



**BETWEEN HABERMAS AND MOUFFE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FROM
THE BRAZILIAN POLITICAL SCENARIO**

*ENTRE HABERMAS E MOUFFE: UMA ANÁLISE COMPARATIVA A PARTIR DO
CENÁRIO POLÍTICO BRASILEIRO*

Matheus Figueiredo Nunes de Souza

Doutorando em Direito Político e Econômico (2021) na Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, com Bolsa de Estudos - Modalidade Isenção Integral do Instituto Presbiteriano Mackenzie. Mestre (2019, com louvor) em Direito pela Faculdade Meridional (IMED), com bolsa CAPES/PROSUP. Professor, Supervisor dos Trabalhos de Curso e Membro do Núcleo Docente Estruturante (NDE) do Curso de Direito, da Faculdade de Balsas (UNIBALSAS). Membro do grupo de pesquisa Rede Law and Social Systems, desenvolvendo suas pesquisas nos seguintes temas: Teoria dos Sistemas Sociais Autopoiéticos; Sociologia das Constituições; Direito e Sustentabilidade. Advogado.

Sérgio Ricardo Fernandes de Aquino

Doutor em Ciência Jurídica pela Universidade do Vale do Itajaí - UNIVALI (2013). Mestre em Ciência Jurídica pela Universidade do Vale do Itajaí (2007). Especialização em Administração pela Universidade Independente de Lisboa em convênio com a Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina - UDESC (2005) e Graduado em Direito pela Universidade do Vale do Itajaí (2003). Professor Permanente do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Direito (PPGD) - Mestrado - da Faculdade Meridional - IMED. Membro da Rede para o Constitucionalismo Democrático Latino-Americano. Tem experiência na área de Direito, com ênfase nos seguintes temas: Ética, Direitos Humanos, Sustentabilidade, Política Jurídica, Filosofia, Direito na Pós-Modernidade.

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to compare the analytical contributions of Jürgen Habermas and Chantal Mouffe models of democracy in the light of the Brazilian political scenario, from a theoretical

contextualization. In order to fulfill this proposal, the research problem is: is it possible to understand Brazilian democracy from the conceptions presented by these two political theories? Thus, scientific method used was hypothetical-deductive, developing a qualitative, primarily theoretical and descriptive research. The instrumental procedures (research techniques) employed were the literature review (selected, respectively, by the criteria of relevance, accessibility and topicality), documentary material and operational categories and concepts. It was concluded that disparities in factors such as Education and Income can compromise the achievement of a medium level of communication, which may rule out the habermasian proposal, but it does not mean an adherence to radical democracy, considering, mainly, the rise of radical discourses post-2018, which eliminate the legitimacy of the "adversary". Thus, mere theoretical transplants should be avoided and observed. Finally, an understanding of the application of one of the models requires further research, with increased results.

Keywords: Chantal Mouffe. Brazilian democracy. Deliberative democracy. Jürgen Habermas. Radical democracy.

Resumo

O objetivo do presente artigo é comparar as contribuições analíticas dos modelos de democracia de Jürgen Habermas e Chantal Mouffe à luz do cenário político brasileiro, a partir de uma contextualização teórica. Para atender a essa proposta, o problema de pesquisa é: é possível entender a democracia brasileira a partir das concepções apresentadas por essas duas teorias políticas? Assim, o método científico utilizado foi o hipotético-dedutivo, desenvolvendo uma pesquisa primariamente qualitativa, teórica e descritiva. Os procedimentos instrumentais (técnicas de pesquisa) empregados foram a revisão de literatura (selecionada, respectivamente, pelos critérios de relevância, acessibilidade e atualidade), material documental e categorias e conceitos operacionais. Concluiu-se que disparidades em fatores como educação e renda podem comprometer a concretização de um nível médio comunicativo, o que pode afastar a proposta habermasiana, mas não significa uma adesão à democracia radical, haja vista, principalmente, a ascensão de discursos radicais pós-2018, que eliminam a legitimidade do "adversário". Assim, meros transplantes teóricos devem ser evitados e se deve observar. Por último, uma compreensão sobre a aplicação de um dos modelos requer pesquisa mais aprofundada, com ampliação de resultados.

Palavras-chave: Chantal Mouffe. Democracia brasileira. Democracia deliberativa. Jürgen Habermas. Democracia radical.

1. INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The form of organization of the political system and the democratic model found in the pillars of liberalism its expression. The main characteristics that identify liberalist proposals for democracy are universalism, rationalism and individualism.

It is clear that the establishment of a rationally grounded procedure is essential for achieving a universalist consensus. However, the dominant political theory, like John Rawls and Jürgen Habermas, fails to work fully on the pragmatic dimension of pluralism and social heterogeneity, relegating to Reason the neutralizing function of the influence that private issues can have on the public sphere, with regard to the good life of the community.

On the other hand, there is the understanding that opposes liberal thinking and deliberative models, represented by Chantal Mouffe. The Belgian political scientist makes a diagnosis of the phenomenon that occurs thanks to the continuous failure of these models, which becomes indispensable for a dialectical analysis of the two antagonistic constructions under a contextualizing perspective of the proposals.

Therefore, starting from this theoretical contextualization between habermasian deliberative democracy and mouffean radical democracy, the research problem from which it starts is: is it possible to understand Brazilian democracy from the conceptions presented by these two political theories?

Aware of this, and in order to better understand the research problem, in the sense of contributing to autonomous thinking and strengthening development, it is important to make an adequate reinterpretation of these discourses of political philosophy to the experienced reality. For this reason, the aim of this paper is to compare the analytical contributions of Habermas and Mouffe models in the light of the Brazilian political scenario.

These two matrices were chosen because, first, Habermas' thought is equidistant from the liberal¹ and republican² political tradition, but it is still supported by a rational artifice to explain the dynamics in the public sphere. Conversely, Chantal Mouffe openly criticizes liberal and deliberative politics, opposing a construction that seeks to base dissent as the very form of (re)production of the political.

¹ As William E. Scheuerman (2014, p. 156) explains, in Habermas's compelling account, increasing evidence suggested that liberal democracy was evolving into a new and unprecedented form of authoritarianism, a mass plebiscitarianism in which organized privileged interests came together in order to perpetuate the social and political domination.

² Peters (1994, p. 112) says that Habermas "[...] *conception of practical discourse and compromise provides for an understanding of democratic, 'deliberative' politics which overcome the widespread, narrow understanding of politics as mere aggregation of private interests. His distinction between the 'moral' and 'ethical' elements of politics, between principles of justice and evaluative conceptions of a collective life-form with common aspirations and projects, lets him keep a healthy distance from the more problematic elements of 'communitarian' or 'republican' understandings of modern society and politics*".

The scientific method used was hypothetical-deductive, developing a qualitative, primarily theoretical and descriptive research. The instrumental procedures (research techniques) employed were the literature review (selected, respectively, by the criteria of relevance, accessibility and topicality), documentary material and operational categories and concepts.

The first part of this paper aims to present Habermas's deliberative policy model, covering the understanding of society as a system and Lifeworld, communicative acting, and then entering the theory of discourse and formulating the principle of democracy, presented by the key theoretical postulates for understanding the thinking of the German philosopher.

Secondly, starting from the criticisms made to the dominant model, especially with regard to universalism, rationalism and individualism, in search of a consensus for the public sphere, we present Chantal Mouffe's model of agonistic pluralism, or radical democracy, as distinctly different proposal. Her perceptions permeate the need to recognize pluralism, differences and dissent as structuring elements of the social, which make up the antagonisms and hegemonic relations that are allocated in different fields in the political domain. Another highlight is the criticism of the impossibility of neutrality of the political sphere, given that it is not possible to relegate pluralism to the private sphere, recognizing that the various areas of human life permeate the antagonistic positions that are taken into the world. political field.

The last topic was divided into two points: in the first one, we sought the the data released through the Atlas of Human Development in Brazil, mainly in the Education, Income and Longevity, to identify the great social inequalities that plague the different regions of Brazil and how these indicators act contrary to the emergence of an intermediate communicational level in the public sphere (taking the postulates of the theory of communicative acting as an ideal type, in the Weberian sense) - that allows the application of the habermasian theory to human conditions in Brazil. In the second part, we sought to analyze data from a survey conducted by the Datafolha Institute about the positioning of the Brazilian electorate in the political spectrum through the support that the population has made to certain ideas presented since the 2014 election period. Along with the analysis from the previous research data, we sought to to give greater visibility in the comparison of the models discussed in the light of the Brazilian political scenario.

2. THE HABERMASIAN DELIBRATIVE POLICY

According to Habermas, society is divided into both system and Lifeworld, having to comply with conditions proper to the maintenance of the sociocultural worlds of life, and the evolution of the system can be measured by the increasing ability to control of a society, while the evolutionary indicator of Lifeworld whose structure is symbolic, is perceived through the separation of culture, society and personality³ (HABERMAS, 1987a, p. 215).

The Lifeworld is a place of transcendence, where speaker and listener meet, where they can reciprocally consider the claim that their broadcasts agree with the objective world, the subjective world, and the social world. Here it is possible to criticize and expose the grounds of such validity claims, to resolve disagreements and to reach an agreement (HABERMAS, 1987a, p. 179).

The systemic patrimony is defined in each specific case by a certain set of cultural values that is embodied in the institutional orders of society or anchored in the motivational basis of the person. However, these values are taken from the cultural system, and this in turn is in a different sphere from the “struggle for existence” (Lifeworld), so values develop an ability to define their systemic heritage and organization that opposes the supreme imperative of the system to abandon any element because of the conservation of global organization (HABERMAS, 1987a, p. 324).

The emergence of the dichotomy between Lifeworld and system occurs through social evolution, because as time goes on, daily practice and the increasing weight of communicative acts end up strengthening the processes of reaching understanding to the detriment of normative tradition and sacred. That is, convictions no longer seek their authority in the aura of the sacred, but in a consensual sphere that is communicatively produced and attained.

In this sense, the law lies between validity and facticity. In the mode of validity of law there is the interconnection of the facticity of the imposition of law by the State with the force of a process of normatization of the law, which seeks the claim to be

³ By culture, it is the collection of knowledge, where participants in communication use interpretations to understand something in the world. Society is the legitimate ordinances through which the participants in the interaction will regulate their belonging to social groups, this ensuring solidarity. And, lastly, personality is understood as the skills that convert a subject into capable of language and action, that is, that enables him/her to take part in the processes of understanding and the affirm their identity in them (HABERMAS, 1987a, p. 196).

rational, to guarantee freedom and to found legitimacy. Despite making a return to Kant with facticity and validity, Habermas points out that such claims can also be transposed to action theory, where coercion and freedom, which are two components of the validity of law, put the choice available to recipients. That is to say, the validity of a positive right is first and foremost determined tautologically by the fact that only that which has the force of law through legally valid procedure is valid as law - but the meaning of this validity of the law it is only explained by the simultaneous reference to its social or factual validity and its validity or legitimacy (HABERMAS, 1997, p. 48/50).

The legal system only acquires autonomy while the procedures that are institutionalized for legislation and jurisdiction guarantee an impartial formation of judgment and will, providing ethical and procedural rationality with an equal entry into law and politics - so law cannot be autonomous. without a realized democracy (HABERMAS, 1987b, p. 16). That is, the autonomy of law is based morally on a rational procedure.

This is because morality and law are both part of a system of actions. Thus, all the norms of general actions are branched into moral and legal rules. However, there is no hierarchy between them, because, in a post-metaphysical scenario, morality becomes autonomous and law becomes positive, existing in a relationship of complementarity. At the level of cultural knowledge, legal norms are separate from ethical and moral; and at the institutional level, positive law also separates itself from customs, the latter being seen as mere conventions. Post-traditional morality represents only a form of cultural knowledge, while law acquires an obligation, also, at the institutional level (HABERMAS, 1997, vol. I, p. 141/142).

In this sense, Habermas presents his deliberative policy proposal, which serves as the basis for the conception of procedural democracy. Thus it explains that when talking about deliberative politics there is only the requirement of an empirical reference when taking into account the plurality of forms of communication in which a common will can be formed, not only through ethical self-understanding, but also through balance of interests and commitments through rational choice of means with respect to an end, through moral justifications and legal consistency examinations (HABERMAS, 1995, p. 45).

Reinforcing this understanding, Werle (2013, p. 150) explains that in the absence of a substantial consensus on values, norms and principles expressed in an image of the world that is accepted and shared by all, the only justification criterion to

be adopted for answers to practical questions is consent rationalization of autonomous, free and equal individuals. On the other hand, social and political institutions are only justified when they reflect the interests, rights and conceptions of the good life of individuals.

There is an intertwining of law, politics and morality, which imposes a moral foundation on the one hand, while legal duty-being does not offend principles of justice, which are universal. On the other hand, the plurality existing in the public sphere demands consideration of the diversity of values in the context of political procedures. Thus it is possible to distinguish a moral discourse, which concerns the universal must-be; an ethical-political discourse regarding the justification of the way of life that is good for a certain community; and, finally, a pragmatic discourse, aimed at justifying the ends and the appropriate means to achieve it (NEVES, 2012, p. 118/119).

It is observed, therefore, that the conception proposed here goes between the republican (with popular sovereignty and the *volonté generale*) and liberal political tradition (private interests and individual freedoms), showing itself as a middle ground and alternative. However, its characterization resides in the face of institutionalization: the search for solving the problem of how the discursive formation of opinion and will can be institutionalized, of the reciprocal action between the informal spheres of the life world with the formal spheres of the decision-making processes. institutionalized decision, of how to transform communicative power into administrative power (LUBENOW, 2010, p. 231).

Yet, to reinforce, Melo (2004, p. 122/123) asserts the integration of elements from both traditions. The public use of reason as a source of normative justification is present in the republican model - here liberalism is at a disadvantage because it limits the fundamental performative sense of public self-determination to the mere "negotiation" between private interests. On the other hand, the weak point of the republican model lies in its "idealism", placing the democratic process in dependence on the virtues of citizens guided by the common good - here the liberal tradition shows its strong point: for containing weaker normative connotations than the republican conception, it insists on ensuring freedom through the rule of law, that is, society does not have the means to self-organize with only the potential integrator of society.

However, even though the rational formation of political will implies complex interactions between different forms of discourse, the question of (moral) justice overlaps with others (legal, ethical-political and pragmatic), leading to the need for

universalist consensus approach that is difficult to materialize in complex and plural societies.

3. CHANTAL MOUFFE'S RADICAL DEMOCRACY

The dominant political thought is clearly marked by three characteristics: rationalism, individualism and universalism, and can identify sexist and Eurocentric biases, characteristic of liberal thought. The universalist ideology brings with it the imposition of certain values, usually belonging to the moral sphere (justice issues), promoting an "agony" of politics, leading to the inability to recognize diversity as a guiding element for the improvement of human coexistence (MOUFFE, 1996, p. 24/27).

However, the belief in the success of liberal democracy is fueled by the collapse of its enemy. It is possible to identify a widespread disregard for institutions, coupled with the sense that traditional parties no longer serve the popular interest and the rise of far-right parties that increasingly make major inroads into the political field of various countries (MOUFFE, 2006, p. 165). In addition, the emergence of ethnic, nationalist and religious conflicts in an era of rational dominance means that most liberal democrats do not understand the intense growth of particularisms and antagonisms that are supposed to have been overcome (MOUFFE, 2003, p. 12).

The dominant model has a political domain necessarily permeated by an individualistic and rationalist approach, which leads the "political" to a reduction to the economic, or the ethical. Given this, the antagonisms and passions that exist within the social environment, indispensable in a plural and complex society, end up being neutralized by the necessary blindness to the nature of the political. What would happen, then, is that actors would be viewed as rational individuals, who above all are driven by rational interests that, at best, act under the coercion of the moral sphere. Thus, this reductionism comes down to the neutrality of the context of interests (MOUFFE, 2003, p. 12/13).

No less impoverishing is the democratic view from the deliberative perspective, which has an approach that resides specifically in a form of normative rationality. Moreover, the proposal is to regain the moral dimension and establish a strong connection between liberal values and democracy. Through proper deliberative procedures, it would be possible to satisfy both rationality as a defense of liberal rights

and democratic legitimacy as popular sovereignty (MOUFFE, 2006, p. 166). This popular sovereignty would be rethought from the standpoint of intersubjective, understood as a “communicative power” that manifests itself in democratic procedures of state will formation, which encompasses the legislative, the electoral process and discourses at multiple levels of the public sphere.

Finally, the models of political liberalism need to be anchored in rational conditions for a kind of argument that can reconcile morality and neutrality. To this end, pluralism is relegated to the private sphere, so that a consensus can be reached in the public sphere - that is, the controversial issues are removed from the agenda, causing the political arena to be dominated by rational individuals who are submit procedures for choosing the claims considered “fair”. It is not possible that the dimension of power and antagonism to be erased, set aside, to the detriment of a business process based on the reason of individuals (MOUFFE, 1996, p. 186).

In his *Concept of the Political*, Carl Schmitt had already identified that moral, economic, ethnic, religious or other opposition is transformed into a political opposition when it is strong enough to effectively group humans into friend and foes. The political sphere draws its forces from the most varied areas of human life, from antagonisms, and is not characterized by its own domain (SCHMITT, 2008, p. 39/40).

The claim that political dominance is separate and neutral from private affairs is unsustainable. This is because the absence of differences in the world is impossible, especially when faced with a heterogeneous and plural society.

Thus, from the model of radical democracy, instead of the old binary political codification provided by Carl Schmitt (friend/foe), it is necessary to rethink and conceive the opposing part as an adversary, because only in this way can the existence of conflicts be recognized as inherent in democracy. In this case, the adversary becomes a legitimate enemy, which has in common a shared adherence to the ethical-political principles of democracy (MOUFFE, 2003, p. 16).

To understand this new way of observing the political sphere, it is necessary to grasp two important concepts: hegemony and antagonism. The first concerns a political operation that builds the social, which has as its starting point a separate particularity that, without losing this particularity, becomes the representation of the universality that transcends it - this relationship, where particularity assumes the representation of universality, is called the hegemonic relationship (LACLAU; MOUFFE, 2001, XIII).

Another important point is the hegemonic articulations, which are built from the presence of antagonistic forces and the instability of the boundaries that separate them, because only with the existence of a vast field of floating elements and the possibility of articulation on opposite sides is the which constitutes the permissive ground for the definition of a practice as hegemonic (LACLAU; MOUFFE, 2001, p. 136).

The antagonism, on the other hand, is an “experience” of the limit of the social, because it does not present internally, but externally to society, constituting its limits and making its total constitution impossible (LACLAU; MOUFFE, 2001, p. 125). It can be affirmed, therefore, that antagonism is constituted as a revealing horizon of the contingency and precariousness of social identity and objectivity (HOWARTH, 2000, p. 106).

Antagonisms, as external limits of a public domain that is under constant construction, and hegemonic relations and articulations, organized in different fields of a discursive plane, with unstable borders that are redefined all the time, are indispensable elements for the understanding of a democratic panorama of a society marked by social heterogeneity and pluralism, besides demonstrating that the political sphere does not have its own domain, where human passions can be relegated to the private sphere, so as to enable a rational universal consensus between individuals, as preach the liberal models of democracy.

4. BETWEEN DELIBERATIVE POLICY AND RADICAL DEMOCRACY: WHERE IS BRAZIL?

According to the data obtained through the *Programa das Nações Unidas para o Desenvolvimento (PNUD)* (2013a), in proportion to their evolution, they show that in the item “Education”, the number of young people aged 15 (fifteen) to 17 (seventeen) with complete elementary school increased from 20% (twenty percent) to 57.2% (fifty seven point two percent), but 40% (forty percent) of young people in this age group do not yet have completed elementary school.

Already the number of young people between 18 (eighteen) and 20 (twenty) years with high school completed from 13% (thirteen percent) to 41% (forty-one percent). That is, about 59% (fifty-nine percent) of these young people do not have completed high school (PNUD, 2013a).

Although Education is the most advanced component between 1991 and 2010, in absolute (0.358) and relative (128% - one hundred and twenty-eight percent) terms, it is the sub-index that has the lowest absolute value of the Municipal Human Development Index (MHDI) (0.637). In 1991, the value was 0.279; and in 2000, it was 0.456 (PNUD, 2013a).

When it comes to the item “Longevity”, it should be noted that it is the largest sub-index that presents the largest reduction in the difference (between the highest and lowest result). Between 2000 and 2010, 39% (thirty-nine percent) of Brazilian municipalities grew above the national average, with emphasis on the North and Northeast. However, in 2010, 42% (forty-two per cent) of municipalities have Human Development Index (HDI) Longevity above the national level, where in the South Region it reaches 76% (seventy-six per cent) - in contrast, 54% (Fifty-four percent) of the Northeast municipalities still have low HDI Longevity (about 20% lower values of this dimension in the country) (PNUD, 2013b).

In addressing the MHDI Income in 2010, in the Northern Region, 90% (ninety percent) of the municipalities are in the Low⁴ and Medium⁵ Development category. In the Northeast Region, 78% (seventy-eight percent) of the municipalities are in the Low category, and only 12 municipalities have HDI Income above Brazil's HDI Income. In the Southeast, 38% (thirty-eight per cent) is in the High⁶ category and 51% (fifty-one per cent) in the Middle; in the South, 60% (sixty per cent) in the High and 38% (thirty-eight per cent) in the Middle; and in the Midwest, 50% (fifty per cent) in the Middle and 36% (thirty-six per cent) in the High (PNUD, 2013c).

From these data, the existing social inequalities, easily observed through the MHDI Income sub-index, end up affecting certain regions, while others are unaware of such realities. The Southern region of Brazil has a high longevity index and has a per capita income distributed between the Middle and High levels, whereas, in contrast to the North/Northeast region, the indices are disparate.

There are strong indications of the inapplicability of the deliberative democracy proposal for two verifiable impossibilities: the first concerns the communicative gap between agents, which arises through social inequalities that act contrary to inclusion in the public sphere; the second is the prevalence of private over public interests -

⁴ Approximate *per capita* Income between R\$ 180 and R\$ 333.

⁵ Approximate *per capita* Income between R\$ 333 and R\$ 618.

⁶ Approximate *per capita* Income between R\$ 618 and R\$ 1.157.

although Habermas recognizes that (destructive) negotiations can take place within the process of rational formation of State will.

With regard to the first identified impossibility, in order for the rules of action to be valid, it is necessary that all those affected can give their assent, as participants in rational discourses (HABERMAS, 1997, vol. I, p. 142). This statement is essential to understanding the principle of democracy, as this principle is intended to tie a procedure of legitimate normatization of law, meaning that only legal rules can claim legitimate validity, capable of finding the assent of all partners of law, in a legal process of discursive normatization (HABERMAS, 1997, vol. I, p. 145).

However, in order for such deliberations to take place, the rational discourses that are produced in the public sphere must seek the assent of all those who are likely to be affected by the consequences. Taking into account the factor “Education” as an indicative element of the scope of the argumentation as a presupposition of validity of a rational discourse, the 59% (fifty-nine percent) of young people, between 18 (eighteen) and 20 (twenty) years, who If they do not have completed high school, they would be much lower than those who have completed higher education, or even those with *lato* and *stricto sensu* postgraduate degrees.

The second impossibility is the prevalence of private interests of agents in the public sphere, which ends up being achieved through procedural consensus. To illustrate this obstacle, we cite the political scenario that preceded the vote on the first accusation of liability against the former President Michel Temer.

Days before the first complaint against Former President was voted, for Responsibility Crimes, the Federal Government announced the release of parliamentary amendments (allocation of funds to the electoral strongholds of deputies). The amounts released were about R \$ 768,000,000.00 (seven hundred and sixty-eight million reais) in May; R\$ 1,600,000,000.00 (one billion six hundred million reais) in June (month in which the President was denounced) and R\$ 1,900,000,000.00 (one billion nine hundred million reais) in July, from the year 2017 (MARIANI; TAKAHASHI, 2017).

Nevertheless, the Planalto Palace proceeded with the same strategy, through the release of resources via parliamentary amendment in the days leading up to the vote on the second complaint against the former President. According to data from the Joint Budget Commission, Planalto authorized the commitment of 80.6% of the amendments in September after the presentation of the second complaint offered by

the Attorney General's Office against the President, and in total, R\$ 272.7 Million were committed in statutory parliamentary amendments (AMARAL, 2017).

Following these episodes and the voting on both allegations, the federal deputies voted to close both accusations, claiming that the country could not go through another "crisis" (a new impeachment) and that there was insufficient evidence. Meanwhile, while complaints against the former President were running, the Datafolha Institute conducted a survey on the satisfaction assessment with the Government, which, between 27 and 28 September 2017, was with 73% of people considering bad or very bad (DATAFOLHA, 2017).

The factors identified above strongly point to an understanding of Brazilian democracy from the model of radical democracy, because the democratic process itself makes it possible to verify the antagonistic forces in the political sphere, where the articulations are made to take on the most plural dimensions, maintaining a "dynamic stability" of the frontier that distinguishes the floating elements that may articulate on opposite sides.

5. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

From the obtained data, it was possible to identify that vectors such as Education and Income are important in the socioeconomic analysis of the Brazilian reality, which reflects directly in the political scenario and in the institutionalization of the discourses. The first observation is that the educational and monetary gap precludes the realization of a communicational "middle level" in the public sphere. The second observation is that, based on economic criteria, representatives of the people place their private interests above the "good life" of the community, would compromise a concrete understanding of a deliberative democracy in the Brazilian political scenario.

On the other hand, from the delineated situation, it is possible to identify the hegemonic articulations that occur from the existence of antagonistic forces and the "dynamic stability" of the boundaries that separate them, through the existence of a vast field of floating elements and the possibility of articulation on opposite sides. Moreover, the permeability of the political dimension to the other spheres of the "world of life" demonstrates the inability of a rational device to establish a procedure immune to external influences.

In this sense, it leans towards a radical pluralist understanding of politics, but with the awareness of regional limitations and peculiarities to be observed (especially after the 2018 presidential elections), which is why a mere theoretical transplant is avoided. Thus, the proposed objective of presenting an analytical comparison between the two models in light of the Brazilian political scenario was fulfilled.

Finally, in order to answer the research problem, it is inconclusive to state through which model Brazilian democracy can be understood. The present study was limited to analytically presenting the main characteristics of the models studied and their comparison with the Brazilian specificities. Therefore, a thorough understanding of the application of deliberative or radical democracy requires further research, with expansion of results.

REFERÊNCIAS

AMARAL, Luciana. Após 2ª denúncia, Planalto liberou 80% das emendas parlamentares de setembro. **UOL Notícias**, 2017. Available at: <https://noticias.uol.com.br/politica/ultimas-noticias/2017/10/03/apos-2-denuncia-planalto-liberou-80-das-emendas-parlamentares-de-setembro.htm>. Access in July 24, 2019.

DATAFOLHA. Avaliação do Presidente Michel Temer. **Instituto de Pesquisa Datafolha**, Opinião Pública. São Paulo, October 02, 2017. Available at: <http://media.folha.uol.com.br/datafolha/2017/10/03/0fd1b3a0cedd68ba47456fb25bc91299.pdf>. Access in July 25, 2019.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. **Teoría de la acción comunicativa, II**: crítica de la razón funcionalista. Madrid: Taurus, 1987a.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. Wie is Legitimität durch Legalität möglich? 1987b. In: NEVES, Marcelo. **Entre Têmis e Leviatã**: uma relação difícil: o Estado Democrático de Direito a partir e além de Luhmann e Habermas. 3. ed. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2012.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. Três modelos normativos de democracia, **Lua Nova**, São Paulo, n. 36, p. 39-53, 1995. Available at: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-64451995000200003&lng=en&nrm=iso. Access in July 19, 2019.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. **Direito e democracia**: entre facticidade e validade, vol. I. Tradução: Flávio Beno Siebeneichler. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1997.

HOWARTH, David. **Discourse**. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000.

LACLAU, Ernesto; MOUFFE, Chantal. **Hegemony and socialist strategy**: towards a radical democratic Politics, 2. ed. London: Verso, 2001.

LUBENOW, Jorge Adriano. Esfera pública e democracia deliberative em Habermas: modelo teórico e discursos críticos. **Kriterion**, Belo Horizonte, v. 51, n. 121, p. 227-258, jun. 2010. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-512X2010000100012>. Access in 28 July, 2020.

MARIANI, D.; TAKAHASHI, F. Emendas parlamentares anteriores à votação beneficiam governo e oposição. **Folha de São Paulo**, 2017. Available at: <http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/poder/2017/08/1907018-emendas-parlamentares-antecedentes-a-votacao-beneficiam-governo-e-oposicao.shtml>. Access in July 24, 2019.

MELO, Rúrion Soares. **O uso público da razão como procedimento**: pluralismo, discurso e democracia em Habermas. Dissertação (Mestrado em Filosofia). Departamento de Filosofia da Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas da USP, 2004, 170p.

MOUFFE, Chantal. **O regresso do político**. Tradução de Ana Cecília Simões. Lisboa: Gradiva, 1996.

MOUFFE, Chantal. Democracia, cidadania e a questão do pluralismo. In: **Política & Sociedade**, Florianópolis, v. 1, n.3, p. 11-26 out, 2003.

MOUFFE, Chantal. Por um modelo agonístico de democracia. In: **Revista de Sociologia e Política**: dossiê Democracias e Autoritarismos, Curitiba, 25, 165-175, jun 2006.

PETERS, Bernhard. On reconstructive legal and political theory. **Philosophy & Social Criticism**, 20(4), 101-134, 1994.

PNUD. Programa das Nações Unidas para o Desenvolvimento Humano. Atlas Do Desenvolvimento Humano no Brasil, 2013a. **Educação**. [online]. Available at: <http://www.br.undp.org/content/dam/brazil/docs/IDH/Atlas%20dos%20Municipios/undp-br-idhm-educacao-2016.pdf>. Access in July 22, 2019.

PNUD. Programa das Nações Unidas para o Desenvolvimento Humano. Atlas Do Desenvolvimento Humano no Brasil, 2013b. **Longevidade**. [online]. Available at: <http://www.br.undp.org/content/dam/brazil/docs/IDH/Atlas%20dos%20Municipios/undp-br-idhm-longevidade-2016.pdf>. Access in July 22, 2019.

PNUD. Programa das Nações Unidas para o Desenvolvimento Humano. Atlas Do Desenvolvimento Humano no Brasil, 2013c. **Renda**. [online]. Available at: <http://www.br.undp.org/content/dam/brazil/docs/IDH/Atlas%20dos%20Municipios/undp-br-idhm-renda-2016.pdf>. Access in July 22, 2019.

NEVES, Marcelo. **Entre Têmis e Leviatã**: uma relação difícil: o Estado Democrático de Direito a partir e além de Luhmann e Habermas. 3. ed. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2012.

SCHEUERMANN, William E. Entre o radicalismo e a resignação: teoria democrática em Direito e democracia, de Habermas. **Rev. Bras. Ciênc. Polít.**, Brasília, n. 13, p. 155-185, apr. 2014. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-33522014000100007>. Acess in 26 July, 2020. [orig. Between radicalism and resignation: democratic theory in Habermas's Between Facts and Norms. In Peter Dews (ed.). Habermas: A Critical Reader. Blackwell. pp. 153—77].

SCHMITT, Carl. **O conceito de Político / Teoria do Partisan**. Tradução de Geraldo de Carvalho. Belo Horizonte: Del Rey, 2008.

WERLE, Denílson Luis. Razão e democracia: uso público da razão e política deliberativa em Habermas. **Trans/Form/Ação**, Marília, v. 36, n. spe, p. 149-176. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0101-31732013000400010>. Acess on 27 July, 2020.

Recebido em 14/08/2019
Aprovado em 30/08/2021
Received in 08/14/2019
Approved in 08/30/2021