

# Global Syndrome of Neopopulism: A Symptom of Authoritarian Reaction in the Era of ‘After Globalization’\*

NAKATANI Yoshikazu\*\*

## ABSTRACT

There is no decisive description of neopopulism (contemporary populism) due to its polymorphic appearances in rhetoric and movement. Populism has traditionally assumed a reflexivity and ubiquity owing to its general proclivity as a movement and ideology of the people. Global syndrome of neopopulism gives a clue to consider the contemporary state in transition.

Regime of the indirect (representative) democracy is based on an oppositional composite of a populist and popularistic principle in political system. The former moment, therefore, erupts in the age of transition. This article tries to scrutinize a syndrome of neopopulism in relation to contemporary globalization from the view that it is an expression of oppositional elements inherent in representative democracy. The rise of neopopulism has been caused by the ongoing globalization which brought about a reformation of the traditional socio-economic structure of each nation (national) state.

For to describe the political character of neopopulism, it is first of all necessary to trace its relation to a genealogy of political liberalism, nationalism and identification effects in politics. The rhetoric and movement of neopopulism not only co-vibrates with nationalism, but with a neoliberal state project, so long as it involves a repercussion to a reconstruction of socio-economic structure.

Although neopopulism has been summarized as a general movement, its appearances are polymorphic according to the given stateness inscribed by the socio-economic relations. After a brief consideration on the contemporary world in paradox and relativization, this paper epitomically concludes with an estimation that global syndrome of neopopulism entails a stronger authoritarian propensity than a social democratic one.

**keywords:** neopopulism, state, nationalism, liberalism, globalization, authoritarianism, indirect democracy

## 1. Introduction

A long time passed since it is said that neopopulism has been remarkably creeping

---

\* This essay is a revised version of the paper prepared for the symposium titled “East Asia and the World after Globalization” at Chung-Aung University, Korea, Feb. 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2018.

\*\* Professor Emeritus, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan.

around the world. Many morbid symptoms have been certainly appearing in the age of globalization. Our general theme “after Globalization”, I assume, means that the contemporary globalization began to take a shape in the 1980s under the shadow of neoliberal transformation of capitalist system within and across the nation-state, and that its process anfractuously remains in force. Globalization is not a straight forward trajectory, but a contradictory (pro-and counter-) tendency in movement as its driving force is discernible in a coined word “glocalization” or “framegration.”

Neopopulism appeared as one of the outstanding political trends at approximately the mid-1990s, especially after the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989) and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union (1991), and its momentum has kept the sway since the global recession of 2007-2008. Neoliberal globalization consequently incurs the eruption of neopopulism around the world, although its appearance assumes a different shape according to particularity of each statehood. Populism is certainly a general tendency at the time of transition. But, its contemporary appearance is remarkable in its global scope and right-wing trends. Global syndrome of neopopulism has been remarked as one of unfamiliar phenomena, and its ascendance has been recognized as a right-wing backlash or a rise of right-wing populist parties which is regarded as an offshoot of polarization of attitudes among the people caused by the contemporary globalization. It has spread as a syndrome around the world, especially conspicuous in Western Europe countries which has been traditionally regarded as a liberal welfare state<sup>1)</sup>. Its outstanding incidents are closely related with a development of socio-economic and political interdependence across and beyond the nation-state. We are facing a contradictory movement of tendency and counter-tendency as is appreciable in the rise of unilateralism. Brexit and Trumpism are another manifestation in these contexts. Given these global trends, neopopulism was also placed on one of agenda at annual meeting of the World Economic Forum (WEF) held on the early of 2018 in Davos. We are observing a paradoxical trend of a self-assertion of particularity in the midst of tendential integration across boundaries in the era of the “World after Globalization.” The contemporary world is moving in the conflicting dynamics of national reintegration under interdependency beyond nation-state.

Given these present conditions, globalization of neopopulism is a bizarre phenomenon of our time in transition. It is, therefore, necessary to reconsider the rampancy of neopopulism in connection with democracy and liberalism, because it appears in a close relation with a fundamental political principle and nationalism in the capitalist state. Although China is another regime called to be a “socialism apt to the Chinese,” it is supposedly also ineluctable from the similar movement in its particular statehood surrounded by globaliza-

---

1) Carlos De Cueto Noguera, “Right Wing Populism in Europe: A Discursive Rhetoric Focused on European Union, Ethno-Nationalism, Democracy and Globalization,” *Memoirs of Institute of Humanities, Human and Social Science*, Ritsumeikan University, vol. 116, 2018 (translated into Japanese by T. Yamaguchi and Y. Nakatani).

tion. Needless to say, it is, however, necessary to approach to its regime from another analytical point of view.

Any modern political discourse has to appeal to some democratic semblance to enjoy a popularity. Neopopulism in the developed states is also a manifestation in such a context and is inseparable from the nation-state, because the latter is a cohesive matrix for integration of the inhabitants, and because the world basically consists of the states. For the formation of the nation (national) state is, at least in the developed countries, generally based on a combination of nationalism with liberal democracy excluding the exceptional state. Then, the rise of populism in the developed states appears in an inseparable relationship with a liberal democratic capitalistic regime in the nation-state, although popular movements in underdeveloped state also assume a particular tendency according to each political and socio-economic structures. In these propositions, it is required to make clear the difference of populism in general and neopopulism in particular, and to explain the reason why neopopulism has arisen in the age of “after Globalization”, because the rise of neopopulism demands to reconsider the political trends of the contemporary capitalist state and to probe for some way to a peaceful coexistence between countries of East Asia through a critical analysis of its relations.

As a political theorist and an explorer of the capitalist state, I cannot offer much in the way of empirical analyses of ongoing party politics of any country, let alone some explanation of the world politics, but I hope to participate in our symposium by making some contribution which could enable to locate neopopulism in a theoretical matrix of liberal democratic state, on my assumption that its appearance would intensively show some political trends “after Globalization.”

## **2. Ideological Aspects of Neopopulism**

For to clarify the contours of neopopulism, it is necessary to disarticulate its composition into components with resort to a sort of discourse analysis, even though in a cursory glance. Neopopulism is a derivative and thin ideology rather than independent and thick one, and its cogency relies, at least in the developed countries, on an appeal to liberal democratic rhetoric and nationalism which is a matrix of the nation (or national) state. These elements are also the intrinsic constituents of the capitalist state, although their articulation varies in conjuncture of history and in particularity of each statehood. In this respect, this paper assumes that it is unavoidable for the state power to (de) rearticulate the socio-economic relations in order to reform the given social formation in the spatio-temporal conditions. In other words, (re)articulation of the socio-economic relations comes into sight in the process of coevolution with a transformation of the traditional ideology through the state apparatus.

**(1) in relation to democratic identification**

Liberalism and democracy are etymologically different terms. The former emerged as a concept of liberation from the feudal bondages and constraints in the period of “trans-Atlantic bourgeois Revolution” and entailed a negative attitude toward the state power. The latter appeared as a demand for direct participation of plebian to the nationwide politics and was subsequently institutionalized in a universal suffrage. Liberal-indirect democracy is a composition of a “unity in conflict”, because it presupposes the concept of freedom “from” and “to” the state power. Over and above, the concept of constitutional democracy is also an expression of a contradictory expression between participation and size in the nation-state, and this contradiction was resolved in a representative democracy which is called a grand discovery of the 19th century.

It is at first relevant to note an interrelation of populism with the concept of democracy, because most accounts remark that invocation and attractiveness to it primarily owes to an appeal to democracy as an all-embracing concept beyond countries. The system of modern regime inevitably involves the form of indirect (representative) democracy due to a contradiction inherent in a difficulty of popular participation in a large population and a vast territory of the nation-state. This contradiction between size and participation has to be resolved by introduction of the representative system into government, whether by parliamentary government or (semi-) presidential system.

Representative democracy inherently has an oppositional proposition of a direct direction from bellow and an indirect government by above: the former is expressed in “government by the people,” and the latter is formulated in an axiom of “government for the people.” This dichotomous phase of an “unity-in-duality” is an expression which designates the direct government by *demos* and the government by representatives. Put differently, representative democracy is an aggregate of “populistic” and “popularistic” elements in political system. This conflicting factor also appears in the tense relation between the concept of self-rule and central integration in the national government. This owes to an oppositional tendency between centrifugal divergence and centripetal convergence in dynamics of politics. Given these preconditions, democratic movement and thinking entail multi-dimensional dynamics in contradiction.

It would be relevant to note the following points in respect to populism and government. First, representative democracy is an artificial contrivance for integration of the nation-state and a driving force for democratic movement in dialectical dynamics. The rise of populism emanates from the system of representative government and has a Janus-faced look resonant with the people’s movement, because populism appears as a fulcrum for conservative co-optation from above and progressive reform from bellow in the given system in an age of transition.

Second, populist movement has a propensity to inspire an expectation of the people toward leadership of the executive in the age of globalization, because globalization

demands a rapid decision and execution of policies. The political power of president or prime minister has been strengthened as a symbolic leader of the nation. In these conditions he/she is strongly inclined to appeal to a plebiscitary procedure which is regarded as the final decision of the nation. It reflects itself in the decreasing relevance of parliament in government. For parliament is nowadays apt to lose its function as an organ to control the executive and to advance the democracy through a deliberation, and to be regarded as an assemblage of a particular interest which represents each corporate group or electoral district.

Third, politics has been treated like a playground or theater (audience democracy), and social mass media regards politicians like an actor (actress) on a political arena for its purpose to arrest the interest of the audience, and audience has virtually the image of a direct contact with a political leader. In these conditions, the people psychologically inclined to identify themselves with speech and deed of political leader on the theater. In addition of these contemporary circumstances mentioned above, complication of socio-economic and political surroundings by globalization has been also amplifying the rise of neopopulism inspired by an expectation of simplification of it.

## **(2) in relation to liberalism**

Liberalism has transformed its meaning in need to adapt itself to an evolution of capitalist system in conjunctures of economic crisis, as is illustrated in denomination of social liberalism, New Deal liberalism, neoliberalism and so on. Liberalism has showed its elasticity amenable to the necessity of co-evolution with transformation of capitalism. This means that liberalism is a meta-ideology of capitalism and an ideological substratum for a construction of politico-social relations in the capitalist state. Put differently, development of capitalism unavoidably has been co-vibrating with re-articulation of elements inherent in liberalism. This means that economic liberalism intermittently has been obliged to change its configurations in need to respond to the development of capitalism. The government perceives the necessity to reform the inherited tenet of liberalism, while keeping the core of its fundamental principle unchanged: that is a profit-oriented and market-mediated economic mechanism. In these historical context, the dominant agents of the capitalism have changed from individual natural person to artificial judicial one in a corporate society. Although the so-called relative autonomy of the state power is one of controversial concept in the state theory, some political agents need for an integration of the socio-economic relations in the state. Government in the capitalist society performs such an agency as an agent to keep and advance the capitalist system.

Liberalism is a basic framework for the construction of government as well as a basic principle for a institutional separation of the capitalistic socio-economic formation between society and the state. It reticulately infiltrates into a fabric of society with a hegemonic vision and has been deeply inscribed in the social formation of the state. Its cultivation is

superimposed on the inherited basic values as a hegemonic vision. These transformation is discernible in history.

Development of capitalism demands to change the configurations of liberalism according to some state project for its future. This transformation has been epitomized as an interventionist liberalism at the turn of 20th century. Its rearrangement was based on the theory of social control in response to a rapid reorganization from rural-agricultural society to urban-industrial one in which “eruption of groups” brought a shift from individual liberalism to corporate one. Consequently, interest group liberalism appeared as a dominant social arrangement in a prescriptive and positivistic theory in the political paradigm. Considering the kaleidoscopic transformation of liberalism, we can ascertain the malleability in its inherent nature workable to the necessity in history. Persistency of liberalism is inseparably related with a notion of possessive individualism, whether its agents are natural person or fictitious one created by law.

The interventionist liberalism is an offspring of social technology in order to react to the development and crisis of capitalism. This means that the given socio-economic relations internally accumulate some contradictions in the process of their working and need to be reorganized by some political devices so that these contradictions may not turn into a political crisis. New Deal liberalism is an exemplar of the interventionist liberalism combined with Fordism. It has been called an “embedded liberalism” of the developed capitalist states in the post-World War II<sup>2)</sup>. Keynesian welfare national state is an expression of it, and its characteristic has been called a Warfare-Welfare liberalism in the period of Cold War. Regime shift, however, arose in a “neoliberal revolution” around 1980s in the context of the contradictions accumulated during the belle epoque of the post-World War society, and the globalization of neoliberalism brought about a shift to a Schumpeterian workfare national state which has been made preponderate by the policy adjustment under the leadership of the annual summit meetings and international economic organizations<sup>3)</sup>. This is nothing more than a collapse of liberal welfare state and a transition to a neoliberal austerity government and the rise of competitive state. This regime remains to be a dominant trend in the international reproduction system. Such a transformation of socio-economic relations has been relied on a 3E typed market fundamentalism of capitalism (economy, efficiency, effectiveness) in place of the former welfare liberalism imbedded in the social relations since the era of New Deal. The policy under the hegemony of neoliberalism is a deregulatory regulation by government and a spatiotemporal dislocation of the contradictions. It caused an underemployment and a growth of disparity in income, alongside of a demographic issue and a rampant inequality of income between rural and

---

2) John G. Ruggie, “International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in Post-War Economic Order,” in Stephen D. Krasner, ed., *International Regime*, Cornell Univ. Press, 1983.

3) Bob Jessop, *The State: Past, Present, Future*, Polity, 2016: 79 and passim (translated into Japanese by Nakatani, Kato, Shindo and Fujimoto, Ochanomizu-Shobo, 2018).

urban districts as well as austerity of social policy. Ascendancy and spread of neopopulism in a global scale should be understood in relation to the state project to reform the socio-economic relations of the society and to reconstruct the relations between the states.

Populism etymologically means a people(*populus*)-centered way of thinking and its movement. It is characteristically a signifiant representing the people. But, it is needless to say that the concept of the people is polysemous, because the political movement could not have an appeal without the word of the “people” like a similar word “democracy”. Populism unavoidably assumes a regressive perspective as well as progressive one about the given conditions. Although both aspires to change the given conditions, the difference especially appears in relation to their attitude toward nation and nationalism. The right-wing neopopulism characteristically signifies a re-identification of nationalism, all the more because the socio-economic relations in the statehood have been transforming under the neoliberal globalization.

### **(3) in relation to nationalism**

At first, it is required briefly to show the concept of nationalism. National consciousness has been always awakened at the conjuncture of transition in history by the state power. Nationalism is most plainly an emotional and civic consciousness of belonging to the same community in time, space and life demarcated by the statehood, and there have been many cases that such a consciousness of the community of fate transforms into an expansionism.

Each socio-economic order comes into existence as an entity by the inherent need to organize it. Statehood is ontologically a relational assemblage demarcated into the given territory by the state power. Nationalism is a building block of the modern capitalist state and established itself as a cohesive element for an integration of the people in the boundary. In these contents, the modern state, on the whole, appears as a nation (national) state.

In a meandering trajectory in history, nation-state has assumed a “container” by which socio-economic relations is comprehended in the given territory. There is a reason why the state is ideally abstracted from the actual relation and has a particular attribute, because a something ideal is necessary to include all inhabitants under the nation beyond social categories such as class, gender and generation. Nationalism is a emotional element for cohesion and spiritually puts inhabitant on trial by a dominant base value congenial to the given social relations. Therefore, there is incessantly latent a potentiality of a conversion for nationalism into a statism in the time of transition. This phenomenon springs from the unification of an emotional element and the relational one in the statehood.

In a historical view of the constitutional government in Western Europe, “trans-Atlantic bourgeois revolution” brought about the regime shift from an absolute monarchy to a republican regime (or constitutional monarchy). This implies, ideal typically, a liberation of the subjects from the feudal bondage by means of the political power which had

been primitively accumulated under the absolute monarchy. The destruction of feudal system changed the inhabitants into a nation based on ethnicity. Nationalism was brought about in the process of civil revolution, and closely tied to liberalism, because the latter was regarded as the fundamental principle for a construction of government and society. In this historical context, nationalism coalesced with a liberal idea. Capitalism as a (re)production system could have found its original root in the liberal state based on an idea of liberal nationalism. In these contexts, liberal nationalism has been a momentum of a driving force for the capitalistic development.

Subsequently, the commons, at least institutionally, developed themselves into the people as a political subject, and this political category has been identified as the political actor in the state. The nation has, therefore, appeared as a fictitious person in an independent state, and its existence is inseparable from the state (nation-state). Put differently, it designates itself as a demarcated whole of inhabitant in the statehood, and appeared as a concept abstracted from the given socio-economic relations.

Some relatively akin ethnic groups (nation, *Volk*) have been generally included in the same nation-state through the process of integration by the state power. It is, of course, needless to say that there is a minority and majority within the same nation-state as well as a hegemon in the international relations. The compound state is generally consisted of some nations, and there are also many cases that dwelling area is located in patches and superimposed by the legacy of the past immigration and colonial policy within the same country. Although nationalism is an emotional ideology for an integration beyond socio-economic and ethnic cleavages, the nation (national) state carries not only its inherited contradictions in the given national composition, but a legacy of the past politics which often bursts into irredentism. These cleavages inherent in the same nation-state becomes conspicuous in the age of transition, such as globalization. The rise of neopopulism is rooted in these conditions of the nation-state.

Considering the remarks on nationalism mentioned above, it is required to make some explanation of a different configuration of nationalism in a homology (*familienähnlichkeit*) for the purpose to locate neopopulism in each state. For the form of nationalism varies according to stateness whose configuration assumes a characteristic appearance of neo(populism). Particularity of stateness is made from a specific articulation of socio-economic relations inscribed in each statehood, and nationhood, most generally, is a concept of combination of ethnic and civil elements. As the state is an abstraction from the socio-economic relations demarcated in the territory, political function is necessary to synthesize both in the nation-state. Nationalism is a devout affection to the state. It is a spiritual element by which the relational entity gets a life force. In this respect, it is relevant politico-culturally to compare a different contour of nationalism between America and Japan as an exemplar in order to set a background of populism, because particularity of culture is inscribed into a substratum of each formation of statehood.

<**Nationalism in America**> American nationalism is based on a deep conviction that liberal capitalism is a *raison d'être* of its statehood, and its polity or constitution has a distinctiveness in federalism, republicanism and presidential system. This particularity is not based on an inherited legacy, but on an artificial device. The genius of the US origins in a pair of revolution and independence from the "Old World", and the right to have rights has been a dream of immigrants to America. The regime combined by these principles has been traditionally regarded as an indigenous genesis of a "republic of ideal". This regime has been regarded as an essential element to keep the immigration country in cohesion excepting native Americans, and it is needless to say that the African-Americans were under the bondage of slavery, at least institutionally as well as socio-economic structure before the civil war.

Such a self-identification inherently involves an exceptionalism which has led to a paradox called a reversion of liberty into unfreedom: that is a compulsory acceptance of inherited basic value in a rhetoric of freedom and a search for its new version in response to the changing conditions, as has been often remarked. Although American liberalism has certainly changed its configuration in history, immigrants from a diverse country has been also incessantly demanded to accept and to be conformed to it. Therefore, deviants from its creed has been estimated as un-American, and not to be a patriot. In addition, the federal composite of the inter-states of the US is apt to be projected into a political imaginary with which international relations are metaphorically patterned according to a self-image of its polity. Additionally, a protean cycle of isolationism and internationalism in its diplomacy should be grasped in relation with the transformation of its domestic economy in history and with its position in the changing world.

Although the US is an immigration country, there frequently arose the limitation of immigrants including the Asians on the pretext of national interest. Additionally, the immigration society as a mosaic one brings about "status revolt". It appears as a revolt by older settlers against the new ones. Populistic movement, although different in its agents, has often arisen in appeal to a rhetoric of the people's movement, especially at the transitional period of the society as is discernible in agrarian populism, Huey Long's demagogic movement, McCarthyism and so on. These trends arise in the period of transition which internally demands a re-articulation of socio-economic relations in the need for reconstruction of them and for a conservation of diplomatic relations with other countries.

Trump's populism is an expression of a relative decline of American hegemony in the world and is animated by a nostalgic renewal. This dwindle may have a strong propensity to authoritarianism, all the more because it can be a repercussion of the hegemon of the world. To be brief, liberal nationalism has been underlying as an American creed and it has been also the driving force for a development of American capitalism.

<**Nationalism in Japan**> In comparison with a civic nationalism of America, Japanese nationalism has characteristically an ethnic element. Its attributes are greatly due to a

narrow land surrounded by the sea and a centralization of administrative power under the feudal system in its own way. In addition to these historical and geographical particularities, rituals of religious observance were indigenized into a substratum of common culture. Especially, animistic and ancestor worship rituals were an internal tie of rural community as you can yet encounter shrine, temple and home altar of them everywhere in Japan. These elements of affection to a local patriotism could have a potential for an induction to a national one by the political power.

Statehood consists of a conjunction of multilayered relations. It is composed of spontaneous *gemeinschaft* and associational *gesellschaft* which are organized into a “container” by the political power, and the state power filtrates into the institutions of the statehood. The national cohesion of this collective is also based on a traditional culture and is closely related with an economic-corporate interest. In this respect, an ethnic feature rather than a civic one has been characteristically underlying in Japanese nationalism. These particularities give a peculiar appearance to the popular movements of its own as mentioned after.

Japanese nationalism was inculcated from above during the Meiji period after the Restoration (1868). The Meiji government embarked forcefully to establish a capitalistic development state based on a semi-feudal landlordism system in order to compete with Western strong powers. Its regime was an absolute monarchy which was closely related to the establishment of Shintoism as a state religion in connection with a conventional ancestor worship to the founders of the Imperial dynasty. The polity of pseudo-constitutionalism was based on such a theology and a semi-feudal socio-economic structure, that is a “Shinto statism” typed totalitarianism. These spirits of monarchical regime were not only imbued in the people by the centralized executive organization as a state religion, but its principle was forcefully instilled into the education system. Its relic remains, for example, in the national flag and anthem which inspires an identification with the given nation-state in visibility and emotionality. In these particularities, the configuration of the state subsequently appeared as a “garrison state” at the era of imperialism. Although there were some democratic movements, all of them were oppressed for being a destructor of the Shintoism-typed divine polity. In these political contrivances, the Japanese people generally did not have the view of relativizing its own extant polity and equated nationalism with the given fundamental principle imposed by the state power. But the defeat and subsequent adoption of the present Constitution was a revolutionary change even though it was basically passive, and a bureaucratic authoritarianism has persisted in the political culture. It is, however, needless to say that civil element is a mainstream of the Japanese Constitution which is complicatedly entangled with ethnic elements in culture.

We cannot find the term “people” in the present Japanese Constitution. “The people” in its English version is displaced by the term of “nation” which inclusively means a population in the state. The term “people (*demos*)” that etymologically origins in the politi-

cal subject is implicitly diluted in the interchangeable usage with “nation”, and the mass movement is generally grasped in a popular petition instead of populist appeal.

### **3. Ambivalence of Neopopulism**

The concept of the “state” is an abstract of the statehood as a relational “container.” This entity has a relative autonomy in relation among the states. Its autonomy is based on the socio-economic relation as a life space which are framed by the juridico-political apparatus and is spiritualized by nationalism. Given these preconditions, I will discuss about the contemporary neopopulism.

#### **(1) compound elements**

Populism ordinarily appeared with two-faces in a transition period of the society as was, for example, discernible in an agrarian populist movement in America at the end of 19 century, some authoritarian-corporatist regimes of Latin-American countries in the 1930s, and anti-imperialist movement in the under-developed countries and so on. These movements involve a progress and reaction in their discourse or an appeal to democracy and nationalism in their pleas. This polymorphism appears in the fact that these movement of the people has been subsumed under the name of populism without distinction, although it connotes a significant difference in its action and attitudes. Populism is a paradoxical compound whose appearance assumes a variegated feature in a different spatiotemporal phase, because the concept of the people (nation) is identified with a demos in its rhetoric. In this respect, neopopulism has something common.

Politics of identity entails a bi-directional political process which involves a reflexive movement of de-identification and re-identification with politics. This function is usually routinized in a concurrence in frictions between the ruler and the ruled. An age of transition, however, generally incurs a turbulence of hegemony and bring about the populist movement from below in connection with a popularistic strategy from above.

There is no party which calls itself to be a populist. A persuasive rallying call of the so-called far-right populist parties involves a “discourse effect” which strikes a sympathetic chord of nationalism and democratic idea. The concept of people and nation has a difference in meaning, and democracy connotes the rule by the “demos”. These terms are not synonymous each other as mentioned above. Discourse of populism generally uses these terms as interchangeable and does not make a difference between them. On the one side it identifies the people with a populace in comparison with an elite or the establishment, and on the other it grasps the international relation in opposition. Both elements are coalesced into the rhetoric of populism. This means that its identification entails a recognition of difference in social formation and international relations. The reference to some social category, however, does not spontaneously develop, but in some political inducement and

against a background of the specific socio-economic conditions in history. Rising neopopulism has been inspired by the right-wing radicals whose strategy relies on invocation to a crisis of the socio-economic transformation by ongoing globalization. In other words, populist politician (or party) inspires the identification among the people about what they are, through an appeal to their dissatisfaction to the present and an uneasiness about the future.

## (2) distinguishing rhetoric of Neopopulism

Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg has been frequently adduced as a proverb of democracy: It says, "government of the people, by the people, for the people". This means that the government fundamentally belongs to the people and is executed by the people, and at the same time that their government is carried out by the representatives "for the people." This proverb involves a contradictory moment of indirect democratic government: the people as a subject to rule and as an object to be ruled. Put differently, a vision of indirect democracy inherently entails a composite of popularistic and populist element. This means that even a noble party (*Honoratiorenspartei*) is obliged to appeal to the people in the image of mass party (*Massenpartei*).

Lincoln's proverb exemplifies an expression about difficulty and apprehension of the government by the people, not only due to the large size of the country, but a hesitation and intuition that there was a perilousness about the government by the people. His concern was underlying since the Federalist paper for a founding of the US. It illustrates a contradictory relation inherent in an idea and institution of representative democracy, and this contradiction is also a driving force of democracy in dialectic dynamics. We can probably find something similar in the contemporary neopopulism.

The given society is certainly not homogeneous, but heterogenous in its social category, and representative democracy basically depends on the idea of concurrence in parliament, although some hegemony is underlying in the social formation. The gist of representative democracy also relies on the premise that the people can incessantly approach to democracy through their human right against the power. In this sense, democracy is not a predetermined idea, but a developmental concept which could be made higher through the relativization of the given regime by the autonomous people. It is, however, unavoidable that the political movement has to associated with the progress and a retreat in its trajectory. Given these conditions in political movements, it is required to locate some distinguishing rhetoric of neopopulism in the present conditions under the age of "after Globalization."

First, it is remarkable that almost all critical researchers recognize a pathology of democracy in the right-wing neopopulism. This appearance owes much to the fact that any political rhetoric has to appeal to discourse of the people, even though it is contradictory to the tenet of liberal democracy. Critics find the relic of a friend vs enemy typed-identarian democracy in the right-wing neopopulism by reason that it discriminates minorities of the

society including immigrants.

In social sciences, it is necessary to identify a variegated social category in the socio-economic existence which is based on the given social relations. But, a distinction is not the same with discrimination. Both are different each other in their concept. In this respect, the right-wing neopopulism turns the concept of distinction into a logic of discrimination by an appeal to the rhetoric of binary opposition in society without any analytical view of the socio-economic relations. Although the discourse of neopopulism appeals to the concept of the “people” internally and “nation” externally, its discourse is clearly contradictory to the idea of basic human rights and pluralism inherent in a pluralistic liberalism.

Second, neopopulism touches the people’s discontent about the present economic conditions and their distrust toward the contemporary politics in the age of transition. The right-wing neopopulism is a reaction against a welfare liberalism dominant in the developed countries. Its movement involves a possibility to collaborate with the trends of neoliberalism in spite of its rhetoric of welfarism, because it opposes the social democratic populism from the view of individualistic possessivism. At the same time, distrust or suspicion of the present conditions, also awakens an irresistible reform from the human right and the social democratic thought. Recognizing that the predicament does not always lead to a progressive movement, anti-elitism of neopopulism can be resonant with a neoliberal reform by the populist politicians in spite of its welfare rhetoric. Although there are two trends of contemporary populism, right-wing populism has been generally designated as a neopopulism owing to its outstanding features.

Third, the issue is on relation of neopopulism and nationalism. It is natural that affection to homeland is potentially lying in all in mind. Nativism is a emotional seed of nationalism, and state power inspires affection to the statehood by cultivation of patriotism based on nativism. In this respect, nationalism has a strong emotional appeal in nationwide, because it is a cohesive element of the nation-state. Attachment to particularity awakens one’s own ethno-nationalism (cathexis) and has also a catharsis effect which often tries to dispel the present discontent by resort to memories of the past politics. The contemporary right-wing neopopulism assumes another characteristic which is discernible in its xenophobic chauvinism by an appeal to homeland. Its exclusionism has been agitated not only by an appeal to the threat of immigration, but intensification of competition among the state in world market. Then, there arises a critical question about a difference between positive nationalism and negative one, especially at the critical conjuncture in history.

### **(3) reflexivity and ubiquity of populism**

Populism is a general incident in representative democracy, even though its phenomenon is polymorphic according to the particular spatiotemporal conditions which are determined by the given socio-economic relations in history. Although populism is an ideology and the movement of the populace, its politico-social characteristic remains

undefined due to its multiformity in its intension and movement. This means that populism is an unavoidable incident of the government whose function inevitably involves some political movement of the people, whether democratic or undemocratic, and whether left, center or right movement. This may be gathered from the fact that “neo” is prefixed to the contemporary movement of populism.

The contemporary global syndrome of neopopulism is also closely related with the eruption of nationalism which assumes a counter-tendency against globalization, because globalization brings about a reconstruction of socio-economic relations in the process of the “after Globalization.” These tendencies are discernible in a variegated schism between generations as well as between local regions, besides of conflicts between countries connected to the development of a competition state under the ongoing globalization. In addition, it is noteworthy that an oppositional dynamic of divergence in convergence is appearing in the international relations. Euroscepticism is an expression of these trends and Islamophobia is another negative indication of neopopulism which has been inspired by an appeal to the threat of immigration from abroad. The landslide victory of the governing party in the latest general election in Japan is also an indication of populist expectation from a conservative reaction against global anxiety hanging over the world.

#### **4. Contemporary World in Relativization and Paradox**

The world in the era of “after Globalization” makes happen a nebulous world. We are seeing something bizarre in the era of developing interdependency across boundary and are also living in the time of “globalization of politics” and “politics of globalization” in their connection. At the same time, the world of the “after Globalization” gives rise to a paradox: that is, a bidirectional contradictory trend in which a claim for particularities has been working in the midst of an advancement of transboundary relations. In addition, we are also living in the time of relativization of the world through the development of mass media, even though it is just in a pseudo-environment. We can broadly grasp the world affairs more than before by the IT revolution which demands to envision some picture for the future through a dialogue between the past and the present.

Legitimation is a necessary condition for any regime. It is a soft power which induces a consent of the ruled by some convincing doctrine through a persuasion. Legitimation is a hegemonic effect to the socio-economic relations and is unavoidable in politics, together with the potential to resort to a force. But, the ideal typical classification of legitimation by M. Weber is not a normative concept, but an empirical analysis apparatus. Therefore, it is necessary to refer its justifiability for a critical investigation from the point of a developmental democracy. In this respect, a variegated neopopulistic reformism and its negative nationalism should be put into a critical scrutiny from the view of justifiability.

A long time has passed since it is pointed out that a traditional territorial sovereign

state has been fluctuating under the ongoing globalization, and that many researchers have given a warning to a “tragedy of global common goods.” Democracy is certainly at a standstill before the high gate of the state as well as factory. Given these present conditions, global democratic theorists have advocated a multitiered (or multilayered) global governance model. This construct is based on a social democratic vision from a methodological internationalism or from a normative and axiological point of view. Then, advocates of this theory are also called a cosmopolitan democrats of global justice school. Their important vision originates in the fact that we face a sort of gridlock in a predicament of a conflict between desirability and feasibility. Global democratic theory is also symptomatic of global problem to which it probes for some solution. Then, it is demanded to reconsider the ingredients of capitalistic nation-state in order to identify its relevancy in the globalizing world.

Capitalist system is fundamentally based on a particular relation of (re)production for commodity in a market society which is networked in global scope. The capitalist state is a relational ensemble in itself and is for itself in need to be articulated by the political power. This system is organized in a limited space, because labour is not exempted from space, and because a fictitious commodity needs the legal-political mechanism as a non-economic device. This means that (re)production basically repeats itself in the state. National economy is a total economic entity in the given state and assumes an appearance like an individual income. National interest characteristically represents itself as a total interest from which relations of production is abstracted.

On the other side, the advanced capitalist state is based on some devise of liberal democracy. This regime is under the control of constitutionalism whose economic principle is based on the possessive individualism, whether natural person or legal one. Personal atomization of social relation is a precondition of socio-economic mold of capitalism which function as a persuasive discourse. The capitalistic state organizes these principles into its existence as a nation-state, although this entity inherently involves also constraints due to a liberal democratic ideal.

Considering the present socio-economic conditions of the “after Globalization”, it would be required to reconsider the given political structure of each state through an idea of developmental democracy. But it should be noteworthy that a demand to demolish the state should mean a loss of bridgehead for its reformation, because the nation-state remains the most persistent and cohesive element of the people. These preconditions and configurations based on them are certainly changing in globalization, but the state is not in the process of hollowing out. Therefore, there is no other alternative than to appeal to a political apparatus in order to democratize the given politico-social relations in the state, alongside of democratic solidarity beyond boundary demarcated by the state.

## 5. Some Concluding Remarks

Democracy is a polity ruled by the people. Political system of any country can not be a model to be followed, albeit involving some elements for consideration on democracy. Democracy is not a predetermined and fixed concept, but to be developed through ideology and theory about it in history. Populism is a necessary condition for the development of democracy, so long as its perspective contains some positive meanings for the future. We should not abandon the democracy in the cause of its ambiguity, but should probe for its further development from the view of the human rights. Creative construction in thought and theory always rely on a critical reconsideration of the given conditions for the future, even though it is just a thought-experimentation. We should take it account that an idea of democracy entails an egalitarian element and solidarity which necessitates a personal development of individuals through a liberation from the given socio-economic constraints. Contemporary neopopulism has a negative face in its dichotomy by which socio-economic categories and international relation are divided into a friend vs enemy. This rhetoric and disposition lead to an authoritarian nationalism in this respect. We should not confuse populism in general with neopopulism in particular, especially right-wing neopopulism.

Neopopulism is a reflection of the people's desire to reform the present conditions, although it involves as a negative momentum in its disposition, especially in an exclusive nationalism. But, nationalism has two sides like a coin. In this sense, nationalism and internationalism are inseparably related each other. Therefore, the latter based on the former may lead to an expansionism. Globalization brings about the necessity to reconsider intersubjectively of the nation-state and the interrelation of it in the perception of subject-object relation. It demands the recognition that a subject is an object from another side and vice versa. So, we can find a clue to have a positive nationalism through a creative mutual critique.

The concept of nationalism is closely connected with a national interest. National interest is, however, an imaginary by which the whole interest of the nation is semantically represented as a corporeal entity. This semantic representation owes to a totality of the people in nationhood. Particular interest is imaginarily subsumed under a national interest, and the state appears as a guarantor of material and physical interest of all. In addition, national interest is justified with an appeal to the concept of publicness. In these conditions, national interest is a "best possible shell" for integration of the people in national scale, when the dominant socio-economic relations are identified with the interest of the people in general. Reason of the state (*raison d'Etat*) originates from these contexts, and state is fetishized as an abstraction from the socio-economic relations of the statehood. National interest economically turn itself into the national income which is statistically expressed in economics. The concept of national interest leads to the competition state

which actuates its support in the possessive concern for a trickling down effect and in an imaginary of equal share of surplus-profit.

Authoritarianism psycho-pathologically means a submission to a superior who resorts to a coercive demand of obedience to the authority. In political science, authoritarian regime has been generally assumed to be the semi-despotic regime based on a limited pluralism and a constrained freedom in action and thought. It involves the exclusion of outsiders and dissents. In this respect, right-wing neopopulism shares an authoritarian propensity in its exclusionism. It appeals to conservative discourse of an internal economic prosperity as well as internal security. Regarding these features mentioned above, right-wing neopopulism characteristically has an authoritarian statism in its rhetoric and movement.

The state project of neoliberalism is to reorganize the socio-economic relations and state apparatus according to the principle of economic rationality of capitalism and market fundamentalism. The policy attends an austerity and reduction of social expenditure for the development strategy of economy. This neoliberal state project, supported by the international organizations, vertically and horizontally, dislocated the contradictions to a certain social category and has cumulatively postponed them to the future. These policies incurred in an apprehension and antagonism of the discouraged people whose anxiety has been additionally flamed by the real and assumed threat from abroad. In these conditions, the global syndrome of right-wing neopopulism arose as an authoritarian nationalism in politics. This movement is likely to encourage the supervision state under the technological communication networks.

Given these remarks mentioned above, it is required to make a democratization of nationalism in view of internationalism. But, reconsidering of democracy beyond borders, it is needless to say that difference should be clearly made between the victims by invasion and victims of the assault country in history and the present. In this critical point, we already shared a miserable history beyond description and should not be permissive of the war in the resort to the cause of its necessary evil. Pacifism of the Japanese Constitution is based on a deep remorse for the past war and hopes to solve by a dialogue when conflict between countries happen to arise, "trusting in the justice and faith of peace-loving peoples of the world (Preface of the Japanese Constitution). It has been, however, apprehensively concerned that the broken-hearted experience of the past war and imperialism falls into a lapse of memory, and that the atrocity in the world war is just recognized as the deeds of the former generations in history.

Considering that consciousness of threat and anxiety is always a subjective perception in the mutual relations, it is necessary not only to remove its causes, but reflexively to relativize what impression one behavior of the state gives to others. Spiral of mutual expansion of armaments not only accelerates an increase of fiscal burden for it, but also makes a further dependency on some dominant power through a military equipment and

the method to how to use its technology. Besides these military effects, it could lead to an authoritarian regime with a plausible pretext that it is necessary to prepare for its internal political arrangements. The threat, whether real or assumed, could be contrived into the project to put the regime under a coercive authoritarian government as history shows.

**<Nationalism and Populism>** It is needed to epitomize the relation between nationalism and populism in order to grasp their appearances in the globalizing world. A nation is ontologically a totality in imagination and practice subsumed by the state power and nationalism is a spiritual bandage which combines the people beyond a social category. The term “people” in the territory is a political and personal representative (*signifiant*) of “nation” as an ethnic-civil aggregate. Both concept assumes an interchangeability in the nation-state. In this relation between the people and nation, nationalism and populism connote the same meaning each other. Although the form of nation is diversified, it is a relational entity composed of civic element based on ethnic substratum. Consequentially both elements are imbricated together in the given nation-state by the state power. In addition, the will of nation (people) and its legitimacy is based on the institutional arrangements whose general form is the indirect democratic system in the capitalist state. Although neopopulism or neonationalism emphasizes one of these element, these have the same root in the nation-state. Ongoing globalization has detonated a consciousness of nation and people in the awareness of “other” in home and abroad, because it awakens the constituents of the nation-state which are dormant at the relatively stable time of the given socio-economic formation. This means that the expansion of the socio-economic relations across and beyond the boundary paradoxically induces a consciousness of particularities.

**<Neonationalism in Japan>** Finally, there should be added some mention about the political trends of contemporary Japan, although there are many political matters to be alluded to. This paper has to limit itself only to the controversy over the amendment of the present Constitution, because it is likely to be the most critical issue with which Japan will face henceforth.

The rise of Japanese nationalism characteristically appears in connection with an affiliation to traditional ethnic element rather than to a civic liberalism. This feature is detectable in the trends of the contemporary neonationalism in which traditional basic values are retrospectively legitimized in the name of patriotism. This means that the ethnic element of nationalism is apt to burst as a statism in Japanese political culture.

The rise of historical revisionism in Japan inseparably related to the need for a (re) evocation of nationalism (neonationalism). Patriotism in nationwide is an emotional distension of local patriotism which is an attachment to personal-intimate relations and a natural-physical sight of one’s own native country. Therefore, local patriotism does not involve an aggressiveness in itself, so long as the conflict is peacefully resolved in the given community. National patriotism is an artificial extrapolation of neighborhood by the juridico-political function of the state power. In these contexts, nationalism appears as a

national spirit (*Volksgeist*), and claims an allegiance to the state, whenever nationalism is equated with statism.

Ethnic and civil elements of nationalism is a shared interest in a nationwide and is, on the whole, accepted as an inherited legacy among the given people. There arises, however, the attempt to negate the negative legacy of the past history in order to embellish it with some justification. But, it is needless to say that a negative legacy can change itself into a positive momentum for the future, when it is reflexively reconsidered with a self-criticism in a nationwide.

A bad stigma of imperialistic invasion during the last World War cannot be erased from the history. Its regime was based on a divined landed-typed ultra-nationalism. Historical revisionism is an attempt to modify the history in order to induce a patriotism whose purpose is to infiltrate neonationalism in defiance of the protest from Asian countries who was colonized and invaded by Japan. These neonational political trends are an expression of the right-wing neopopulism in Japan, and its tendency has been latent in the right-wing of the incumbent political party in Japan. This attempt is closely related to an amendment of the present Constitution in a pretext that it was just forced to accept by the victors of the last war.

Amendment of the present Constitution is a long-standing task for the governing party since its founding in 1955. These political trends are connected with a historical revisionism whose purpose is to take back the traditional values in a repulsion of liberal democratic principle in the Constitution<sup>4</sup>). It means the rise of authoritarian nationalism in Japan. Its project has been recently legislated as a series of laws relating to a national security which has been spurred by the unstable environment of East Asia, especially by the provocative military strategy. We have to engrave it on our heart that many cases of internal shift to an authoritarian regime may be inspired by an appeal to the threat from abroad.

This paper concludes the remark that the essential enquiry of the social science is an exposition about the future through the critical study of the present conditions. That is, a complex and reflexive enquiry of normative or axiological study based on positivistic survey. Given this proposition, we should probe for the conditions of democracy beyond borders through a critical investigation of internal and external political trends in East Asia.

I shall be extremely fortunate if my paper in some small way contribute to a collaboration of development of our study.

---

4) Karoline Postel-Vinay, "The Global Rightist Turn, Nationalism and Japan," *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, vol.15, Issue 10 (1), May 15, 2017: 1-14.