

Abstract.

The research project examines some aspects of representative democracy in the twenty-first century, and in particular phenomena such as democracy of the "public" and anti-democracy. They are highlighted the effects of the "democratic broken promises" by the political parties, and the economic and social causes that have contributed to destabilizing representative democracy at both national and European level (so as to be configured as post- democracy).

Democracy of the "public" understood as the transformation of the people in "public" not only to the influence of a media leaders and the use of his party, but to the effect of neo-liberal policy which the media are an expression and instrument.

It is noted that the issue is not to recover the method of drawing lots as he thinks B. Manin, but to try to shape new political subjects.

In the last part of the research we analyze the powers against democratic (as defined by Pierre Rosanvallon), and possible strategies for ways to contain.

The forms of control (surveillance, interdiction and sanctions-judgment, according to the phenomenology developed by Rosanvallon) are considered by us not so much an expression of an active citizen participation (as it wants Rosanvallon same), but rather a means to ascertain the inefficiencies of politics "negative".

The multiplication, in fact, the work of the independent authority as well as the internet and the press (since the 90s) is the mal functioning of political parties, and their task can not be saddled with such instances, since they function control on the market but not in the political sphere adjustment.

Our reflection shows that the solution is not in limitation of political parties but rather in their new building, because only through them will be able to affirm the rights of plurality and challenge important issues (such as populism and trends to the extreme individualization of the social body).

Our analysis focuses on the importance not only of the social sphere (as shown Rosanvallon) but of that policy, as both are necessary in a context that can be said to be democratic.

Populism comes to us not just in a pathological role, that is, as the ability of anti exaggerate political surveillance and interdiction powers and judgment in impolitic and counter-political action (as he thinks Rosanvallon), or only democratic-radical key, (as believes E. Laclau) that is as construction of politics and political, but in a more complex form because symptom of democracy "economic" (ie of the lobbying and finance).

The thesis aims to demonstrate how individuals Rosanvallon just some effects related to populism as the need for transparency in politics that has exasperated his electorate, however, neglecting the emptying of political content and replace them with social forms that try to hide the need of political representation through its own negation, and how the risk policy thus being reduced to a container of populism.

The counter-political (or apolitical) is understood by us as a broader phenomenon, such as: the crisis of democratic power and collective subjects, who report a shortage of politics and the political.

Our proposal illustrates the need to rethink both agonist in a robe and not antagonistic, as suggested by the

philosopher C. Mouffe.

The political fact, come to us not only as the expression of a historical concept (as it wants Rosanvallon) but also hegemonic (as believed Mouffe).

In addition, the "singularity" is considered by us as the inability of institutions to be an expression of the demands of the individual, that is, as the lack of a political authority capable of converging the demands of pluralism in a political project; and how this has led individuals to break away from politics and to seek in their abilities (as in merit and luck), the way in which to emerge.

Our research on the one hand recognizes the importance of the proposals such commonality, reflexivity, similarity (fielded by Rosanvallon) on the other believes they will not work if not supported by a proper political context.

The possibility of a media sharing (ie a horizontal democracy, which flows into the narrative of the individual) is deemed by us only partially effective, since this proposal albeit ambitious it may be unable to face the neoliberal issues, and probably will be able only to to increase the outflow of its symptoms such as populism, singularity and control.

The latter in fact, reflect the representative deficit of contemporary phase, which is the result of lack of political authority (especially the left) capable of converging the demands of pluralism in a political project. In closing analysis, the hypothesis would be desirable in a new politicization from below with new political subjects, and a political culture that is able to understand not only their own means of the global media but especially popular subjectivity, participation and a democratic power as the expression of a regulatory and institutional framework.