



INTRODUCTION

Marina Costa Lobo
Filipe Carreira da Silva
José Pedro Zúquete

EDITORS

This volume offers an interdisciplinary perspective on citizenship in a time of crisis. Crisis has been a word recurrently used to describe political and social processes in Portugal, Europe and elsewhere, but one that deserves further analysis. Even though it is common for all generations to believe that they are living through critical junctures, at the risk of losing sight of what actually constitutes a crisis situation and how exactly this differs from a period of non-crisis (i. e. decay, recovery, instability, etc.), it does seem safe to apply “crisis” to the 2008 financial situation. With its origins in the USA’s financial system, it quickly spread to other parts of the world, hitting the Eurozone in particular where, especially in smaller peripheral economies, it often led to dramatic economic problems. The duration and severity of the negative economic consequences of the crisis has had a profound impact on the political and social realm. Political consequences include the strengthening of the radical right, as well as populist leaders, the relative decline of centrist parties, in particular the electoral decline of social-democrat/socialist parties, together with an increase in the radical left, especially in Southern Europe. Not only have there been repercussions at the national level, but the EU has been called into question due to difficulties in reaching a consensus on how best to respond to a crisis that has often led to great tensions between governments of debtor nations and creditor nations. Moreover, Brexit means that for the first time a member state will leave the EU, potentially signalling the beginning of the end of the decades-old process of European integration. The crisis, of course, is not only a European phenomenon. As mentioned above, it quickly spread around the world. Despite the apparent protection that relatively insulated banking systems of countries such as Brazil provided in the immediate aftermath of the crisis, Latin American countries eventually proved unable to escape the political and economic ripple effects. Some have seen signs of a political backlash against economic globalisation and its dramatic social implications in this, calling the existing global order into question. The election of Donald J. Trump as President of the United States, in November 2016, only reinforced this association of a global crisis in the financial and economic realms with the questioning of democratic institutions and the meaning and exercise of citizenship itself.

The word “crisis” therefore, conveys a multiplicity of meanings and deserves further attention. As researchers in the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon, we want to bring together a number of different disciplinary and epistemological approaches that have been employed in the study of this issue in the last decade or so.

This volume focuses on the causes, characteristics and consequences of the crisis for citizenship. Following T. H. Marshall, we take citizenship to entail three dimensions: civic, political and social. The civic element includes the rights necessary for individual freedom – freedom of the person, right of expression, thought and faith, right to property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice. The political dimension of citizenship includes the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of an institution with political authority or as a voter of such institutions. Social rights of citizenship include the right to health care, the right to social security, the right to work, and the right to education. So-called fourth-generation rights, associated with recent developments in areas such as biotechnology or the Internet, although absent from Marshall's original analysis, are also considered here.

Portugal is an especially relevant case when analysing the causes and multiple consequences of the crisis. The 2008 international financial crisis, which led to the country's bailout in 2011, had a strong sense of *déjà vu* for those who remember the two previous bailouts that had to be negotiated in 1978 and 1983. In fact, Portugal's democratic experience since 1974 has been punctuated by recurrent economic crisis. Its frequency does not detract from the dire situation which has marked Portugal in recent years. In 2011, the country was unable to finance itself, having lost access to international capital markets. This forced the Portuguese authorities to request a bailout loan of 78 billion Euros. In mid-2011, the Portuguese government and the Troika of lenders signed a Memorandum of Understanding detailing the conditions under which this loan was to be granted. The bailout's conditionality, following the so-called "Washington consensus" on privatisation, deregulation and trade liberalization, focused on reducing public deficit, reducing the segmentation of labour markets and reforming welfare provision. This resulted in a long period of economic recession, record-high unemployment rates and significant levels of immigration. Portugal found itself among the most gravely hit countries in the Eurozone, close to Greece, Ireland, Spain, Cyprus and Italy. At the same time, starting in the summer of 2013, a wave of hundreds of thousands of Syrian and North African refugees began reaching European shores, putting immense pressure on European governments to integrate them. European public opinion, already anxious about the first wave of terror attacks on European soil since the 1970s, received the news of this sudden inflow of refugees with mixed feelings. Partly given to its geographical location on the Atlantic shore, partly to the lack of economic opportunities, Portugal has

received only a residual number of these immigrants. This may partly help explain why, unlike in other Southern and Eastern European countries, there has been no rise of populist movements or leaders in Portugal. If anything, the crisis seems to have reinforced, rather than questioned, the commitment of the Portuguese to the citizenship rights won on 25th April, 1974.

The main goal of this volume is to discuss the ways in which citizenship, its exercise and our understanding of what it means to be a citizen, has evolved in the context of these events. The assumption is that the crisis, in its various dimensions, has created significant challenges to the way in which citizenship has been exercised. A second goal is, whenever relevant and possible, to take a longer-term and comparative approach. This includes *prima facie* the European context, which has gained additional relevance given the role of the Euro and the EU in the origins and management of the crisis, as well as the Latin American context, whose Iberian roots afford important points of transatlantic comparison. A third and related goal is to question whether 21st century economic globalisation and its financial dimension can be effectively regulated by elected forms of government, and whether the EU and other multilateral and regional organisations are supplying useful citizenship and governance to the national dimension. Due consideration will also be given to a potential trend towards a political reversal of globalisation, a closing of borders, and its implications for the concept of citizenship.

The disciplinary backgrounds of the three editors of this volume are, respectively, in political sciences, sociology, history and international relations. Together, we represent two research groups in the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon (ICS-UL), namely the SPARC and the Research Group on Regimes and Institutions. Our aim has been to bring together contributions where the concept of crisis figures as either a dependent or an independent variable; sociological and political science studies delving into the consequences of crisis for citizenship; studies in international relations and history that provide a more long-term perspective; as well as cross-country comparisons adding depth to the research on the way in which citizenship has been challenged in times of crisis. The thirteen chapters making up this volume, and which we summarise below, fall into three sections: (1) Questioning the crisis; (2) Actors in crisis; (3) Consequences of the crisis.

QUESTIONING THE CRISIS

The first chapter in this section is “The crisis of political representation: the Portuguese case (2002-2015)” by Manuel Villaverde Cabral and Susana Salgado. Making use of a longitudinal analysis of post electoral surveys, as well as other quantitative data, the text sets out to discuss how Portuguese citizens evaluate political parties and politicians. This, in turn, enables the authors to address the broader question of whether the idea of a “crisis of political representation” is indeed the most appropriate in accounting for this situation. Confirming Bernard Manin’s hypothesis that the deepening of such a crisis of political representation may occur simultaneously with a scenario of consolidated democracy and high levels of formal education, the authors conclude that this has indeed been the case in Portugal, namely if one takes into account the combination of low levels of turnout in elections and citizens’ responses to the post electoral surveys.

The second chapter is “Revisiting the politicisation of the EU. A three-dimensional approach” by Marina Costa Lobo and Jan Karremans. This text proposes to increase our understanding of the ways in which Europe has emerged in national political debates (both at the media and parliamentary level), and with what consequences for national democracy, in terms of citizen attitudes and political behaviour. One of the major consequences of the financial crisis has been to bring the nature and consequences of European integration to the heart of national politics. Are we witnessing a period of increasing lack of choice among EU member-states democracy or, in contrast, are we on the path to the formation of a European democracy and European public space? The authors’ overview of the literature frames the terms of an important debate on the state of democracy in Europe.

The third chapter is by Pedro C. Magalhães and Tiago Abril, and is entitled “Favourable outcomes, procedural fairness, and political support: results from a survey experiment” It begins with the observation that it is often the case that, in their relationship with authorities, people care not only about getting their preferred outcomes but also about the way those outcomes are generated, particularly about the extent to which decision-making procedures are fair. The text focuses on the case of political authorities, which is particularly relevant to the exercise of citizens’ rights in hard times. Making use of a survey experiment, the authors reach three different conclusions. First, from a procedural point of view, fair rules have a significant larger total

effect on political support for authorities, an effect that is largely mediated by perceptions of fairness but can also, in some cases, be a direct effect. Second, they show that this finding holds regardless of the dimension of procedural fairness – Voice, Neutrality/Impartiality and Accessibility/Transparency. This suggests that, overall, fairness matters more than outcome favourability. Third, they show that in high transparency events/situations, receiving a favourable outcome is of little importance, but in low transparency events/situations, receiving a favourable outcome or not counts more.

The last chapter in this section is “Economic crisis and political decision: words and meaning” by Virgínia Henriques Calado and Luís Cunha. Their argument is built on the assumption that the “crisis”, either as a phenomenon or concept, does not exist independently of the social agents’ meaning-making practices. A crisis is, therefore, a fundamentally discursive formation. Narratives, as practices of production of discourse, are thus hypothesised to have a significant impact on how crisis, their origins and consequences, are perceived by the public and managed politically. The text’s main contribution is its original analysis of the speeches by Portuguese prime ministers in State of the Nation debates over ten years (2008-17). It shows how the notions of *crisis* and *reform* but also of *adjustment*, *ideology* and *reality* were mobilised to produce decisive effects, and that the ideological tenor of political speeches increases when one is in the opposition and diminishes when one is in office.

ACTORS IN CRISIS

The second section starts with a chapter on “Children, citizenship and crises: towards a participatory agenda” by Ana Nunes de Almeida, Ana Sofia Ribeiro and Jussara Rowland. The text discusses the relation between children, citizenship and crises. Drawing upon the findings of two research projects, it advocates the importance of including children’s perspectives in crisis narratives (the right to be heard), as well as a participatory agenda recognising children’s agency and competencies to be active participants in policy processes that concern not only their present, but also their future.

The sixth chapter in the volume is “Youth and generations in times of crisis: Portugal in the global situation” by Vítor Sérgio Ferreira. The author posits that the flexibility established in the labour conditions and its potential extension throughout the life course focuses on *inequalities* in the discussion

on generations, detaching it from the mere cultural values and ethics of life *differences*. It is hypothesised that “precariousness”, although experienced in very distinct ways due to young people’s unequal social support, can be part of the core of a new generational conscience as a structural condition considered during a lifetime. It can have deep and extended effects going beyond the sphere of the working life, reifying a context that is favourable to the ontological insecurity of the younger citizens.

Moving from a sociological perspective to a political one, the next two chapters in this section deal with social partners and parties. The seventh chapter is “The crisis impact on the political discourse of Portuguese social partners” by Raquel Rego, Miguel Won, Bruno Martins, Amália Mendes, Iria del Río, Pierre Lejeune. Like Calado and Henriques’ chapter above, this contribution also focuses on discourse. It offers an analysis of the evolution of the political discourse by trade unions and employer associations between 2011 and 2014, the period in which the country was under the financial tutelage of the Troika. It is hypothesised that the social partners would assume asymmetric positions given their opposing ideological perceptions regarding the neo-liberal policies imposed by the Memorandum of Understanding. Their findings give credence to this hypothesis. In fact, this original analysis of social partners’ discourses shows that the belligerent tone of the discourse is not only a feature of trade union discourse, but also of employer discourse. Both organisations have clear enemies, abstract, and polarised: the “capital” for CGTP, and the “state” for CIP.

The eighth chapter is “Party-citizen online challenges: Portuguese parties’ Facebook usage and audience engagement” by Sofia Serra-Silva, Diana Dias Carvalho and Júlio Fazendeiro. It addresses the contemporary challenges to citizenship by looking at the current relationship between parties and citizens in the digital context, a space where political action and active citizenship is increasingly undertaken. Focussing on how political parties use ICT and social media, namely Facebook, the authors conclude that since 2010 all major political parties have increased their investment in Facebook content. In recent years, most parties have been moving towards a strategy to increasingly include more multimedia content so as to diminish their dependence upon Facebook. The main finding refers to PAN – *Pessoas-Animais-Natureza* (People-Animals-Nature). Despite being a small and recent party, when taking into consideration the relative number of “likers”/friends, it showed the second highest level of user engagement. This result highlights how the

use of new technologies can favour new parties and help them overcome their limitations. PAN's successful Facebook communication might be explained because it emerged in a more recent technological context when compared to parties, such as the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP), the Socialist Party (PS) and the Social Democrat Party (PSD), which developed at a time when the printed mass media was the dominant communication channel between leaders and citizens.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE CRISIS

The final section, on the "Consequences of the crisis", begins with a socio-psychological approach to citizen attitudes with the chapter "Racisms and normative pressures: a new outbreak of biological racism?" by Jorge Vala and Cícero Roberto Pereira. The authors present different strands of research – both old and new – which they have undertaken on racism in contemporary European societies, namely on its impact on social relations in different societies. The research is framed by the concept of social representation and social norms and uses the metaphor of racism as an "evolving virus" to understand the mutations of racism in contemporary societies. The authors propose that racism has undergone adaptive transformations, making it possible to maintain the fundamental aspects of traditional racial beliefs, without jeopardising democratic institutions and a non-racist, non-prejudiced self-representation. It is the mutation that racism has undergone, the subtle shift from the biological to the cultural sphere, which allows its overt widespread and socially effective persistence. Their results illustrate how expressions of racism vary across countries depending on the dynamic of social relations framing the motivations underlying social identities, and the content of social representations about human groups.

The tenth chapter is "Why no populism in Portugal?" by Filipe Carreira da Silva and Susana Salgado. This text offers a blueprint of a possible answer to the question why there is no populism in Portugal. Populism has been a common consequence of the economic crisis, both in Europe and elsewhere. Yet despite the deep economic recession Portugal suffered between 2011 and 2013, the fact remains that there was no "populist revolt" in the country, either in the form of a social movement like the *Indignados* movement (and the subsequent *Podemos* party) in neighbouring Spain, or in the form of a

changed discourse by an established political force. This text proposes a novel research design in order to answer this question: methodologically, the negative case presented by Portugal is to be studied in contrast with a positive case, Spain. Theoretically, populism is understood to function according to the logic not of enmity, but resentment. The logic of resentment includes both socio-political indignation, which refers to democratic norms and has the potential to reinforce democracy, and radical envy, which can slide into racism and political violence. The seeming absence of populism in the country would be explained, from this perspective, by the performative failure of political agents in using either of these sub-logics of resentment to promote a populist response to the crisis.

The eleventh chapter is “In welfare we trust? Political trust in Portugal and Spain, 2008-2014” by Edalina Rodrigues Sanches, José Santana Pereira and Isabella Razzuoli. The authors seek to identify the sources of political (dis)trust in two countries that were profoundly affected by the Eurozone crisis: Portugal and Spain. They assess the relationship between welfare perceptions and political trust in the two Iberian countries, hypothesising different impacts of those perceptions on the two countries according to the timing of the sovereign debt crisis. Their findings show that perceptions of welfare performance are a strong predictor of political trust, and that its impact is stronger on Spain than Portugal. However, the impact of welfare performance perceptions was weaker in 2012, at the peak of the crisis, than in 2008 or 2014. Cognitive mobilisation also led to these perceptions having a stronger impact, but only on Spain and in 2014.

The twelfth chapter in this section is Roberto Falanga’s “Critical trends of citizen participation in policymaking. Insights from Portugal”. The text discusses three critical trends pinpointed by the international literature with regards to the institutional design of participatory processes, namely participatory budgets: the detachment of local participatory practices from global issues; the shift towards technocratic approaches in detriment to political-oriented practices; and the scarcity of evaluation in contrast to the mushrooming of pilots. Findings show that with the first trend, although the implementation of the national participatory budget challenges international preference for local scale, the weak institutional articulation with the massive presence of local processes may impair state reform goals. As to the second trend, models of deliberation focused on the capacity of the individuals to network and campaign without either intermediation or inclusion of

organised groups may have favoured the emergence of self-organised lobbies. Regarding the third trend, the absence of evaluation from both local and national institutional designs further limits this reflection, given the lack of data about who is actually participating in these processes.

We end the volume with an international perspective on the consequences of the crisis. Gonzalo Delamaza's "Political consequences of socio-territorial conflicts. Conceptualizing changing paths of citizenship and democratic governance in the Andean Region of Latin America" takes this critical evaluation of the civil implications of the economic crisis beyond Portugal and Europe to Latin America, expanding the frontiers of what we mean by citizenship and which groups are involved. This text studies socio-territorial conflicts, i.e. conflicts that involve contentious actions taking place and that are carried out by social agents from a given geographical territory, and whose claims involve issues that impinge directly on that territory. It is further suggested that this type of conflict is on the rise in countries in the Andean Region of Latin America, and that they have generated a different type of political outcome. This has enabled citizen groups formerly excluded from political expression to become increasingly visible. There is evidence, the author concludes, that there are several areas in which the conflict dynamics open up spaces to new actors, new territories and new forms of social and political action.

Taken together, these chapters provide a snapshot of the ongoing research on citizenship in crisis at the ICS-UL in the last decade. We hope that this volume will contribute to the advancement of scientific knowledge on the contemporary challenges to citizenship. It is an issue of great public interest, insofar as it deals with the open-ended debate about the quality and nature of democracy in the 21st century.

MARINA COSTA LOBO

Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa

Av. Prof. Aníbal Bettencourt 9 — 1600-036 Lisboa, Portugal

marina.costalobo@ics.ulisboa.pt

orcid.org/0000-0002-7329-0972

FILIPPE CARREIRA DA SILVA

Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa

fcs23@ics.ulisboa.pt

orcid.org/0000-0003-2459-0802

JOSÉ PEDRO ZÚQUETE

Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa

jose.zuquete@ics.ulisboa.pt

orcid.org/0000-0001-6209-6931

CITE THIS CHAPTER AS:

LOBO, M. C., F. C. da Silva, J. P. Zúquete. 2018. "Introduction". In *Changing Societies: Legacies and Challenges*. Vol. II. *Citizenship in Crisis*, eds. M. C. Lobo, F. C. da Silva and J. P. Zúquete. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 13-23.

<https://doi.org/10.31447/ICS9789726715047.00>