

Rethinking of the Significance of Passions in Political Education: A Focus on Chantal Mouffe’s “Agonistic Democracy”

Sho Yamanaka *

This paper discusses the significance of passions in political education through the consideration of Chantal Mouffe’s agonistic democracy. Mouffe points out the role of the passions that facilitate organizing political identities, and presents the risks of eliminating passions. The liberal interpretation of democracy intends to eliminate passions that prevent people achieving a rational consensus. On the other hand, the emphasis on rationality makes it easy for right-wing populism to mobilize people’s passions. In other words, the elimination of passions creates a situation in which dialogue with other political identities is difficult: this is the contradiction of the liberal interpretation of democracy. To avoid this, Mouffe suggests channels that express collective passions as democratic designs to disarm antagonistic passions. Mouffe’s democratic theory indicates the risk of a too optimistic understanding of the passions in political education which takes deliberative approaches. Also, this result suggests the necessity of reconsidering the position of passions in the political education. From the perspective of Mouffe’s agonistic democracy, the role of political education should be regarded as not elimination of passions but sublimation of antagonistic passions. To achieve this sublimation, we should facilitate participation in democratic practices. However, sublimation of antagonistic passions through democratic institutions is not always successful. If antagonistic passions are expressed in destructive forms, what should we do? This paper touches only briefly on this point. Further studies are needed in order to contribute to this issue.

Keywords: Political Education; Passions; Democracy; Chantal Mouffe; Deliberative Approach

* Graduate Student, Graduate School of Education in Hiroshima University
e-mail: yamanakasho0601@gmail.com

1. Introduction

In political education, most researchers have argued for the importance of rationality, while regarding passions as a risk of democracy. Ruitenberg (2009) points out that most researchers who take deliberative approaches in political education have given passions short shrift (p.276). These researchers have suggested political education based on deliberative democracy, which originates with Jürgen Habermas. This democratic theory intends to achieve consensus through rational dialogue. In other words, deliberative democrats consider that ideal decision making is realized by a procedure which irons out different opinions and achieves consensus. From this perspective, passions tend to be eliminated from politics because antagonistic passions occasionally bring about vigorous confrontations and these oppositions prevent rational dialogue from achieving consensus.

However, the current political situation has indicated the limitations of rationality. In the world, there are various confrontations where consensus is difficult, such as terrorism and the increase of xenophobic discourses and disputes based on religion or race. In this situation, believing in rational consensus may be too optimistic. This also indicates an issue of political education that takes deliberative approaches, which is that it fails to understand the characteristics of passions in politics.

In fact, passions have been regarded as destructive, pathologic and anti-reasonable things from ancient times (Saito, 2010, p.14). For instance, Plato (H. D. P. Lee, Trans. 1987) argues that passions pose mental instability, a characteristic of children, women, and slaves (p.202). Machiavelli (Aida Yuji, Trans.1966) claims that it is important for national governance to restrict the people's passions (p.297). Plato and Machiavelli regarded passions as a negative concept that destroys political community. However, some researchers have pointed out the importance of passions in politics. Nussbaum (2010) argues that emotion, that is passions recall the commonality of people, and unite different people (p.64). Also, Walzer (2000) shows that passions are the energy of political movements (p.200). Although the significance of passions has been reconsidered in politics, they are still understood as destructive things in political education.

This paper focuses on Chantal Mouffe's democratic theory, "agonistic democracy"¹. This democratic theory is considered as an alternative to deliberative democracy. Mouffe argues that deliberative democracy overlooks the role of passions in politics, and this failure makes it difficult to understand political confrontations. Her object is reconsidering the role of the passions, which has been regarded as a risk for democracy, and connecting passions with politics. This examination also may suggest a new interpretation of the significance of passions in political education.

Currently, Mouffe's democratic theory has been gradually attracting attention in political education² and some researchers have indicated the necessity of educating about passions. Ruitenberg (2009) argues that "political education cannot consist in skills of reasoning and civic virtue alone" because the passions and "the desire for belonging to collectivities" is concerned with politics (p.274). Biesta (2011) claims that citizenship should be understood as not "a stable and positive identity obtained through identification with an existing socio-political order" but as "one who is driven by a desire for democracy" (p.96). According to him, passions should be mobilized in the public sphere because they facilitate participation in democracy (p.90). His suggestion is important to establish a more open public sphere because

it does not explain citizenship as a positive identity that requires reasoning skills or civic virtue (p.87).

These previous studies have emphasized the significance of passions in political education and have showed the limitations of political education that takes deliberative approaches. But these studies have not understood the characteristics of passions sufficiently, overlooking the significance of passions in political education. This may be due to the following two points. First, there is little research that refers to Freudian psychoanalysis. Mouffe (2005a) points out that taking “into account the affective dimension of politics is therefore crucial for democratic theory and this calls for a serious engagement with psychoanalysis” (p.25). The characteristics of the passions cannot be fully understood without the perspective of psychoanalysis.

Second, previous studies have not paid attention to Mouffe’s interpretation of populism movements. Right-wing populism, an example of these political movements—for example, the “Front National” (FN), in France³—“constructs people limited to ‘true nationals’, excluding immigrants who are relegated to ‘them’, along with ‘anti-nation’ forces of the elites” (Mouffe, 2016). Mouffe argues that the rise of populism parties is the sign of importance of passions in politics, and also locates the crisis of democracy with the rise of populism movements. Therefore, Mouffe’s interpretation of populism movements is crucial because it enables us to understand not only the role of the passions but also their limitations. This paper presents the characteristics of the passions considering the above two points and shows the significance of passions in political education.

2. Freud’s group psychoanalysis and the role of the passions in politics

This section discusses the characteristics of “identification” and “libido” through an examination of Freud’s group psychoanalysis and presents Mouffe’s interpretation of the role of passions in politics. According to Mouffe (2005b), right-wing populism parties “have already existed for some time, but they were considered marginal and their strong presence in countries like Austria was explained by specific national idiosyncracies” (p.50). Currently, this argument has lost its relevance because populism parties have succeeded in most European countries (p.50)⁴. Mouffe thinks that these political movements indicate the crucial role of passions in politics. While most democratic theories have claimed that passions should be eliminated from politics and democratic politics should be understood in terms of rationality, Mouffe points out that this thought fails to understand the role of passions in politics (Mouffe, 2005a, p.28). She focuses on two of Freud’s works, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* and *Civilization and Its Discontents* in order to present the role of passions in politics.

2.1. The characteristics of libido and identification

In *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, Freud (Strachey, J, Trans. 1922) argues that libido is “the energy (regarded as a quantitative magnitude, though not at present actually measurable) of those instincts which have to do with all that may be comprised under the word ‘love’” (p.37). This energy aims at not only sexual union, but also uniting concrete objects or abstract ideas such as, “self-love, and ... love for parents and children,

friendship and love for humanity” (p.38). Libido unites everything whatsoever that organizes different people as collective identities.

According to Freud (Strachey, J, Trans. 2010), libido has two characteristics, “eros” and “death.” The former is “the instinct to preserve living substance and to join it into ever larger units” and the latter is the “instinct of aggressiveness and destructiveness” (pp.105-106). These characteristics indicate that libido facilitates not only organizing collective identities, but also destroying others. In fact, Freud considers that eros and death emerge as not only separate entities but also as a mixture. For instance, people who belong to environmental groups unite in love of nature and also in hostility toward companies that destroy nature. Freud shows that establishing collective identities connotes a solidarity of the inside and an exclusion of the outside. Thus, libido has conflicting characteristics and this ambivalence facilitates organizing collective identities.

Also, Freud (Strachey, J, Trans. 1922) argues that identification is “the earliest expression of an emotional tie with another person” (p.60), and has an ambivalent nature. The typical model of identification is a little boy who would like to grow up like his father. Freud discerns the nature of his identification through a little boy’s imitation, but this identification is not permanent. Freud claims that

The little boy notices that his father stands in his way with his mother. His identification with his father then takes on a hostile colouring and becomes identical with the wish to replace his father in regard to his mother as well. (p.61)

This argument indicates the ambivalence of identification. The identification of a little boy is caused by love not only for his father but also for his mother. Thus, if this boy recognizes the monopoly of his mother’s love by his father, the favorable identification with his father transforms into hostility. The little boy would like to replace his father in order to get his mother’s love. This shows that the identification is brought out by libido directed at a specific object, but this object can be replaced by others. This transference of identification means transformation of eros into death. To use Freud’s words, identification “is ambivalent from the very first; it can turn into an expression of tenderness as easily as into a wish for someone’s removal” (p.61).

In addition, Freud referred to a girl who has a letter from someone with whom she is secretly in love, which case indicates that identification can infect other members in the group. Freud argues as follows.

Supposing, for instance, that one of the girls in a boarding school has had a letter from someone with whom she is secretly in love which arouses her jealousy, and that she reacts to it with a fit of hysterics; then some of her friends who know about it will contract the fit, as we say, by means of mental infection. (p.64)

This case finds “identification based upon the possibility or desire of putting oneself in the same situation” (pp.64-65). A letter from someone who loves one girl stimulates the jealousy of another girl, and this jealousy also infects other girls who would like to replace her. In other words, identification “may arise with every new perception of a common quality shared with some other person who is not an object of the sexual instinct” (p.65).

2.2. The role of passions in politics A focus on populism movements

Mouffe's analysis about populism indicates her Freudian interpretation of the passions. Mouffe considers that the success of FN in the 1980s indicates the role of the passions. Social democratic parties in France moved towards the political center after Mitterrand's "Parti Socialiste" victory, and this movement brought about a situation with no alternative. Jean-Marie Le Pen, the party leader of FN, claimed to be "the only one to challenge the dominant consensus" (Mouffe, 2005a, p.68). This discourse was effective in order to get support from people in a political situation in which the partisan dimension was unclear. Le Pen's discourse mobilized the passions of people excluded from the neoliberal form of globalization, such as low-income groups and unemployed groups. FN was the only political party which responded to passions such as desire and anger. To use Mouffe's words, "we should realise that, to a great extent, the success of right-wing populism parties comes from the fact that they provide people with some form of hope, with the belief that things could be different" (Mouffe, 2005b, p.56). This case shows that the passions facilitate organizing political identities: that is, right-wing populism parties mobilize people's passions by emphasizing their fundamental differences from other political parties.

Currently, such movements have increased in the world: for example, Donald Trump's victory in the US election in 2016 and the remarkable progress of the FN in the French election in 2017. These results indicate a growing number of people who support right-wing populism. In an interview with Waleed Shahid, Mouffe points out that the political frontiers in the 2016 US election were right-wing populism □ Trump's Republican Party □ and left-wing populism □ Sanders' Democratic Party. Mouffe explains that Trump's base is white working and middle class people who feel they used to have more social and economic rights, but have also been abandoned by neoliberalism now (Shahid, 2016). Trump has gotten public support from them by behaving like a racist. Trump's strategy has roused the dissatisfaction and angry of the white working and middle class: that is, he has mobilized their antagonistic passions. In France, Marine Le Pen's Front National achieves success through the votes of the working class as the losers of globalization. According to Mouffe, Le Pen has articulated their democratic demands with xenophobic discourses: that is, she has argued that working class suffering is caused by immigrants (Shahid, 2016). As with Trump, Le Pen has established a political frontier against immigrants through mobilization of antagonistic passions.

As well, European left-wing parties, which have been on the rise in the past ten years, have mobilized passions from different political identities. Mouffe regards the success of Jeremy Corbyn's Labour Party as the rise of left-wing populism. Corbyn has proposed a radical manifesto, which includes "renationalization of public services like the railways, energy, water, and the post office, an end to the privatization of the NHS and education system, the abolition of university tuition fees" (Mouffe, 2018a). These policies oppose "freedom of choice" and the Labour Party intends to "create a more equal society" (Mouffe, 2018a). Corbyn has mobilized people's passions by emphasizing the difference from right-wing populism. In fact, the base of Corbyn's Labour Party is feminist, anti-racist, ecologist and LGBT, groups which have been excluded from right-wing populism. Left-wing populism parties have succeeded in articulating their manifestos with "a variety of democratic demands" (Mouffe, 2018b, pp.79-80). In other words, left-wing populism is a progressive and transversal collective will (Errejón & Mouffe, 2016, p.123).

In addition, Mouffe also recognizes that passions are expressed as hostility to other po-

litical identities. She writes that “Freud’s analysis of the process of ‘identification’ brings out the libidinal investment at work in the creation of collective identities and it gives important clues concerning emergence of antagonism” (Mouffe, 2005a, p.25). Freud points out a characteristic of libido as death, and Mouffe accepts his argument. People inherently have an instinct for death that can be expressed as aggressiveness to others. Of course, it is possible to reduce this antagonism by “fostering communal bonds through the mobilization of the libidinal instincts of love,” but this mobilization necessarily implies the determination of “they” (pp.25-26). As Freud indicated, the opposition of “we” and “they” “could always become enmity” and the appearance of enemy may facilitate the identification of people with collective identities (p.26). According to Mouffe, Slavoj Žižek, a scholar of nationalism, indicates that antagonistic passions contribute to organized political identities. The origin of nationalistic identification is affective bonds: that is, hate for enemies that threatens our enjoyment (pp.27-28).

This section presents the conflicting characteristics of libido and the ambivalence of identification. Libido as eros facilitates creating emotional ties with a specific object and organizing collective identities. Also, libido as death is expressed as hostility to other collective identities, and this antagonism enables different people to organize groups. Mouffe considers that antagonistic passions facilitate organizing political identities with different people. In other words, she recognizes the ambivalence of passions, showing that her interpretation of the role of passions in politics is influenced by Freud’s group psychoanalysis. Mouffe regards Freud’s group psychoanalysis as a suitable theory which explains the construction of political identities.

3. From elimination of passions to establishment of channels of passions

In section 2, we examined the role of the passions, which facilitates organizing political identities by the functions of eros and death. However, antagonistic passions have brought about terrorism, ethnic conflict and other serious confrontations. From this perspective, passions should be eliminated from politics, but is this approach appropriate? This section proposes that the elimination of passions brings about crises of democracy, and how to avoid these. To achieve this object, section 3 focuses on Mouffe’s analysis of liberal interpretations of democracy leading to the rise of right-wing populism.

3.1. Liberal interpretations of the nature of modern democracy

Mouffe considers that the “liberal interpretation of the nature of modern democracy” (Mouffe, 2005b, p.52) is the origin of the success of right-wing populism. Most researchers who take this interpretation believe in “the end of an old antagonism” (p.53). This means the triumph of liberalism, to be precise, the hegemony of neoliberal form of globalization (p.55). Most researchers who believe this theory think that the confrontation of left and right, that is “the political,” disappeared after the Cold War. For example, Beck (1994) argues that the power of collective identities “[is] suffering from exhaustion, break-up and disenchantment” (p.7) with the progress of globalization. This makes difficult for people to belong to a collective identity. And the political frontiers—left and right—are decreasing, which facilitates rational dialogue with different people. This interpretation regards democracy as a “consensual,

completely depoliticised democracy” (Mouffe, 2005b, p.54). It holds that consensus is achieved through deliberation by moral people. This trend is expressed in the use of the terms “good governance” or “non-partisan democracy” by social democratic parties (p.54).

Mouffe shows the limitations of liberal interpretations of democracy. According to her, “[p]olitics has always a ‘partisan’ dimension and for people to be interested in politics they need to have the possibility of choosing parties offering real alternatives” (Mouffe, 2005a, pp.28-29). However, most traditional left-wing parties believe in the triumph of a neoliberal form of globalization, in which they deny antagonism and move towards the centrist political. Thus, it is impossible for people to choose an alternative in an election: that is, this situation forces us to recognize the neoliberal form of globalization. Mouffe considers that the absence of alternatives is a favorable situation for right-wing populism parties.

3.2. The crisis of democracy with regard to the elimination of passions

Mouffe’s analysis of the rise of the FPÖ is useful to understand the crisis of democracy with regard to the elimination of passions. Currently, the FPÖ is the governing party in Austria, but this party faced a crisis of extinction in the 1980s. Mouffe considers that the following two conditions have been factors in the FPÖ’s progress.

First, the government after World War II contributed to the rise of the FPÖ. In 1945, the Austrian government was reestablished as a coalition of three existing parties—the Socialist Party (SPO), the People’s Party and the Communist Party—“in order to avoid the conflicts that had dominated the First Republic” (Mouffe, 2005b, p.60). This coalition stabilized the political system and reduced the space for political opposition. The coalition government by three parties connoted the governance of oligarchic elites. According to Mouffe, this situation “created the conditions that were later to allow a gifted demagogue like Jörg Haider to articulate the diverse forms of resentment against the governing coalition” (pp.60-61).

Second, the strategy by Haider, the FPÖ leader, contributed to their success. Haider transformed a centrist political party into “a protest party against the ‘Grand Coalition’” (p.62). Haider focused on labour, which was disappointed in the SPO, which had come to represent the middle class. His strategy was to present the party as a supporter defending labour’s interests by using xenophobic and aggressive discourse. Mouffe explains his strategy as follows.

The discursive strategy of Haider consisted in constructing a frontier between an ‘us’ of all the good Austrians, hard workers and defenders of national values, against a ‘them’ composed of the parties in power, the trade union bureaucrats, foreigners, and left-wing artists and intellectuals who were, all in their own way, contributing to the stifling of political debate. (p.63)

Haider established a political frontier, with “all the good Austrians” as “we” and the others against the former as “they”. This frontier was constructed by deciding on a political enemy through the mobilization of passions. Also, Haider used the censure of the FPÖ as a tool for obtaining support. Political parties that looked upon the FPÖ as an enemy of democracy called them ‘neo-Nazis’ or ‘extreme-right’. They tried to exclude the FPÖ from Austrian politics, but this strategy instead “contributed to its remarkable rise in the last decades” (p.64). Mouffe considers that this exclusion enabled the FPÖ to behave like a victim exclud-

ed from a government of elites. This behavior roused the people's sympathies or anger, and these passions organized political identities that supported the FPÖ.

However, Mouffe considers the situation in which mobilization of people's passions is done only by right-wing populism to be harmful⁵. This is because the crystallization of collective passion "will take more violent modes of expression" (p.70). The liberal interpretation of democracy believes in the end of antagonism, but this brings about the absence of alternative parties. This political situation makes the mobilization of passions by right-wing populism easy. Also, this result indicates that without political identities that represent people's passions, their demands would be articulated with xenophobic discourses. In other words, "the ideas that power could be dissolved through a rational debate and that legitimacy could be based on pure rationality are illusions which can endanger democratic institutions" (Mouffe, 2000, p.104).

From this perspective, the elimination of passions from politics should be avoided, but antagonistic passions bring about crises of democracy. Mouffe suggests an alternative idea to mobilize passions towards democracy as follows.

The aggressive instinct can never be eliminated but one can try to disarm it, so to speak, and to weaken its destructive potential by several methods which Freud discusses in his book. What I want to suggest is that, understood in agonistic way, democratic institutions can contribute to this disarming of the libidinal forces leading towards hostility which are always present in human societies. (Mouffe, 2005a, p.26)

Mouffe's strategy is not the elimination of passions, but the disarmament of its antagonism through democratic institutions. Her consideration of Elias Canetti's parliamentary system indicates useful cases to understand this strategy. According to Mouffe, Canetti points out that parliamentary votes prevent two political parties resorting to force, arms or violence. In other words, this system decides the strength of the two political parties through the votes cast. This democratic institution contributes to continuing the democratic tradition and practices through the disarmament of antagonistic passions (p.22). Without democratic institutions, political confrontations with antagonistic passions could create violent political enemies. In Germany, the collapse of parliamentary politics facilitated regarding Jews as the antagonistic "they" (p.23). Therefore, Mouffe requires channels that express collective passions as democratic designs to disarm antagonistic passions (Mouffe, 2000, p.103). These channels are democratic institutions, practices and discourses: that is, the democratic tradition that contributes to enabling people to behave as democratic citizens.

This section has examined the liberal interpretation of democracy and the crisis of democracy. Many researchers who take this interpretation believe in the stability of politics and achievement of consensus based on rationality. In fact, the European traditional left is trending towards the centrist political, meaning an absence of alternatives against neoliberalism. Right-wing populism parties organize political identities that oppose neoliberalism to mobilize people's passions. It is easy for them to articulate the democratic demands of people who are excluded from neoliberalism with xenophobic and exclusive discourse. This political situation is a crisis of democracy: that is, people's passions are mobilized by right-wing populism parties only. The trust of politics based on rationality reduces rooms for political choices, and this brings about the central crystallization of antagonistic passions.

Mouffe's suggestion is to increase the channels that express collective passions. In other words, Mouffe considers that passions should not be eliminated, but sublimated to democratic practices.

4. Too optimistic understanding of passions in political education

Most researchers have considered that passions are incompatible with political education. As the trend of deliberative approaches indicates, rational consensus and political education have a high affinity. In this trend, passions should be eliminated from political education because they sometimes prevent people from establishing consensus. From this perspective, the role of political education is the establishment of a stable order through fostering rational and ethical citizens.

However, Mouffe emphasizes not the achievement of rational consensus, but the impossibility of the elimination of antagonistic passions. While antagonistic passions encourage disintegration of the political order, they also become the energy of political identity formation. Right and left populism has succeeded in creating emotional ties through the mobilization of passions. On the one hand, this identification creates enemies because political identities are established by the function of the passions as eros and death. The FN and FPÖ have gotten support by stimulating people's passions using xenophobic discourses. Mouffe considers that there is no collective identity without passions, and argues that rational consensus in which passions are excluded is illusory. Also, interestingly, Mouffe suggests that the crisis of democracy is associated with elimination of passions. Most researchers who believe in rational consensus have tried to eliminate passions from politics. But the absence of alternatives due to the establishment of consensus makes it easy for right-wing populism to mobilize passions. This is a crisis of democracy because xenophobic and exclusive discourses have articulated the demands of people who are eliminated from neoliberalism. This movement leads to the disregard of plurality and equality, which should be respected as a democratic value. The elimination of passions creates a situation in which dialogue with other political identities is difficult, contradicting the liberal interpretation of democracy. This contradiction shows that without the channels that express passions, they are easily mobilized by demagogues.

The understanding of passions in Mouffe's agonistic democracy differs from that of political education. The former regards passions as non-eliminable things and their antagonism as the energy of political practices by different political identities. The latter regards passions as eliminable things and their antagonism as the energy of irreconcilable confrontations. This difference indicates that passions are understood too optimistically in political education. Indeed, fostering rational and ethical citizens is an important role of political education, but trust in rationality leads to the mobilization of antagonistic passions. As Mouffe indicates, the infiltration of rational consensus and elimination of passions has resulted in the paradoxical crystallization of antagonistic passions. The rise of right-wing populism parties is a typical case of this crystallization. Because of the European political situation, where the partisan dimension is unclear, their xenophobic discourses have fascinated people whose democratic demands are not articulated by the centrist political party. Based on Mouffe's agonistic democracy, we should recognize that the exclusion of passions may contribute to the crisis of democracy. In other words, emphasis on rational consensus leads to strong mobilization of

passions. This highly exclusive crystallized passions threaten democratic values. Political education that has a high affinity with rationality and consensus is so optimistic that it overlooks this paradoxical conclusion.

Therefore, we should not eliminate passions from political education, but consider their reintroduction. To achieve this issue, this paper suggests the acceptance and sublimation of antagonistic passions as political practices. As Mouffe indicates, the channels that antagonistic passions disarm are required to maintain democracy. These channels, for example elections, voting, demonstrations, sabotage and parliament, have contributed to the establishment of the democratic tradition. In other words, antagonistic passions are sublimated into democratic behaviors through democratic institutions, practices and discourses. Political education that introduces antagonistic passions will not attempt to achieve rational consensus, but aim at respecting the expression of political oppositions. To achieve this, the role of political education should be understood not as elimination of passions by rationality but sublimation of antagonistic passions. And this sublimation is facilitated by participation in democratic practices. Children learn how to express their passions in a democratic way through this participation. Consequently, the establishment of channels that transform antagonistic passions into democratic practices is the key to reintroducing passions into political education.

5. Conclusion

This paper has presented the significance of passions in political education through the consideration of Chantal Mouffe's agonistic democracy. Mouffe's theory indicates the risk of a too optimistic understanding of passions in political education that takes deliberative approaches. It also presents the necessity of reconsidering the position of passions in the political education. We should stop arguing that passions are entirely negative for democracy, because the elimination of passions would contribute to the crisis of democracy, that is the crystallization of antagonistic passions. To avoid this crisis, we should recognize the role of passions in organizing political identities and increase the channels to express passions. Indeed, sublimation of antagonistic passions through democratic institutions is not always successful. If antagonistic passions are expressed in destructive forms, what should we do? This paper has barely touched on this point. Further studies are needed in order to contribute to this issue.

Notes

1. Mouffe is a Belgian political theorist who studied at the University of Paris and received a master's degree from the University of Essex. Currently, she works at the Centre for the Study of Democracy in Westminster University.
2. Of course, Mouffe's challenge as mentioned above has been referred to as follows in the field of politics. Some researchers have suggested that agonistic democracy is valid for understanding political exclusions (Oga, 2007; Jones, 2014). Other researchers have considered that agonistic democracy and deliberative democracy could be connected (Knops, 2007; Tamura, 2008).
3. In March 2018, Marine Le Pen, the leader of this party, changed the party name to "Rassemblement National" (RN) from "Front National" (FN).
4. Of course, Mouffe recognizes that people generally avoid the term populism, which "connotes fascism or strongman leadership" (Shahid, 2016).
5. Mouffe argues that right-wing populism policies are "illusory hope, founded on false premises

and on unacceptable mechanisms of exclusion” (Mouffe, 2005b, p.56).

References

- Beck, U., Giddens, A., & Lash, S. (1994). *Reflexive Modernization Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Stanford, US.: Stanford University Press.
- Biesta, G. (2011). *Learning Democracy in School and Society*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Errejón, Í. & Mouffe, C. (2016) *Podemos: In the Name of the People*, London, United Kingdom: Soundings.
- Freud, S. (1922). *Group Psychology and the analysis of the Ego*. (Strachey, J. Trans.). New York, US.: Boni and Liveright.
- Freud, S. (2010). *Civilization and Its Discontents*. (Strachey, J. Trans.). New York, US.: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Jones, M. (2014). Chantal Mouffe’s Agonistic Project: Passions and Participation. *Parallax*, 20, 14-30.
- Knops, A. (2007). Debate: Agonism as Deliberation-On Mouffe’s Theory of Democracy. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 15(1), 115-126.
- Machiavelli, N. (1966). *Sekai no Meicho Machiavelli Seiryakuron [Discourses on Livy]*. (Aida, Yuji. Trans.). Tokyo, Japan: Chuokoronsya.
- Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*, London, United Kingdom: Verso.
- Mouffe, C. (2005a). *On the Political*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Mouffe, C. (2005b). The ‘End of Politics’ and the Challenge of Right-wing Populism. *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy*. London, United Kingdom: Verso. 50-71.
- Mouffe, C. (2016, December 5). The Populist Challenge. *Democracia Abierta*. Retrived from <https://www.opendemocracy.net/democraciaabierta/chantal-mouffe/populist-challenge>
- Mouffe, C. (2018a, April 16). Jeremy Corbyn’s Left Populism. Retrived from <https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/3743-jeremy-corbyn-s-left-populism>
- Mouffe, C. (2018b). *For a Left Populism*, London, United Kingdom: Verso.
- Nussbaum, N. (2010). *Kanjo to Ho Gendai America Syakai no Seijiteki Liberalism [Hiding from Humanity: Disgust, Shame, and the Law]*. (Kono, Tetsuya. Trans.). Tokyo, Japan: Keio University Press.
- Oga, Satoshi. (2007). Tero tono Senso to Seijitekinarumono no Seijigaku Chantal Mouffe no Kokusai Seijishiso heno Tenkai. [War on Terror and the politics of the Political: Movement on International Political Theory of Chantal Mouffe]. *SeijiShiso Kenkyu*, 7, 203-236.
- Plato. (1987). *The Republic* (2nd ed.). (H. D. P. Lee. Trans.). London, United Kingdom: Penguin.
- Ruitenbergh, C. (2009). Educating Political Adversaries: Chantal Mouffe and Radical Democratic Citizenship Education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 28(3), 269-281.
- Saito, Junichi. (2010). Seijitekikukan niokeru Riyu to Jonen. [Reason and Passion in the Political Square]. *Shiso*, 5, 14-34.
- Shahid, W. (2016, December 15). America in Populist Times: An Interview with Chantal Mouffe. *The Nation*. Retrived from <https://www.thenation.com/article/america-in-populist-times-an-interview-with-chantal-mouffe/>
- Tamura, Tetsuki. (2008). *Zyukugi no Riyu. [The Reason of Deliberation]*. Tokyo, Japan: Keiso Shobo.
- Walzer, M. (2000). *Seiji to Jonen. [Politics and Passion: Toward A More Egalitarian Liberalism]*. (Saito, Junichi., Wada, Koichi., & Yazawa, Masashi. Trans.). Tokyo, Japan: Fukosya.