

should be the decisive criteria in deciding whether we need to establish a dialogue with their work.

I see the refusal of many democratic theorists to engage with Schmitt's thought on moral grounds as typical of the moralistic tendency which is characteristic of the post-political Zeitgeist. In fact, the critique of such tendency is at the core of my reflection. A central thesis of this book is that, contrary to what post-political theorists want us to believe, what we are currently witnessing is not the disappearance of the political in its adversarial dimension but something different. What is happening is that nowadays the political is played out in the moral register. In other words, it still consists in a we/they discrimination, but the we/they, instead of being defined with political categories, is now established in moral terms. In place of a struggle between 'right and left' we are faced with a struggle between 'right and wrong'.

In Chapter 4, using the examples of right-wing populism and of terrorism, I will examine the consequences of such a displacement for domestic as well as for international politics and unveil the dangers that it entails. My argument is that, when the channels are not available through which conflicts could take an 'agonistic' form, those conflicts tend to emerge on the antagonistic mode. Now, when instead of being formulated as a political confrontation between 'adversaries', the we/they confrontation is visualized as a moral one between good and evil, the opponent can be perceived only as an enemy to be destroyed and this is not conducive to an agonistic treatment. Hence the current emergence of antagonisms which put into question the very parameters of the existing order.

Another thesis concerns the nature of collective identities which always entail a we/they discrimination. They play a