technically it comes about through elections.</p>	<p>His speech focuses on a particular issue: the possibility of fraud in the elections. Going further, there is no argument for a systemic change. There is indeed the presence of an idea that “an evil minority who was recently in charge, subverted the system to its own interest,” but there is no systemic change.</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>It does not openly justify non-democratic means, but it has a solid and constant conspiratorial tone, attacking his opposition, accusing them of plotting frauds. It is an attempt to call the people to fight against the opponent who is already plotting an electoral fraud to prevent him from winning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “That I ask you to put yourself in the place of the convict who is there in Curitiba, with all his popularity, with all his possible wealth, with all his traffic along with dictatorships of the whole world that support themselves, especially in Cuba. Would you passively accept, bovinely go to jail, you would not try an escape? Well if you did not try to run away with everything at your side it's because you have a plan B. What is plan B of this convict, that poor man back there who stole all our hopes? I can not think of anything else unless Plan B materializes in a fraud unfavorable to 	<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>Lula, or better in favor of Lula. We have elections now. When I saw Dilma Rousseff's reinstatement in 2014, I thought to myself: "We can not wait for 2018 because Lula will be a candidate, they will not leave. Look how Brazil is, where we are going, in every aspect without exception and I always used to say, and I still say, that as serious as corruption is the ideological question"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- "So this possibility of fraud in the second round is concrete"	
---	--

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech contains a few populist elements, but it lacks the presence of a Dualistic or Manichaeic division, a division that has nothing in between; it lacks the use of cosmic proportion and the argument for systemic changes.

On the other side, there is a clear presence of an enemy, an evil minority who has "figured" the path to power, and that is "now" (in his words) openly plotting an electoral fraud to prevent him from being elected. There is a solid and constant bellicose and conspiratorial tone; in that way, his speech is highly conspiratorial. There is this idea that the enemy, an evil ruling minority who was recently in charge, subverted and usurped the power from the people.

This speech also lacks nationalist traits; even though he claims that Brazil needs to be saved, it is not constant nor strong enough.

Overall, this speech is more conspiratorial, and I personally think it marks a passage between his "less radical" self to a more radical one - to better understand this, we need to also know the background: it was a speech that he gave on his hospital bed, right after being stabbed during a political event where he walked among the electorate from Juiz de Fora.

Speech 6

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at Avenida Paulista

Date of Speech: September 30, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: February 10, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

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>“A change of ‘PT not anymore, PT not ever again’.”</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>“Brazil is ours, the good people, workers, who do not want gender ideology in classrooms”</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>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>“We will fight until the last minute, this is the last chance we have to get away from this 30-yr old politics of PT and PSDB”</p>
<p>Although Manichaeic, 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>“We want change: get away from Communism and from the form of Politics in Venezuela”</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>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 will fight until the last minute, this is the last chance we have to get away from this 30-yr old politics of PT and PSDB”</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>“This movement comes from the ones who have suffered and want changes” “We are different from them, we are not Left, we abhor Communism, we abhor Socialism”</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>

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.

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.

“We want a president who can appoint compromised and competent ministers, according to what is best to Brazilians”
“This is our country”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): The discourse, although short, presents us an intense use of Populist elements, but all of them making reference to a more nationalistic approach of things, giving the idea that the will of the Brazilians has to be the ruling ideology in a government. This is what Bolsonaro is proposing to the people in this speech, thus claiming to be the change and the rupture with past forms of government and presenting a government focused on giving the people what they want. There are not many strong Populist elements present that have nothing to do with Nationalism.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Av. Paulista

Date of Speech: September 30, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: February 8, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): **0.5**

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"> - “Brazil is ours, good people, workers, conservatives, Christians who preserve family values, who do not want gender ideology in classrooms, who want Brazil doing business with the whole world, without ideological bias” - “Brazil is ours. We are different from them, we are not leftists, we abhor communism, we abhor socialism” 	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “It’s the last chance we have to get away from this politics that have been plundering the Brazilian people for 30 years so far” 	<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 Manichaeic, 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>Even though he doesn’t say “popular will” directly, this passage evokes the idea of something close to that: the interests of the people.</p> <p>It is not that populist, in a way that “popular will” would be, but it is something that needs to be acknowledged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We want a president with 	<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>exemption, who is free to appoint a team of ministers, technical and competent, and committed to the interests of the Brazilian people and not of political parties”</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “It’s the last chance we have to get away from this politics that have been plundering the Brazilian people for 30 years so far” - “Enough of PT and PSDB, Brazil is ours, it’s mine, it’s yours” 	<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</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>technically it comes about through elections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We want change, we want to move away from communism, give a brush of the politics that exist in Venezuela. We do not want this for our Brazil” - “Let's fight until the last second! It's the last chance we have to get away from this politics that have been plundering the Brazilian people for 30 years so far” 	
<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>There is nothing that goes with the “everything counts approach,” but he does not say anything that suggests that he respects the rights and liberties of the opposition, but he also does not say anything that let us think otherwise.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech is very short, so I tried to think of intensity over quantity. I then searched how intense the populist traits were in his speech.

There is a clear Manichaeian distinction when he talks about the "good people," there is also cosmic proportion even though it is not that intense.

There are also a few mentions to the people and what he calls "the interest of the people": Even though he doesn't say "popular will" in a direct way, that passage in question evokes the idea of something close to that. It is not that populist, in a way that "popular will" would be, but it needs to be acknowledged.

The enemy is not that present in his speech. It is something more subtle, but that can be perceived.

There is nothing that goes with the "everything counts" approach.

He does not say anything that suggests that he respects the rights and liberties of the opposition, but he also does not say anything that lets us think otherwise.

In terms of Nationalist traits, there are a few things that are worth highlighting:

- 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.

Speech 7

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: Coder A

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 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 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 Manichaeic, 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</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</p>

TEAM POPULISM | Leader Profile Series

<p>“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 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>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>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.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Facebook live 1 day before the elections

Date of Speech: October 6, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

Date of grading: February 8, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.3

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"> - “But at the moment it is polarized: it is us and the PT; is green and yellow Brazil and they representing Cuba, representing the government of Venezuela, with its flag that is red and with the sickle and hammer on top of it. Let's change Brazil” - “There are many people who voted for PT and are coming to our side, many people who back there decided 	<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"> - “Let's unite the Brazilian people. Our flag is green and yellow, our heart is green and yellow” - “The union of all, my people. Let's unite, let's unite this Brazil here. [...] but to unite by example, by dedication, by love of the Fatherland, by respect for the family, for the desire to really move away from socialism, communism, and freedom from this ghost that happens in Venezuela(...). Let's move away from that”

<p>not to vote anymore for P, that woke up and is on our side now”</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>He tries to justify the moral significance of his ideas by tying them to the bible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “The seed we preach through Brazil is the one that is in the book of John 8:32: And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free”	<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>His speech doesn’t seem to have any passage that indicates the importance of the “popular will.” It does communicate a lot with the people since it is supposed to be a “live talk with the people,” and he thanks the people for their support and acknowledges them, but that is as far as it goes.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let's make Brazil big, Let's be proud again of this Homeland, let's move away from what did not work out: socialism, communism that is embodied in the PT, in the PC do B, and PSOL” 	<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"> - “Let's make Brazil big, Let's be proud again of this Homeland, let's move away from what did not work out: socialism, communism that is embodied in the PT, in the PC do B, and PSOL” - “But [Roraima’s potential] is suffocated by environment and indigenous issues. Let’s solve this, let’s fuse the ministries of agriculture and environment. It will end this fight” 	<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>There is no presence of an “everything counts” approach. Even though he disrespects his opposition a few times, it does not disrespect liberties and formal rights.</p>

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

In this speech, he focuses a lot on the elections (that took place one day after), so in this case, he respects the election even though he claims that the ballots can be rigged, his opinion on that subject is not that strong as it was on the day he got stabbed.

His speech contains a few traces of populism, but they are tempered with some non-populist ones and present a lot of nationalist traits. There is a clear distinction between them (his 'side' as he uses this word) and they (the PT). Even though a distinction is somewhat Manichean, it is not that populist.

I didn't see any cosmic proportion that is worth highlighting, and his speech doesn't seem to have any passage that indicates the importance of the "popular will." It does communicate a lot with the people since it is supposed to be a "live talk." He thanks the people for their support and acknowledges them, but that is as far as it goes.

Now for the 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.

Speech 8

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech right after the first round of elections

Date of Speech: October 7, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: February 10, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.6

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>“Brazil is about to collapse. We have to value our Armed forces and family values”</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>He mentions many things he would like to improve regarding civilian safety, as well as many improvements regarding the reduction of the State power over businesses</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>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>“Brazil had a 13-yr experience with what has been the worst in politics”</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 have to rescue our Parliament, working to improve the conditions to all Brazilians. We have all to become a great nation. We have to unite all Brazilians”</p> <p>“We must value what is ours”</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>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>“We do not want Brazil to follow the same path of Venezuela, like the other candidate does”</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>“Brazil is drowning in a deep ethical and moral crisis. We cannot give any other step towards the left, but we have to walk to the center-right”</p> <p>“We cannot continue flirting with Socialism and Communism”</p> <p>“What is waiting for us if PT returns to power? According to their government plan: media control”</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>“I want the Northeast to be free of lies and coercion by PT over the humblest ones”</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.

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.

Various critiques towards the election process, such as faking of votes and lack of respect to the elderly when voting

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This speech is a repetition of his campaign in a more summarized way, where he mentions again the things he promises to do for the nation, and he again attacks the opposition while also criticizing their presence in power. Moreover, he mentions the country cannot keep on flirting with Socialism and Communism, as the past administrations have done. He then goes on to talk about the potential that Brazil has as a country and how he plans to evidence that around the world, but he needs the people by his side to guarantee he can become the president to do so. What is new in this speech is that he mentions possible frauds in the election process, and subtly mentions that, if it weren't for that, he would have probably won by this moment. This affirmation is debatable as none of the supposed "fraud in the voting booth" were proven.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Right after 1st round

Date of Speech: October 7, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “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>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 Manichaeic, 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

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>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.</p> <p>It is not that populist, in a way that “popular will” would be, but it needs to be acknowledged.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “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” 	<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 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” 	<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>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “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 	<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>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.</p>

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

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

It contains almost every populist element, 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 mainly moral division, 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, in a way that "popular will" would be, but it 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.

Speech 9

Country: Brazil

Leader: Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Speech at Avenida Paulista

Date of Speech: October 22, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder A

Date of grading: February 8th, 2019

Final Grade (delete unused grades): 0.8

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>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>“Institutions will be recognized. Armed forces will be made powerful”</p> <p>“The police will have the backup from the justice to destroy PT. Criminals from MST and MTST, you will be considered as terrorists”</p>

	<p>“We are majority, we are the truth. Together with the Brazilians we will build a new nation”</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>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>“PT, you will all go to the tip of the beach. I will cut all your benefits. You won’t have anything else. It will be a cleansing never before seen in Brazil”</p> <p>“we want free press, but Folha de S. Paulo is the biggest diffusor of fake news in the country”</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>“Without any political indications, we will establish a team that will attend to the necessities of our people”</p>

	<p>“Brazil will be respected outside and will not be made fun of as it is now. Corruption will not be a problem anymore”</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>“They lost yesterday, they lost in 2016 and they will lose again next week. Only this time the cleansing will be more widespread: these people, if they want to stay here, will have to be under the rule that everyone has to follow.”</p> <p>“These red criminals shall be banned from our country. We believe in the future of Brazil”</p> <p>“With this new political class, we are going to build what we deserve”</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>“Lula, you wanted to see Haddad president. But you will rot in jail, and Haddad will join you soon. Though he will not be visiting you, he will be by your side. Since you love each other so much, you can rot in jail together”</p> <p>“Whoever steals from the people will be put behind bars. This people has always stood up in the harshest moment of this nation to save it. All of you making a protest today are trying to save the country. You are saving mine, yours, our Brazil”</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>“Together we will make a different Brazil” “I invite you all to mobilize the people and to actively participate in the elections in the next Sunday in a democratic way: no lies, no fake news, no Folha de S. Paulo [newspaper]”</p>

“We love liberty: we want democracy and we want to live in peace”

Overall Comments (just a few sentences): This is a pretty radical speech of the soon-to-be president, where he mentions that Brazil has to restructure itself. He openly attacks the ones he considers to be the source of the problem of the country and mentions they will not have a place anymore. Moreover, the language he uses at all time gives the impression of a semi-revolution in a certain way, where he proposes a disconnection with the past and the building of a new nation based on democratic values. He mentions also the importance of the people for this to happen and calls everyone to vote in the upcoming elections. Not only, but he again repeats the same arguments and campaign promises used in various of his speeches to make a better Brazil.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

Title of Speech: Av. Paulista

Date of Speech: October 22, 2018

Category: Campaign

Grader: Coder B

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 	<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>red flag and has a sold/alienated head”</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"> - “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” 	<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>Many references to "our country" and the</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>

use of expressions such as "we" and "us," but he builds them in 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 serve the needs of our people. You can be sure, you can trust us because we trust you”
- “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”

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.

- “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

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>am going to cut off all your stewardships”.</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 have more advertising money from the government” 	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “‘Petralhada’, you all go to the <i>‘edge of the beach’</i>, you will not have any more turns in our country, because I 	<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>

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 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)"

Overall Comments (just a few sentences):

This speech contains pretty much all the populist traits present on this rubric. There is a clear division, moral and Manichaeian.

There are cosmic proportions and systemic change, but it doesn't feel strong enough.

There are many references to "our country" and the use of expressions such as "we" and "us," but he builds them in 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 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.

Speech 10

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

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

Date of Speech: October 27, 2018

Category:

Grader: Coder A

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</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>inside universities, but if someone hung up a banner with any of my ideas I would be hated for that”</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 Manichaeic, 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 the last minute”</p>

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.

Country: Brazil

Leader: Jair Bolsonaro

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

Date of Speech:

Category:

Grader: Coder B

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 	<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

<p>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”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “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 dictatorships” <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 intends to usurp the power and subvert our traditional values.</p>	<p>about ‘races’)”</p> <p>This last passage does not frame the racial issue in moral terms, although this idea is only present at the end.</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 	<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>and that scheme that was dismantled back there by Joaquim Barbosa will return to occupy the center of Brazilian politics.”</p> <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 with the government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “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>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Let's assert our will, we will not 	<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>give the opportunity for another side to say "we won, it was the turn" we will not give this opportunity to them"</p> <p>In 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":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "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 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!" 	
<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"> - "Where have we been for 13 years of 	<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>

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 for family, it is an approach to dictatorships”

He also utilizes a strong bellicose language, even calling his opponents “Esquerdalha.” There is also a conspiratorial tone when he calls the people (people here as “his supporters”) to verify and check ballots because he is “afraid” of fraud:

- “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”

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.

- “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.”

He advocates for changes on the educational system, currently responsible for molding students into “leftist activists”, and for

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>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 in his speech;
- There is also no “everything counts,” he does not disrespect the 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 intends 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 Kirk, 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 subtle praise of the virtues and distinctiveness of what can be identified as the "core nation," although there are no specific passages; this can be perceived.

Even though there are no *family metaphors* on the rubric, he utilizes words like "nation" and "we Brazilian people." Here is worth mentioning that I believe he does that mostly because terms like "people" are heavily linked to the left, to the PT - his main opposition -, so I think 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 straightforward: here, he adopts more populist traits and tends to "switch" or temper his discourse way less. Even the strongest element present in his first speech (we equated to nation) is not that strongly perceived; I would say that it is indeed present, but not in a straightforward way.