

## **How did we get to the Trump Era, in the US and in Brazil**

Ana Cernov\* for INESC's webpage

It is impossible not to see similarities in the surprising election of Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil in November of 2018 and the election of Donald Trump for the presidency of the United States in late 2016. So much that the international media started calling Bolsonaro the *Brazilian Trump* to easily translate to its readers and audience what the candidate meant. After all, both were participants of democratic electoral processes but proudly undemocratic carrying populist discourses against human rights.

Both were elected defending setbacks in terms of human rights, strengthening of austerity measures and the advancement of a neoliberal agenda, and both were heavily advised by family members. Besides that, they are also identified and united by the alliance sought between the two countries by the groups that surround the two presidents - Trump and Bolsonaro.

In a period in which we are experiencing a convergence of the economic and the climate crisis, while the international rights protection mechanisms are being challenged and questioned in their role of guaranteeing the protection of human rights, both men used dissatisfaction to sell their agenda of more austerity and more conservatism as the answer. Without many concrete proposals, but with a destructive and well crafted discourse, both voiced simple solutions in a moment of enormous complexity. Analysts and activists were surprised by the outcome of their efforts.

It was believed, in the US and in Brazil, that something would happen to avoid the election of leaders professing hate speech, inciting animosity and violence and threatening the institutions. Rejection rates for both were extremely high, but not enough to prevent that they both were elected.

However, the shock caused by their elections are part of a wave. We have seen similar processes set in motion in Hungary and the Philippines, in local elections throughout Europe, in which the dismantling of rights guarantees and defense of conservative values are setting the agenda and surprising activists and analysts that trusted the level of institutionality we have reached, would not be challenged to this point. Never before we had leaders so proud of not wanting to be part of the democratic game, breaking key rules of respect (and showing contempt) for institutions. And we seem to lack the preparation to deal with this.

We have two presidents that were not elected by a majority of votes. The American system with optional voting and composed of electoral colleges do not necessarily award victory to who has the majority of votes, but to whom has the majority of the electoral colleges. Trump received 46.4% of the valid votes (62.984.825) against 48.5% (65.853.516) received by his opponent

Hillary Clinton, but they meant 306 electoral colleges for him while she Clinton had 232. The same took place in Brazil, where voting is mandatory for all citizens between 18 and 70 years old: in the second round of voting, 57.797.073 voted for Bolsonaro while 89.504.543 did not.<sup>1</sup>

The same phenomena took place in Hungary, in the Philippines and with Brexit in the UK. It was not a majority that voted for the setbacks, even though the majority was unable to transform the opposition in concrete action to block the reactionary agenda in the name of greater protection for guaranteed human rights. In the Philippines we see that the support to this new discourse of conservative values recovery - linked to the church and the family, fighting crime with a steady hand, and fighting corruption despite being very corrupt, has enough traction to last beyond the current administration and this platform is poised to last and continue in future elections. In Hungary it has been already 8 years since the authoritarian government of Viktor Orban started and again, the majority was not able to contain his agenda.

### **Mainstream Media Coverage**

In Brazil, with the intense participation of Bolsonaro's relatives in the presidential campaign, in addition to the legislature seats his sons managed to secure - one senator, one congressman and one councilor in Rio de Janeiro who was not elected for Congress because he gave up on that particular candidacy - a dynasty is created and his sons have behaved publicly as representatives of the president, including declarations on delicate foreign policy matters. The lack of preparation of his family, to deal with intricate subjects and with enormous consequences like the change of the Brazilian embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, causes astonishment.

One of the explanations for the success of the Bolsonaro family in his campaign was the use of the internet. The president-elect was absent from almost all the electoral debates, participating of only two before the candidacy of Fernando Haddad was defined<sup>2</sup>. After the definition of Haddad as the PT candidate in lieu of former President Lula, prevented from running, and the attack suffered by Bolsonaro on September 6, he did take part in any debate, accepting only to do interviews and had enough time dedicated to him in the newspapers, magazines and television channels in Brazil throughout the period between his hospital discharge and the rest of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Data from the Supreme Electoral Court (Tribunal Superior Eleitoral, TSE in its Portuguese initials) show that Haddad received 47.039.291 votes and a very important number of people decided not to vote for any of the main candidates: 42.465.252 abstentions, or annulled and blank votes, adding up to 89.504.543 voters not picking Bolsonaro in this election.

<sup>2</sup> For several months, the polls were consistently led by former president Luiz Inácio 'Lula' da Silva, PT's then-presidential candidate, despite the fact that he was in prison following a politically motivated corruption trial. Given that Lula's conviction could still be overturned following appeals, the UN Human Rights Committee had urged the government to guarantee his right to run for president, a call echoed by the Coordination Bureau of National NGO Associations and Networks of Latin America, among many others. In record time, however, Brazil's Supreme Court decided that the UN request could be in conflict with national legislation and on September 11, PT had to replace Lula with the largely unknown former mayor of São Paulo, Fernando Haddad.

electoral campaign. There was a clear lack of balance in the time provided to each of the two candidates for the second round and grossly, the newspapers avoided calling him what he is: a right-wing populist extremist and provided a platform for the candidate to expose his calamitous ideas as “contentious” and “controversial”.

In the United States, media coverage also positively impacted Donald Trump's campaign. In a survey conducted by the Kennedy School's Shorenstein Center at Harvard University, shortly after the election, coverage by major media in the country was considered corrosive because it had brought mostly negative news. [According to study author Thomas Patterson](#), negative coverage has and had partisan consequences.

*“The mainstream press highlights what’s wrong with politics without also telling us what’s right. It’s a version of politics that rewards a particular brand of politics. When everything and everybody is portrayed as deeply flawed, there’s no sense making distinctions on that score, which works to the advantage of those who are more deeply flawed. Civility and sound proposals are no longer the stuff of headlines, which instead give voice to those who are skilled in the art of destruction.”*<sup>3</sup> And Patterson completes that even though conservatives claim that the press has a liberal bias, the media’s persistent criticism of government reinforces the right wing’s anti-government and anti-politics message.

Trump received about 15 percent more coverage than Clinton in the 2016 election campaign, according to the same study. There are no numbers yet to quantify the extra attention received by Bolsonaro in the electoral campaign in Brazil, but surely it is something around the same level or above it. Two television networks of massive scope courted the candidate with the intention to become the equivalent to “Fox News” in Brazil. One of them - [a concession to a great evangelical leadership](#) and also a news portal owner - [created internal rules that prevented criticism of Bolsonaro](#) and spreaded negative news against Haddad, prompting a senior news editor [to resign](#). It was clear during the campaign that the traditional Brazilian media was not only participating in the elections, but was betting on a candidate to be elected and decided to court him, hoping to be in his favor in an eventual government.

### **Importing the use of Fake News**

The Brazilian press has a terrible history of intervention in electoral processes and this time, it was no different. But it was not the only channel that disrupted the electoral process. Just as in the United States, the capillarity of social media was essential to reduce voters' very high rejection of the candidate and to transmit the infamous fake news. The use of this disinformation tactic was so successful in the US that it was imported into other electoral processes, always with

---

<sup>3</sup><https://www.politico.com/blogs/on-media/2016/12/report-general-election-coverage-overwhelmingly-negative-in-tone-232307>

the fingerprints of Steve Bannon, the right wing strategist and former Trump campaign coordinator.

Bannon was able to take advantage of the fact that at that time 65% of adults<sup>4</sup> in the United States used social media (today this number is estimated at 71%<sup>5</sup>) and [joined the company Cambridge Analytica](#) to create a strategy that succeeded in securing the White House for Donald Trump and his group from the use of Google, Snapchat, Twitter, Facebook and Youtube. The main tool however was the use of Facebook, which made it possible to use (illegally) data from thousands of users that allowed to direct groomed campaign messages to target audiences. The lack of Facebook controls coupled with Cambridge Analytica's strategy was extensively documented in reports that have revealed the relationship between social media manipulation and Trump's election.

The company was created from experiments led by a University of Cambridge psychology professor when the university refused to allow its experiments to be used for commercial purposes. First, Global Science Research is created in 2014; but Aleksandr Kogan's data collection is done through a company called Strategic Communication Laboratories (SCL) which has an electoral division that promises to use data-driven messages to deliver electoral success. His arm in the US is Cambridge Analytica that received huge investments from billionaire investor Robert Mercer, a Trump supporter and closely advised by Steve Bannon. In addition to investing in the company's development, Mercer also made huge sums available to Trump's campaign to get the company hired. Steve Bannon was also an employee of CA and months after ensuring that his ties to the company had been cut, [a Trump campaign check for CA services was delivered at a Bannon address in Los Angeles](#).

The fact is that an estimated 100 to 185 thousand people have completed questionnaires and made their profiles available for data collection without knowing that this would lead to a network that reached about 30 million Facebook profiles and made it possible for users to be mapped without your consent. Each post and every like was analyzed by operators seeking ways to influence the US elections. In the UK, the CA is being investigated by the Parliament for its potentially illegal performance in the Brexit campaign; according to [statements made by the former director of the company to the British Parliament](#) in March of that year, *"one can reasonably say that the outcome of the referendum would have been different."*

And while the impact of CA itself on US elections is difficult to measure, Facebook's campaign use is not. Trump's campaign never hid its strategic use, dedicating 80 percent of its campaign

---

<sup>4</sup> Data from 2015 in survey conducted by the Pew Research Center  
<http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/10/08/social-networking-usage-2005-2015/>

<sup>5</sup> Results of survey Global Digital Report 2018, conducted by marketing agencies We Are Social and Hootsuite and published in January 2018. <https://digitalreport.wearesocial.com>

budget for digital media on Facebook: "Joel Pollak, an editor at Breitbart, writes in his campaign memoir about Trump's "armies of Facebook 'friends,' ... bypassing the gatekeepers in the traditional media." Roger Stone, a longtime Trump adviser, has written in his own campaign memoir about "geo-targeting" cities to deliver a debunked claim that Bill Clinton had fathered a child out of wedlock, and [narrowing down the audience "based on preferences in music, age range, black culture, and other urban interests."](#) In addition, there is the whole issue raised by the special prosecutor Robert Muller's investigation into the possible Russian interference in the election process, the purchase of ads on Facebook, and possibly hacking into the Democratic Party. But at the end of the day, Facebook helped campaign for the tool it is.

In Brazil, *"the 2018 elections represented a paradigm shift in the country's political campaigning in force since 1989, triggered by the effects of Operation Car Wash on the political system. Accepting the strong process of delegitimization that Car Wash imposed on it, the political system made strong modifications in the structure of political campaigns. Among these, it is worth noting the reduction of the campaign period, the free time on TV and the block of free advertisement in prime time. All these changes can be understood within a logic of reducing public debate elements in political campaigns. Add to these elements the reduction of the street campaign and rallies. With fewer public activities, for the first time since 1989, the field for the exclusively private campaigns, such as that of Bolsonaro, was focused almost exclusively on social media - since he had very little free tv and radio time allotted to his campaign - and inside them, in those as private as possible circuits, as it is the case of WhatsApp lists."*<sup>6</sup>

As in the US, the communication strategy of the right-wing campaign has invested heavily in the use of social media. According to data, [Brazil has 62% of the population using social media - YouTube, Facebook and Whatsapp in order of users](#) (60, 59 and 56% of the population uses these networks) and has the second largest daily time dedicated to social media in the world - 3 hours and 39 minutes, just behind the Philippines.

In addition to that, Brazilians have currently a very low degree of trust in institutions<sup>7</sup>. Research conducted by the Institute of Democracy in March 2018 reveals that trust in political parties is at its lowest level since 2006, and that only 19% of respondents are satisfied with democracy in Brazil and more than 80% are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. This had already been identified many years ago by the [Brazilian Platform of Social Movements for the Reform of the Political](#)

---

<sup>6</sup> Author's translation of quote present at this article, originally written in Portuguese:

<https://blogs.oglobo.globo.com/ciencia-matematica/post/fake-news-legitimadas-por-grupos-de-familia-e-igreja-explicam-eleicao-de-2018.html>

<sup>7</sup> Data from the survey "The look of Democracy in Brazil", published in Portuguese as "A Cara da Democracia no Brasil", was conducted in March 2018, with the intent of providing an updated landscape of how Brazilians see democracy in the country and how political information is received by voters.

<https://www.institutodademocracia.org/a-cara-da-democracia>

[System](#), which created proposals to democratize the political system, beyond the electoral process, and to increase the quality of democracy in the country. With the involvement of political parties in corruption scandals and the open practice of bargaining in Congress and in the presidential palace, it has become difficult for the population to trust those agremiations will protect the public interest. Not to mention the role they had in negotiating extensively the candidacy of Bolsonaro and support to his agenda in the first and/or second round of voting, negotiating principles to become part of the new government support nucleus.

But this scenario of intense use of social media and little confidence in institutions becomes a ground for carefully crafted anti-establishment speeches made to sound brutally honest and fake news to be scattered capillary. Messages are tailored to profiles, defined by social media from likes and shares, and reinforced to targets by bots and fake profiles. We saw this clearly during the Bolsonaro campaign when mentions to informal social media nicknames given to the candidate generated excessive reactions in news portals, without any electoral content, as if he was being attacked and needed to be defended. The best example is a [tweet from Folha de São Paulo, the largest newspaper in the country, about a classic bar snack called bolovo](#), and because this was being used to name Bolsonaro at twitter and facebook, the article was bombarded with comments in support of the candidate.

What scholars have been saying with increased vehemence is that social media influence is unbalancing democratic processes and behavior through manipulation. Recently, [author of the book "Likewar: the Weaponization of Social Media", P.W. Singer, categorically stated](#) that *"most people are not aware that they are constantly being manipulated by internet marketing and political campaigns - very little of what is happening today in social media, whether it is a viral video , a hashtag or photo, is spontaneous."*

Going back to the fact that in Brazil the trust in institutions is extremely low and that in a period of intense use of social media, the electoral campaign has unfolded much more in private channels than in public debates. And a peculiarity of Brazil is the prevalence of family and friends groups or lists in Whatsapp, which is understood if we look at the fact that in research on trust in institutions: family, friends and church receive a high degree of trust. We saw this tool being used massively to spread fake content, especially since September, and since these messages come from friends and family, the level of trust in them is greater than if they were reached by other means.

Even with the denials and corrections regarding Haddad-related fake news, they continued to circulate. Part of this was people's confidence in the messages received and passed on and part was the [illegal manipulation of the tool in a scheme unveiled by journalists](#).

As a parallel between the two electoral processes, we can affirm that they were elected candidates without the majority of votes, with campaigns that focused on social media, which had support from traditional media - explicit as in Brazil or collateral as in the United States. They were also processes that took advantage of the right to freedom of expression to manipulate information, create emotive messages and fuel the fear of their voters through private channels, joining socially conservative agendas to gather support. In both cases, neo-Pentecostal churches played a key role in supporting and directing campaign and governmental messages. This led them both out of their niches, of particular constituencies, and became characters supported by an expressive part of the population, despite their sexist, racist and retrograde discourses.

In Brazil, the electoral process still had important components: the interference of the heavy hand of the judiciary with the politically motivated actions of Operation Car Wash and with the cowed decisions by the Supreme Court; and the economic interests of private companies (from Facebook to the big agribusiness), of churches and their allies, such as the bullet, bovine and bible caucus<sup>8</sup> and others we do not know. We know of his dialogue with Steve Bannon and his unbridled admiration for the United States, but we do not have enough evidence to analyze what the interests are behind the candidacy of a political figure who has had an underwhelming career spanning 30 years.

### **On the Left, not enough emotion**

But what about the left in electoral processes of this kind, how did it behave? [A reflection by an US activist reinforces the importance of understanding the narratives at stake](#): *“When the left finally did realize how resonant and popular Trump was it responded in the only way an institution that prides itself on being correct and superior possibly could: it fact-checked him. Rather than engage with the true emotions of those drawn to him, they ridiculed people who connected with Trump’s message and ignored their emotional reality. Meanwhile Trump spoke to feelings and values and painted a picture of a world that genuinely resonated with people and soothed their fears. You cannot fact check a feeling. Hopefully the lesson will sink in now.”*

The right-wing campaign in both countries was far more emotional than the campaigns of their opponents. Trump and Bolsonaro certainly stood for the image of ordinary men, outraged by the crises in their countries - economic and social in the US, also politics in Brazil and of values in both. Their answers to complex problems were simplistic and in the case of Bolsonaro, closely linked to conservative values; his explanations blame the lack of God, lack of authority in the family, and lack of patriotism as causes of the ills of the daily life of Brazilians. But it offers no solution, just points the problem, like Trump.

---

<sup>8</sup> BBB Caucus is a nickname given to the caucus representing the arms industry (bullets), agribusiness mainly focused on cattle industry (bovine) and the neo-pentecostal caucus (Bible), which regularly votes in block and threatens human rights.

The opposition to them and other representatives of traditional politics lacked to offer explanations that resonated with the middle and popular classes. The problem is that discussing this profoundly would also imply unraveling the shaded relationship between political parties and representatives of large lobbies and economic interests. The revolving doors between those who hold high government posts of high public interest and high corporate offices, privately financed electoral campaigns, the corporate capture of spaces of debate and decision of public interest in favor of the profit of few economic groups, the role the banks, the media, and their relationship to public life. It would be necessary to show that corruption is certainly a serious problem, but it is not it that deprives the majority of the population of living in better conditions with their economic, social, cultural and environmental rights served, but those shady relationships.

*"In Trump's United States and Bolsonaro's Brazil, financial capitalism breaks down and destroys social relations and associative life, causing disorientation and isolation of the individual. And again, he is told that failure is his fault - not of an unjust system. It is a fascist structure, yes, a new type. That it is internationalizing and that it feeds from the same kind of disrespect and dehumanization that previous fascism did. Which means that the other, by thinking differently, deserves to die. And the middle class, which has always hated the poor, is now feeling more comfortable expressing this hatred. In the end, hatred is exactly what fascism produces."<sup>9</sup>*

## **Gender Ideology and Globalism**

In order to create responses to the crises that we are experiencing in the US, Brazil and the rest of the world, it is increasingly common that the right wing raises two themes: gender ideology and globalism as the origins of the ills that our societies suffer. The gender ideology is not new and it is an empty and malleable concept to the needs of discourse, combining feminism, LGBTI and queer theories and communism in an absurd way; [Sonia Correa makes an important genealogy of its origins since the mid-1990s and its use in international spheres and in international politics on gender issues](#). She recalls in her writings how the idea was shaped in international negotiations and in the higher theological spheres, in principle in the Catholic Church, but which today has the support of other religious forces and also of a broad spectrum of society: doctors, psychoanalysts, right-wing extremists, and even left-wing politicians. *"Above all, anti-gender proponents mobilise simplistic logics and imaginaries and constitute volatile enemies – here the feminists, there the gays, over there the artists, ahead the academics, elsewhere the trans bodies – nourishing moral panics that distract societies from structural issues that they should be debating, such as growing inequalities of gender, class, race and ethnicity."*

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://theintercept.com/2018/11/18/jesse-souza-entrevista/>

The same happens with *globalism*, being used as a concept to defend Christian values, presented as the economic globalization captained by cultural Marxism, according to the definition of the next Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, Ernesto Araújo<sup>10</sup>. The old term, dated from the 1940s, was recovered by Steve Bannon and his disciples, but was initially identified with the Nazi expansionist project, later used to name domestic actors in the US that could jeopardize US national sovereignty by supporting international politics, as in post-war migratory issues. The seed of the term comes loaded with prejudice and stands as opposition to projects of national interest - in the USA, the "America First" and in Brazil, "Brazil above everyone, God above everything."

The fact that the US are leading a policy like *America First*, often immoral and egocentric, as in the case of the separation of families, opens the way for other leaders to take steps previously unimaginable before the international system and before the United States itself. *America First* does not necessarily mean support for other leaders, it means that the country will not express its disapproval of authoritarian policies. As long as there is no direct opposition to Trump, what happens in each country does not matter to it - except in the right-wing target (for defence or attack) countries (Iran, Israel and Venezuela).

For civil societies in the United States and Brazil, and in other countries led by authoritarian leaders or on the way to, these are bad news. The activism developed decades ago, including the greater professionalization since the 90's, is already suffering attacks in what is being called the reduction or shrinking of democratic spaces and that tends to be intensified. Organizations and social movements fighting for rights are being named the enemies of progress and hate speech against activists have grown dangerously. We saw during the election campaign in Brazil the attacks on journalists and activists growing in a frightening way; we have also seen that even before the new president takes office, there is intense movement in Congress to pass legislation such as adjusting the anti-terrorism law to create mechanisms to suppress and incarcerate dissent.

### **In the United States, resistance in the Congress and local legislatures**

In the United States, the election of Donald Trump generated an extremely interesting movement of women who organized local cells and catalyzed numerous applications to Congress and local legislatures, reaching a record of elected women - 107 of the 435 seats, plus the extremely important and timely control of the Congress by Democrats. [The importance comes from the fact that, starting in 2020, the Congress will undergo a process of redefinition of the electoral districts](#). Currently a strategy put in place by former President George W. Bush's advisor Karl Rove called RedMap - Redistricting Majority Project - continues to bear fruit to Republicans in the elections, where even receiving fewer votes numerically, wins by districts.

---

<sup>10</sup><https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/mundo/2018/11/contra-o-globalismo-e-o-pt-conheca-frases-do-novo-chanceler-brasileiro.shtml>

The district definition can be an attribute of the state legislators that resort to softwares and voters' data to define what are the limits of each of the country's 435 congressional districts, each representing approximately 711,000 people. Gerrymandering is the name of the practice of designing a district according to party interests to guarantee control of a seat. Republicans, led by Rove, put this strategy in practice after acquiring control of the Congress in 2010 and targeting states in which the legislature was in charge of the redistricting process to take control of the process and redraw the district lines. Democrats weren't expecting this and nothing at this scale had ever been attempted before.

Usually, gerrymandering uses two techniques: packing and cracking. In packing, the party in charge of redistricting tries to pack voters from the rival party in few districts to minimize their opportunities to guarantee seats, In cracking, blocs of opposition voters are distributed out in varied districts to achieve the same goal, reduce the chances of the opposing party. "In preparation for the next census, Democrats have come up with a redmap-like plan of their own. They call it Advantage 2020, and say they hope to fund it to the tune of seventy million dollars. Republicans, for their part, have announced redmap 2020. [Their spending goal? A hundred and twenty-five million dollars.](#)"

But besides the enormous investments being made in shaping the future of districts, for the first time since 1950, the [U.S. Census Bureau is planning to ask everyone living in the United States whether they are citizens](#) when it conducts its next decennial census in 2020. Anticipating that some immigrants might avoid answering the question, the Trump administration wants to try using other government records to fill in missing responses. And this process will affect heavily the redistricting process, the next 10 years of American politics and how budget is allocated to the states - an estimated U\$ 800 billion a year in federal funds.

### **In Brazil, electoral reform and representation up for debate**

In Brazil, the debate on electoral reform and changes in the representation model will grow in 2019. That's because, in October 2017, the Congress passed new collateral electoral rules but could not get enough support to advance the discussion for adopting a new voting model. There was enough pressure from well-known figures and situation parties for the Mixed-member proportional (MMP) representation to be adopted. In it, unlike today, with Open list proportional representation, voters would have candidates supported by the parties in each of the districts and the rest of them on pre-ordered lists.

Proponents of this model claim that it can facilitate greater social control over the performance of parliamentarians and bring voters closer to their representatives. However, it would benefit well-known figures and large political parties at the expense of the opportunity for new

candidates and smaller parties to compete in a balanced way. The MDB, a party that has been part of the nucleus of all governments since 1989, regardless of their political spectrum, would be the biggest beneficiary of this model, which shows that many adjustments would be needed to bring the political system closer to the population. Besides, it is concerning to think that the current leadership of this party would be in charge of defining the electoral districts in Brazil, abusing the gerrymandering.

### **Resistances react**

There is a lot to be concerned about, but also a lot of steps in the right direction have been taken. We have seen social movements and activists increasingly getting their messages of solidarity and justice across to audiences that would not necessarily listen. As Iara Pietricovsky said in a message exchange, “they will be able to bring back the idea of humanism and solidarity and will re-humanize our societies.”<sup>11</sup>

The resistance reaction has managed to combine much more effectively what happens in social media and on the streets and is catching up to what the right-wing has been able to do in campaigns. The movement around the Haddad campaign in Brazil in late October has given a taste of what it will be possible to do - both on the streets and in the social media through the huge groups of women formed and who are creating local chapters of debate and support for actions, in Brazil and abroad.

There's a lot going on. The end of equally gloomy periods was always achieved by popular action, by groups and movements that were not intimidated and created creative and powerful strategies to break down regimes that did not have the public interest as guiding principle. It will be no different now; there has been a lot of work being done in the United States, in Brazil and elsewhere, for groups to articulate, adjust messages and protect our societies from greater damage and return to the logic of defending and securing rights won to broaden and universalize them, and not keep them hostage of other interests.

### **References:**

Avritzer, Leonardo. “Fake News legitimadas por grupos de família e igreja explicam eleição de 2018”. O Globo, 7 December 2018, available in: <https://blogs.oglobo.globo.com/ciencia-matematica/post/fake-news-legitimadas-por-grupos-de-familia-e-igreja-explicam-eleicao-de-2018.html>, accessed in December 2018.

---

<sup>11</sup> Email exchange between author and activist Iara Pietricovsky of INESC on December 8, 2018.

Bump, Phillip. "All the ways Trump's campaign was aided by Facebook, ranked by importance", The Washington Post, 22 March 2018, available in: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2018/03/22/all-the-ways-trumps-campaign-was-aided-by-facebook-ranked-by-importance/?utm\\_term=.2a293558315a](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2018/03/22/all-the-ways-trumps-campaign-was-aided-by-facebook-ranked-by-importance/?utm_term=.2a293558315a), accessed in December 2018.

Carty, Nicole. "Our movements are powerful. The institutional left is not the solution. Here is what we should do next.", November 2016, available in: <https://medium.com/@nicolecarty/our-movements-are-powerful-92d6788bbbd5>, accessed in December 2018.

Cernov, Ana & Pousadela, Inés. "Are women the last line of defence against Brazil's authoritarian shift?" Democracia Abierta, 6 October 2018, available in: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/democraciaabierta/ana-cernov-in-s-pousadela/son-las-mujeres-la-ultima-l-nea-de-defensa-contra-la-deri> accessed in December 2018.

Conectas. "SUR - International Human Rights Journal, 26th edition, December 2017. Available in: <http://sur.conectas.org/revista-imprensa-edicao-26/>, accessed in December 2018.

Correa, Sonia. "Gender Ideology: tracking its origins and meanings in current gender politics", The London School of Economics and Political Science - Engenderings Blog, December 2017, available in: <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/gender/2017/12/11/gender-ideology-tracking-its-origins-and-meanings-in-current-gender-politics/>, accessed in December 2018.

Illing, Sean. "Author explains why Democrats will struggle to win the House until 2030". Vox, 3 June 2017, available in: <https://www.vox.com/conversations/2016/10/5/13097066/gerrymandering-redistricting-republican-party-david-daley-karl-rove-barack-obama>, accessed in December 2018.

Ingraham, Christopher. "This is actually what America would look like without gerrymandering". The Washington Post, 13 January 2016, available in: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/01/13/this-is-actually-what-america-would-look-like-without-gerrymandering/?utm\\_term=.450058bb5ce8](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/01/13/this-is-actually-what-america-would-look-like-without-gerrymandering/?utm_term=.450058bb5ce8), accessed in December 2018.

Instituto da Democracia. "A Cara da Democracia". March 2018, available in: <https://www.institutodademocracia.org/a-cara-da-democracia> accessed in December 2018.

Kolbert, Elizabeth. "Drawing the Line - How redistricting turned America from blue to red". The New Yorker, 27 June 2016, available in:

<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/06/27/ratfcked-the-influence-of-redistricting>, accessed in December 2018.

Sayuri, Juliana. “Entrevista: “A esquerda foi singularmente incapaz e burra nessas eleições”, diz Jessé Souza, The Intercept Brasil, 18 November 2018, available in: <https://theintercept.com/2018/11/18/jesse-souza-entrevista/>, accessed in December 2018.

Schwartz, Mattathias. “Facebook failed to protect 30 million users from having their data harvested by Trump Campaign affiliate”, The Intercept, 30 March 2017, available in: <https://theintercept.com/2017/03/30/facebook-failed-to-protect-30-million-users-from-having-their-data-harvested-by-trump-campaign-affiliate/>, accessed in December 2018.

Youngs, Richard (editor). “The mobilization of conservative civil society”, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2018. <https://carnegieeurope.eu/2018/10/04/mobilization-of-conservative-civil-society-pub-77366>, accessed in December 2018.

We are Social & Hootsuite. “Global Digital Report 2018”, 9 January 2018, available in: <https://digitalreport.wearesocial.com>, accessed in December 2018.

\* Ana Cernov is a human rights activist engaged in the protection of civic space and initiatives for movement building, justice and equality. She is currently active in the Collective For a Democratic Brazil in Los Angeles. Formerly the Engagement Officer at the Vuka! Coalition for Civic Action, Ana has also led the South-South programme of Conectas Human Rights from 2014 to 16 and worked with trade unions, social movements, faith-based and development organisations in her native Brazil and Latin America for 15 years. She holds a degree in International Relations and a Master's Degree in Social Sciences from the Catholic University of Sao Paulo (PUC-SP). *This article does not necessarily reflect institutional opinions and brings solely a personal perspective.*