

- Schmitt, H. and van der Eijk, C. (2003): Die politische Bedeutung niedriger Beteiligungsraten bei Europawahlen. Eine empirische Studie über die Motive der Nichtwahl. In: Brettschneider, F., van Deth, J. and Roller, E. (eds.): *Europäische Integration in der öffentlichen Meinung*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, pp. 279–302.
- Schneider, H. (1995): Politische Partizipation – zwischen Krise und Wandel. In Hoffmann-Lange, U. (ed): *Jugend und Demokratie in Deutschland*. pp. 275–335. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Sebold, M. and Straßner, A. (2004): *Verbände in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Spanning, R., Ogris, G. and Gaiser, W. (eds.) (2008), *Youth and Political Participation in Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills, MI.: Barbara Budrich Publishers.
- Uehlinger, H.-M. (1988): *Politische Partizipation in der Bundesrepublik*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L. and Henry, E.B (eds.) (1995): *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Weßels, B. (2001): Vermittlungsinstitution und Interessenvertretung: Zur Performanz von Mitgliederorganisationen in Deutschland. In: Koch, A., Wasmer, M. and Schmidt, P. (eds.): *Politische Partizipation in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, pp. 221–246.
- Weßels, B. (2004): Politische Integration und politisches Engagement. In Statistisches Bundesamt (ed.): *Datenreport 2004: Zahlen und Fakten über die Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. pp. 639–648. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
- Westle, B. (1994): Politische Partizipation. In: Gabriel, O.W./and Brettschneider, F. (eds.): *Die EU-Staaten im Vergleich. Strukturen, Prozesse, Politikinhalt*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 137–173.
- Westle, B. (1994): Politische Partizipation. In: Gabriel, O.W. and Brettschneider, F. (eds.): *Die EU-Staaten im Vergleich: Strukturen, Prozesse, Politikinhalt*. pp. 137–173. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

4.2 Young People, Citizenship and Leisure

José Machado Pais

1. Introduction

We get to know the world through words. They give meaning. When the inhabitants of Macondo, one day during their “hundred years of solitude”, were suddenly gripped by a kind of amnesia, they were terrified of the possibility of losing their knowledge of the world (Márquez, 1995). Faced with the threat of forgetting what was meant by a tree, a house, a cow, they decided to make labels and hang them on the things whose meaning they were afraid of forgetting: “this is a tree”, “this is a house”, “this is a cow”... So words end up telling us what the world is when we believe that the world is the reality that the words designate. But sometimes we confuse the names with the reality they designate.¹ This happens with many concepts that turn into “nominal realities”, as St. Thomas of Aquinas would say. And this is what happens with the concept of *citizenship* and many other nominal definitions which are attached to it, such as those of “inclusion” and “exclusion” (Martins, 2004a). We could make a label with the word “citizenship” but we would not know what to hang it on.

With the French Revolution, the idea of *citizenship* was associated with the ultimate expression of revolutionary universalism. The struggle for emancipation was carried on in the name of universal rights, guided by an ideology of *assimilation*, and never out of respect for a plurality of cultures, an idea which never so much as crossed a right-thinking *Jacobin* mind (Ferry, 1990; Craith, 2004). But when we try to make the “citizenship” label stick to something contemporary, a number of tricky questions raise their heads. For example, how can universal rights live side by side with the rights of segments of the population, such as young people, who embrace lifestyles which call for pluralization, difference, identity and individuality? It is no coincidence that the concept of citizenship has multiplied into varied and contradictory meanings (Beiner, 1995; Bulmer & Rees, 1996). The worst thing we can do, in these situations, is to capitulate before the instability of the label or to remain hostage to its original meanings. Samuel Taylor Coleridge described *ideas* as forward looking thoughts – as opposed to *epigrams* which

¹ Paper is based on a presentation at the opening session of the International Symposium on Youth, in Rio de Janeiro, UFRJ, October 2004.

encapsulate the thought of the past. Undoubtedly, the course to take is to regard the concept of *citizenship* as a forward looking idea, taking contemporary reality into consideration. And what this reality tells us is that the idea of citizenship remains connected to the defence of universal rights, and one of the most important of these rights is, without doubt, the much touted right to *difference*. This is the difference that young people look for, above all, as consumers and producers of culture (Rosaldo, 1994). So perhaps the young can help us to a better understanding of the various faces of citizenship.

2. Cara or Coroa?

It surprises me how Brazilian people address each other in casual speech; as "faces" (*caras*). By referring to someone as a *cara* they are implicitly recognizing an individuality, with his or her inherent subjectivity, his or her own face. And it is no coincidence that, etymologically, *cara* is a present in *character*. At the same time, young people have hit on another term whose symbolic resonance is worth exploring: *careta*, or "scowl", used derogatively to designate an old-fashioned and prejudiced person, an interpreter of outdated, outmoded values. The status of legitimacy hangs about real *caras* (*cara legal* – *legal* being Brazilian slang for *cool*). The other side of the coin, *coroa* [*cara ou coroa*? = heads or tails?], is used to refer to an elderly person with antiquated ideas. This consensual world includes the *caretas*, although it is not clear that the entire consensus is embodied in this designation (Vianna, 1997, p. 4).

Ranged against the *careta* approach to life (dominated by the *coroas*) we find young people claiming the right to new life experiences, and here we run into a new crop of related words – they seek to be *descarado* (cheeky or daring), *dando a cara* (showing their face), *escancaradamente* (for all to see). The *coroa* world of politics is of no interest to them. In a document recently published by the Council of Europe on political participation by young Europeans (Lautizen, Forbrig and Hoskins, 2004), the picture we find is one of disenchantment with institutions and traditional forms of political participation. Trust in political institutions is on the wane, and this is reflected in significant levels of abstention in elections (Galland & Roudet, 2001). The *careta* establishment wants to make them fit into a system dominated by *caretas*, also known (no coincidence) as "squares". For their part, the young people suggest that they are seen by the establishment as marginalized "misfits" or "dropouts", terms which point to exclusion, in which many young people transform an opportunity to reaffirm their identities, exacerbating the divide.

Speaking of citizenship means speaking of *faces*, identities. *Individual* identities (of a person, a voice, a position, subjectivity) and *group* identities

("us", people like ourselves, in relation to "others" who differ from us). But citizenship has traditionally referred to a "universalized" person, to an impersonal "face". Can citizenship exist without recognition of the identity of a "face"? To what extent can the universalist attributes normally associated with the notion of citizenship accommodate claims for subjectivities and group identities? Does the citizenship ideal start and finish with the defence of equality, or can it also recognize difference (Benhabib, 1996)? Does the form of citizenship that defends the autonomy of the "face" imply recognition of the affirmation of identity, of an independent will, of decision-making ability (Franck, 1999)? Why do young people invest so much in their image? Because identities are a construction achieved in a look, language, and in forms of communication and consumption, using a variety of scenic strategies (Canclini, 1995). Young people's bodies are a stage set for more and more investment: in tattoos, drugs, piercing, weight loss, muscles, tanning, hair removal... Their faces are made up, perfumed, adorned with original glasses and exotic and colourful hairstyles (Pais & Cabral, 2004). Between the two World Wars, fashion was governed by a rational functionalism in which the key values were uniformity, predictability and conformity. Young people today regard these fashions as *careta* fashion. What counts is cultivating self-image, invested with a strong sense of expressiveness and sensibility (Negrin, 1999). What we see today is a "stylistic eclecticism" (Connor, 1991) which renders fashion itself ephemeral and opens the way for the performativization of identities constructed as the marks of a supposed individuality. We are faced not only with a question of fashions (incorporated), but also with the need to assert identities (which are the object of intervention). Identities which are socially ritualized, and in this sense tattoos, piercing and other bodily interventions are individual marks, without ceasing to pertain also to groups. They individualize not only the marked bodies but also demarcate them, giving rise to a variety of group affiliations (Haenfler, 2004), different ways of making the body speak, of multiplying its ability to talk. They lay claim to forms of civic participation and dissent, based on the relevance of the body and of control over the body.

In a scenario where claim is loudly laid to the right to free use of the body, citizenship must increasingly be examined in the fields of self and sexuality, reflecting the individualization of culture. As Giddens argues (1997, p. 56), "life political issues supply the central agenda for the return of the institutionally repressed". The more attractive rights are those which interfere in individual well-being, such as consumer rights and those centred on questions relating to gender, sexuality, lifestyle and quality of life. The possibility of reproduction being separated from sexuality has also opened the way to diverse ways of experiencing affect and varying life options. The dilemmas of everyday life are being increasingly privatized. Dilemmas, which involve the affirmation of individual identities in the field of sexuality, bodily expression, feelings and personal realization. Summing up, social rights mo-

bilize to the extent to which they express individual rights. Many contemporary social movements are manifestations of rebellion against institutional forms of repressing individuality (Muggleton, 2000). Personal realization and social transformation are not mutually exclusive goals (Calhoun, 1994).

In short, we should consider not only the attributes (epigrams) which characterized the traditional and abstract way of looking at citizenship (rights and responsibilities, duties, prerogatives, etc.) strongly anchored in an "adultocentric referential" (Castro, 2001, p. 13). When considered in relation to young people, citizenship should not be tied only to the discourse of "integration", ignoring the dimension of "recognition of diversity" (Moya, 2003, p. 10). In other words, it is also necessary to explore youth movements expressed through culture, without forgetting the *feelings of belonging* and the subjectivities invested in relations of sociability and leisure. A cultural understanding of this "citizenship of intimacy" (Plummer, 2003), which takes in the universe of feelings and imagination, will help us to a better understanding of the emotional investments of young people when (individual and group) identities are not determined by rational interests are at stake (Frosh, 2001).

"Showing your face" has obvious advantages – asserting your own will – but it means a confrontation with different ideas will be inevitable. From being looked at askance so many times, young people end up reflecting back the rejection meted out to them. Hence the opposition between *cara* (*legal*) and *coroa*, *careta* or *quadrado* (square). Citizenship has traditionally been conceived within a *square frame*. It has defined itself, in each age, by the limits it imposes on itself. Hence the concepts were derived from *inclusion* (within the frame) and *exclusion* (outside the frame). But should the exercise of citizenship be confined to strategies of enclosure – those which are wall for a framework whose virtues are beyond dispute? The hypothesis which is debated is that the exercise of citizenship can also express itself in the inventive power of the margins which rebel against the strategies of enclosure and which shine most brightly in the process of opening.

The logic of *closure* and that of *opening* confront each other in many areas of life, such in linguistic communication itself (Deleuze & Guattari 1994, p. 103–104). Language is a variable and heterogeneous reality, but it is normally subject to the policy of closure. So it is homogenized, centralized and standardized. The grammaticality of a language is a marker of power before it is a syntactic marker. The unity of a language is fundamentally political. But in everyday life, language takes part in the "process of opening" – particularly amongst those on the margins of power. In young people's speech, a language connoted with their own values can often be observed. They renew the lexis, they create a flow of voices which are constantly renewed, and they invent new words, deform them or give existing words new meanings. We may here invoke the Saussurean dichotomy between language and speech. Language refers to a system of conventions and norms which determine how

we should speak. Speech, on the other hand, has to do with the practice of linguistic usage – which leads many speakers to make distinctive use of the language. The obscene language of young people is a different question: this is part of a polyphonic movement which contests or ignores the logic of discourses codified by the instituted grammars.

Slang always turns into a language of resistance when let loose on the fringes of society (Burke & Porter, 1996). Youth slang provides proof of this when it contrasts *cara legal* to *coroa* or *careta*. Irony is often used to create a distance by the people who feel themselves to be watched from a distance. A *cara legal* may even be a mugger, but he is still a *cara legal* (cool guy). He may speak *legal*, despite a poor command of Portuguese. He may have illegal work which is regarded as *legal* (cool) or have work which is not *legal* (i.e. alienating), although carried out within a wholly legal framework. The speech of the fringes makes frequent use of anti-phrasal, that is expressions laden with irony which express the opposite of their conventional meaning. *Cara legal* may express legality in marginality, faithful to the codes of marginality, and outside the legality of other social worlds.

Deleuze & Guattari (1994, p. 103–104) speak of "high" and "low" languages. The former are based on the power of constants, the latter on the potency of variation. It is these possibilities of variation which permit "games of opening". What is called linguistic or cultural poverty is a restriction on constants. But there is no guarantee that the best way of exercising citizenship is that of a blind commitment to all or any types of "constants", just as there is no guarantee that the all or any type of "variation" actually corresponds to a form of social emancipation.

Traditionally, the concept of citizenship establishes boundaries and margins between societies and groups. Some fall within the framework (the "included"), whilst others lie outside (the excluded, the marginal). But the margins are defined from the centre, in other words, on the basis of values which belong to "us" (the included), as opposed to "them" (the excluded). Of course, there is a citizenship of *established rights* which are legitimately regarded as stable, consensual and constant. The right to vote (conquered in the past) is a good example of an established right. But there is also a citizenship of newly *conquered rights*, the urgency of which is justified by the changing circumstances or needs of life. In this case we can speak of an innovatively participative citizenship.

3. Participative Citizenship

A model of *participative citizenship* is provided by a computer game which has caught the imagination of many young people, when they find that they have the power to participate in creating their own city. *SimCity* was one of

the first games to explore the fascination of bottom-up power (Johnson, 2001). Bottom-up systems contrast with deterministic top-down models, typical of authoritarian set-ups. Bottom-up learning and bottom-up action are both to be found in everyday life, using "local information" which can lead to "global knowledge". In this game, the bottom-up world is to be found in the possibilities for emerging behaviours to organise themselves. Unlike in cities planned on a top-down basis, the vitality of cities comes from those who move informally about the public space of the city: the street. The magic of the city comes from the bottom and not from the skyscrapers where social life appears to be caged in.

Recurrently, young people lay claim to the street as the setting for a participative culture. We could look at the example of young skaters, for whom the street is a setting for a compromise with the city. For a sensory experience of the city through the sound of rollers, the sight of the movements, through the smells, and the bodily vibrations as the skate swoops along. Young skateboarders produce "free spaces" within the square frames formed by the "architectural power" of cities (Menser, 1996). What do young skaters do with the urban space of the city? They reinvent it, putting it to new uses, and thereby create a new space, distinct from the original. The skater's body conducts a dialogue with the architecture of the space through which it slides, as if this "body to body" could yield a new urban discursivity. The skater refuses to accept space as a pre-existing given. He gives it a life of its own when he challenges it to adapt to uses other than those formally envisaged or pre-established.

The performances of young skaters challenge the spatial hierarchies established by the conventional architecture of cities; they generate a kind of "trans-local" community (Willand, 1998) contesting spatial boundaries. They call for renewed enjoyment of "total space", freed from the constraints resulting from top-down urban planning, and they redefine the urban fabric, furnishing it with new meanings, taking a multi-functional approach to space. The architecture of cities segregates them into mutually exclusive spatialities, such as gated communities. Skaters lay claim to a democratized occupation of the public areas of cities.

The concepts of *spatiality* and *territoriality* are associated with power relations and capacities of inclusion and exclusion. Cities are spatialized nodal agglomerations, constructed around an instrumental capacity to dispose of social power. They form centres of control, and are designed to protect and dominate, bringing into play a subtle geography of boundaries and borders (Soja, 1989, p. 13). What we can observe in them is the subjection of public spaces – which is where citizenship should be promoted – to the technical and financial flows of the economy. In the regulation space of cities, young skaters discover the opportunity to produce other flows: those of performative expressiveness. Regulation space is a pre-established space, structured in streets, roundabouts and traffic lights which provide a framework for spatial appropriation. But regulation space can also be subverted. Streets are trans-

formed by skaters into spaces that assert themselves through uses which owe nothing to the authorities, movements which expand driven by a desire for expansion. Just watch them doing 180° spins (spinning the body round half way, and landing back on the skate), flips (flipping the skate over under their feet) or "ollies" (jumping with the skate on their feet). They often use the expression *drawing lines*, as if they wanted to show that the city is sheet of paper on which they can inscribe their creativity. In their own way, they write the city, albeit on a micro-spatial scale, leaving records, lines, signs of their presence, just like the young graffiti artists.

The *striated space* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 487) of cities is recovered by young skaters as a smooth space. They show us that space is much more than the projection of an intellectual representation. It is made of movements, gestures and complicity. We might say the same of citizenship. Citizenship only comes globally into its own when it is exercised locally. *Streetskate* suggests to us that the cities may be activated from their micro-spaces, as much as through vast urban projects and plans. Skaters show us that the urban is not only a product, but it is above all a way of life. There is a reason for their preference for occupying spaces with a strong symbolic resonance, such as tourist sights and historic squares. It is here that social relations may most clearly be inverted to create *heterotopic spaces* (Foucault, 1993, p. 422–423).

In the movements of skaters – and in those of breakdancers – we can make out a whole operative geometry of flow and movements, guided by rules in which variation is supreme, in contrast to the rigidities of Euclidian geometry. It is no coincidence that young surfers lay claim to this geometry of the fluid when they refer to surfing as *fazer fluido* ("making fluid") (Rector, 1994). Certain rappers and ravers (especially in jungle and gangstadelic music) also favour a style of dance which suggests a struggle consisting of a flow of movements against a threatening enemy. They dance like boxers or students of martial arts. With gestures that seem designed to repel a fearful – and invisible – opponent.

For the hieratical powers of order and stability, any metamorphosis is problematic and any small interval of variation is diabolical. It is this mobility, characteristic of "smooth space" some young people seek. This is the space of transit and itinerants, interstitial space, places of movement and also of *citizenship*, open to a host of uses, a multiplicity of appropriations. There is an analogy between the dichotomy proposed by Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 487) between "smooth space" and "striated space" and that proposed by Merleau-Ponty (1984) between "geometric" and "anthropological space". *Striated space* refers to a geometric, homogenous and standardized concept of space, whilst *smooth space* suggests an anthropological and fractal concept of space, accommodating of life experiences.

On the one hand we have the *polis* which harks back to political order, to the centralized administration of the city, and on the other hand we have the *urbs*, which is the city's pulse, sculpting its own form, marked by resistance

to the control exercised by the *polis* (Delgado, 1999). The *polis* comes after the *city*, emerging in the late eighteenth century, when the *topos urbano* was taken in hand by squadrons of engineers, architects and public health officers. From then on, the city undergoes *striation* as soon as it is subjected to principles of rationalization which had been conceived for institutions of confinement, such as prisons, boarding schools, army barracks, factories and hospitals. City planners sought to exorcise disorder, to purify conduct, to scrutinise populations and to marginalize poverty. To use Foucault's famous expression (*Discipline and Punish*, 1975), a "state of plague" was proclaimed. The city became an enclosed space, a model city, where watch could be kept over citizens' movements, as happens today with the video cameras that spy on us in shopping centres, public and residential buildings. It is against the model city that people lay claim to a city of citizens, a humanized and shared city, which refuses to submit to deterministic planning and to the social problems (poverty, crime or violence) which sustain such planning. To a certain degree, citizenship is a form of rejection of the planned city in favour of the city that shapes itself. A city which is home to cultural expression in forms which are not necessarily institutionalized, which further new expressions of identity and of inclusion of those who live there (Zukin, 1995). Provided, of course, that they don't undermine the basic principles of social co-existence.

The *urbs/polis* dichotomy is analogous to that proposed by Spinoza between *potency* and *power*. The *urbs* is a *Spinozian potency*, a creative energy. Movement in the *urbs* shows the extent to which the power of the *polis* can be contested. These can be mass movements such as those that occur in large social manifestations, or else micro-movements which, in their own way, proclaim other ways of life. When the *polis* becomes aware of the *urbs*, the conditions exist under which *participative citizenship* can be genuinely exercised. It is the *polis* that the Greek tradition associated with public space – a space belonging to all, the setting for *logos* in the service of the freedom of speech and thought, a space which refers back to the *agora*, where the right to equality in the diversity of ways of speaking, thinking, feeling and doing was defended.

As the city corresponds to a striated space, it is shaken by a whole series of social movements that breach some of the confining barriers typical of striated space. The sedentary norm is challenged by urban tribes with their nomadic philosophies (Melucci, 1989; Marín & Muñoz, 2002; Almeida & Tracy, 2003; Pais & Blass, 2004). Sedentary space is striated, closed, whilst nomadic space is smooth and open (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 385). Nomads circulate within smooth space, occupying, inhabiting and possessing it – this is their territorial principle. Variability of direction is one of the essential features of the smooth spaces, open to rhizomes that modify its cartography. Nomadic space is localized, not limited. It is the striated space that Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 386) call "relative global" that is limited: this is space *limited* in its parts, with corresponding constant directions, separated

by boundaries; it is also a limiting space which restricts and excludes. Citizenship is not the exclusive property of the "relative global". It also has a full existence in the *local absolute* – an absolute that manifests itself in the local. For Deleuze and Guattari, the absolute merges with the unlimited place: this is not globalization or universalization centred on abstract principles or the rights of the State. Instead, it is an infinite succession of local operations which yields a participative citizenship.

4. Fluidity, Empathy, Trajectivities

I have not forgotten the mirth I provoked when in a *gafieira* in Rio de Janeiro I first ventured on to the floor in a dance which is claimed to be universal: The *for all*, or *fórró*. As someone with two left feet, I stuck to the simple steps I had been taught: Two to the left, two to the right. But for all my good intentions, I still got teased for being a "quadrado" (square) on the dance floor. Only much later did I learn that the *fórró* combines fixed movements (two to the left, two to the right) with varying movements not limited to the simple *arrasta-pé* (shuffle). This is when they shouted: "loosen up your hips!" I then realized that the *fórró* is not just danced with the feet, but with the body, or rather, in the harmony of the dancing bodies, in their melodic and rhythmic lines which typify the different genres: *bate-cocha*, *rala-bucho*, *pela-ovo*... In general, young people in a way which explores much more the fluidity of their bodies. For example, funk is a continuous development of the form, it is the fusion of the harmony with the melody in order to gain release from the rhythmic values and the constraints of square-dom. The idea of fluidity makes us think of two possible faces of citizenship, an idea originally presented by Urry (2000) who weighs up the relative virtues of two types of citizenship: the citizenship of stasis and the citizenship of flows. In the same way as we may contrast a monotonous *fórró* (shuffle) with a dynamic and engaging *fórró* (emotive, mischievous), we can also distinguish between an *abstract and static* citizenship and one which is *fluid and empathetic*.

The idea of fluidity is dear to many youth cultures. This is true of young skaters, as we have seen. Their performances bear out Manuel Castells (1996) when he states that the "space of flows" replaces the "space of places", an idea not so distant from that propounded by Guattari (1986) when he suggests the cities of the modern world have witnessed the proliferation of multidimensional rhizomatic networks involving technical, scientific and artistic processes whose main consequence appears to be the production of subjectivities. This production of subjectivities takes place in many other youth cultures which explore new forms of sensibility, from the margins (Gelder & Thornton, 1997). Let us look at the example of rave culture. The word *rave* itself is an intransitive verb, with its literal meaning of speaking

like a madman, losing control, babbling incoherently and furiously... It is no coincidence that this is an intransitive verb, in other words a verb that expresses an action or state that goes no further than the subject (intransitive words require no direct object). Indeed, rave culture is a culture of acceleration with no destination. It is based on the generation of sensations with no apparent referent. At a rave, it is celebration itself which is celebrated, with aimless fervour.

In a certain sense, culture tells us where we have come from and where we are going. But this is not the case with rave culture, where everything seems to come down to sensations, and where referents and meanings are lost. Signs are not fixed to any particular meaning. Instead, they are free to flow with the sensations, to move on. The intransitive aspects of rave culture – the best roads are those that lead nowhere – are present in the effects of the chemicals of the drugs which sustain them. Ecstasy incites a kind of floating fervour, an energy which is mobilized for going nowhere: or rather for depression, withdrawal, mental weakness, melancholy. This shows us that not all cultures which offer an escape from the banality of urban life result in emancipation. Very often, they are alienating manifestations of resistance to the same banalization of life (Wooden & Blazak, 2001).

The distinctive feature of all the different styles of rave music (dark/side/hardcore, darkore, jungle) is the festively sinister image of paranoia and confusion (Reynolds, 1998). Ecstasy plays a leading role in the way music is experienced at rave parties (Saunders, 1995). This is a drug that, according to pharmacologists, exerts a *potentiation effect*. It stimulates not only introspection, but also feelings of empathetic openness in relation to others, leading to a *loved up* state. Rave music, with its synaesthetic texture, its contagious rhythms, stimulates the effects of ecstasy, helping to free the body, to liberate speech. It is no coincidence that the “love drug” has been described as a “torrent” drug, as the impetuosity it produces dissolves bodily and psychological constraints, releasing multiple feelings of connection. We could say that ecstasy is a kind of “zen capsule” that causes the state of receptivity and surrender?, a desire to be carried along by the flow of confused (and blending) sonorities and of personal (and sensory) contacts. The key features of rave dancing are the open gestures, the raised arms, stretching to the sky, as if in an expression of mystical surrender. Rave culture is an example of what Deleuze and Guattari (1994) called a “wishing machine”, that is a non-centred, non-hierarchical, non-signifying system, defined essentially by the idea of circulation. Indeed, the body of a young raver is converted into a continuous and self-vibrating region of intensities in a flow that has nothing to do with movement towards culmination. The ecstasy pursued is generated by a desire for the unreachable.

Could not all these subversions on the margins be taken into the mainstream? This is certainly what happens when they are transformed into fashion. And it may also happen when they are exploited for their money-making

potential. This is what we think of when we talk about drug traffickers that prey on youth cultures. For Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 389), one of the characteristics of the State – but also of capitalist speculation – is that it uses “smooth spaces as a means of communication in the service of striated space”. The same happens when the politics of inclusion associated with citizenship feed on exclusion: “For any State it is not only vital to overcome nomadism, but also to control migrations and, more generally, to lay claim to a zone of rights over the entire exterior” [translation from Portuguese] (idem). This is a citizenship which includes on the basis of exclusion; that controls flows of population, goods and services in order to direct them more effectively.

We might suggest that the margins could generate resistance, creativity and “re-active” forms of cultural citizenship (Blackman & France, 2001) which rebel against archaic forms of imposed citizenship. However, whilst the cultural margins from which the most creative youth cultures emerge can serve as territories critical of the establishment, they can also be absorbed by the establishment, as happens with most musical movements. Or else they can turn into forms of pure social alienation. We have also seen that certain young people – such as skaters, graffitiers, rappers, etc. – turn urban life into a lifestyle dominated by minimalist and expressive sociabilities. Expression is a form of liberation: A pressure that is externalized. A counter-movement in the flight from repression. We have also seen that the street is claimed as a domain of creativity and emancipation where juvenile ritualities appear as a sort of celebration of difference and autonomy. Youth cultures are not merely “cultures of resistance” (Haenfler, 2004), but they are also forms of claiming an *existence* which is not always recognized by society (Honneth, 1997).

Why is it that some young people get involved in risk-taking behaviour? As this behaviour provides an opportunity for their daring and physical prowess are rarely exercised in their everyday life. The excitement of the risk feeds on “courage of existence” courage which is displayed in exposure to risk and in undergoing a test. What matters, for some young people, seems to be the possibility they have, at a life stage where most of the dominant discourses leave them destitute of power, to give themselves over to activities whose visibility is increased by the risks (real or imagined) associated with them. By engaging in risk-taking activities (Pais & Cabral, 2004), young people exhibit the attributes of fearlessness, virility, etc.

No citizenship can be claimed when access to autonomy is barred. Although young people are regarded as dependent on various types of socialization, they lay claim to the rights of autonomy. Youth studies have traditionally been dominated by paradigms which reflect the way young people are represented ideologically: that is as dependent, non-autonomous. Today, even in the domestic arena, young people are exposed to the exterior. In the refuge of the home, television and the internet are open windows onto a world to which all have access (Postman, 1983). This exposure to the media

and to new technologies has given young people a power they never previously enjoyed. Whilst in order to produce you need to learn specific skills, to be a consumer you only need a set of preferences.

Formerly, when children were more protected and confined at home and at school, a child that behaved more cheekily would attract the comment that he was "coming out of the shell" as if the universe of his life was an egg, a family cocoon. Today, the cocoon shell has effectively been broken by new technologies (Hutchby & Moran-Ellis, 2001). Communication through new technologies has allowed an "electronic economy" to develop (Lanham, 1993), which escapes the constraints exerted on communication by spatiality. The classical democracies of Greece and Rome were participative because they were based on interpersonal relations. Recent research has shown that, even in relation to certain violent computer games, young people have the opportunity to develop the spirit of cooperation, solidarity and mutual help, helping them on the other hand to work off the feelings of anxiety and frustration which dominate much of their daily lives. These games can give them the chance to express socially repressed emotions (Nachez and Schmoll, 2003/2004). On the other hand, the use of mobile phones may also be associated with a reinvention of individuality or serve as the medium for conspicuous sociabilities. When young people distinguish themselves by the use they make of particular objects (mobile phones, skate boards, trainers...), we can talk about the "social life" of these objects (Appadurai, 1986).

Taking the ideas of communication, fluidity, spaces of openness, "coming out of the shell", etc., we can get back to reflecting on citizenship. If the traditional concept of citizenship refers us to the idea of a relationship of belonging (to a community, a culture, a nation), what is the heuristic capacity of this concept in a society where relations of belonging are multiple, fragments, temporary? When people argue that citizenship is connected to the land or to blood, they are probably forgetting the trajectory, i.e. the social networks that connect individuals (Irigaray, 2000). The social sciences have dug deep into the "objective" and the "subjective", but have barely touched the surface of the "trajective" – which consists of contacts, approximations, wandering. Paul Virilio was probably not a skateboarder. But he has pinpointed the idea of a *trajective citizenship* (Virilio, 2000) because as a scholar of urban life he has realised that the urban is a fabric of trajectories.

5. Trajectories of Youth: "The Ground beneath Their Feet (or not)"

To make allegorical use of the title of a novel by Salman Rushdie (*The Ground beneath her Feet*), I would like to pose a final question: when so many political initiatives are aimed at young people, why are so few of them

actually effective? In other words, why is it that good policies on paper (in legislative terms) failed to produce the desired outcome (in practical terms)? It is possible that some youth policies are planned with scant regard for the real context in which they will be applied ("*the ground beneath their feet*"), where *trajective* aspects are of considerable importance.

It is crucial that political decision makers be in a position to *plan* their interventions effectively with what tools? The etymological roots of the verb *to plan* lead us to another word, of the same family, which is *to explain*. *Explaining* as a necessary condition for *planning*. This means that a good prognosis (for political action) must be based on a sound diagnosis (from research). Practical policies may be misjudged if not *anchored* in rigorous studies of reality, if they lose sight of the real world. So, by analogy with *grounded theories*, the concept of *grounded policies* can now be proposed: policies which always keep a grip on the ground beneath their feet.

Political intervention means mobilizing instruments, measures or programmes. Most commonly, political intervention is based on *programmes*, which basically set the guiding principles for the action to be taken. But how do the agents to which these programmes refer to proceed with their work? It depends on the context in which they work. Within the logic of programming, different types of context may be distinguished (Russell & Norcig, 1995). For example, the game of chess offers a context which is *accessible* (we know all the rules), *deterministic* (moves by each piece have predetermined effects), *static* (there is no change in the context of the game whilst the player is playing) and *discrete* (there is a fixed number of possible moves). In contrast, the contexts of human action are all quite different from this: they are frequently inaccessible, non-deterministic, dynamic and non-discrete. In other words, youth policies deal with a complex reality: not only because young people's trajectories are complex but also because they are played out in maze-like territory (Pais, 2001).

In the course of ethnographic research I undertook (Pais, 1993) on a Portuguese island in the Atlantic (Santa Maria, in the Azores), I found that some young students wanted to study subjects not available on the island (in Portugal, on completing their compulsory education, young people are required to choose a specialist area depending on the university courses they want to follow). Faced with this "data", which was seemingly "objective", the Ministry of Education decided to cater to the students' supposed wishes, tailoring the "supply" to the "demand". So secondary schools on Santa Maria all started to offer the specialist subjects which the students had hitherto wanted to take. Surprisingly, the young people suddenly all wanted to study the subjects that had been scrapped, due to lack of interest.

How should we interpret this paradox? By treating "data" which is apparently "objective" with caution, and by looking into the *subjective* and the *trajective contexts* of these options, which are so unexpected as to suggest the existence of a hidden agenda. Santa Maria is a tiny island in the midst of the

Atlantic Ocean. Many of the inhabitants dream of emigrating: to Brail, the United States, Canada or Lisbon. The young people on the island have grown up in the grip of this trajectory idealization. Their great dream is also to get off the island, all they need is an excuse. So they decide to take school subjects not offered at home. And once they get away it's easier to find a boyfriend or girlfriend who will help them to stay away. This means that conjugal strategies are tightly enmeshed with academic and vocational strategies.

This case illustrates how intervention policies (or employment or educational policies) can be misguided if not grounded in careful research. This is why I suggest the concept of *grounded policies* – policies which always look at the ground beneath their feet, the *contexts of life* (objective, subjective and trajectory) of those at whom they are aimed. The “problem of youth participation” has emerged as a reflection of a conceptualization of an “instrumental” nature which is based on “education for work; work to achieved standardized citizenship; citizenship as a stable category of rights and duties” (Reguillo, 2004, p. 50). And this way of posing the problem rarely questions the meaning of the education system we have, the unequal structure of opportunities in the employment system, the crisis of representative legitimacy in the party political system.

So, let us go to the heart of the question. We have seen that some young people lay claim to a citizenship which is different from that offered to them. Consequently their *performative behaviour* can be read as signs of anxiety in relation to the “closed systems” which loom in their future. It is no coincidence that this performative behaviour is ritualised in fields of everyday life which are freer of institutional constraints. Which domains are these? Those of leisure, play and culture. So it makes sense to attract the debate on citizenship and social participation to the cultural domain (Stevenson, 2001, 2003).

In these performative cultures, so often misunderstood, we find the flow of an unjustly despised energy. We can find a desire to take part, to take a lead. We can find possible paths open to the future, which researchers and political decision makers cannot fail to consider, when looking into instruments to guide youth policies. Many of the performative aspects of youth cultures are also manifestations of an “open art”, in the phrase used by Eco (1968) to describe the Baroque. Art open to the future. Designing youth policies is designing *maps of the future*. But there would be no point in these maps if there were no travellers wishing to follow them. What meaning can young people give to politics if they feel that it leaves them out in the cold?

References

Almeida, M., Mendes, I. de & K.M. de Almeida Tracy (2003): *Noites Nômadeas: Espaço e Subjetividade nas Culturas Jovens Contemporâneas*. Rio de Janeiro: Rocco.

- Appadurai, A. (ed.) (1986): *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beiner, Ronald (ed.) (1995): *Theorizing Citizenship*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Benhabib, Seyla (ed.) (1996): *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Blackman, S. & France, A. (2001): Youth marginality under ‘postmodernism’. In Stevenson, N. (ed.), *Culture & Citizenship*. pp. 180–197.
- Bulmer, M. & Anthony M.R. (eds.) (1996): *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T. H. Marshall*. London: UCL Press.
- Burke, P. & Porter, R. (eds.) (1996): *Línguas e Jargões: Contribuição para uma História Social da Linguagem*. São Paulo, Unpubl.
- Calhoun, C. J. (1994): *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Canclini, N. G. (1995): *Consumidores y Ciudadanos: Conflictos Multiculturales de la Globalización*. Mexico: Grijalbo.
- Castells, M. (1996): *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol. 1 (The Rise of Network Society) Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castro, L.R. (ed.) (2001): *Subjetividade e Cidadania*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Lidor.
- Connor, S. (1991): *Postmodernist Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Craith, M.N. (2004): Culture and citizenship in Europe: Questions for Anthropologists, *Social Anthropology*, 12 (3), pp. 289–300.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1994): *Mil Mesetas*. Valência: Pré-textos (1st edition in French, 1980).
- Delgado, M. (1999): *El Animal Público*. Barcelona: Editorial Anagrama.
- Eco, U. (1968): *Obra Aberta*. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva.
- Ferry, L. (1990): *Homo Aestheticus*. Paris: Éditions Grasset e Fasquelle.
- Foucault, M. (1975): *Surveiller et Punir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (1993): On other spaces: utopias and heterotopias. In Joan Ockman (ed.): *Architecture Culture 1943–1968*. New York: Rizzoli, pp. 422–423.
- Franck, T.M. (1999): *The Empowered Self: Law and Society in the Age of Individualism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frosh, S. (2001): Psychoanalysis, identity and citizenship. In N. Stevenson (ed.): *Culture & Citizenship*. pp. 62–73.
- Galland, O. & Roudet, B. (2001): *Les Valeurs des Jeunes*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Gelder, K. & Thornton, R. (1997): *The Subcultures Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Giddens, A. (1997): *Modernidade e Identidade Pessoal*. Oeiras: Celta Editora.
- Guattari, F. (1986): *Questionnaire: Answer*. New York: Zone ½.
- Haenfler, R. (2004): Rethinking subcultural resistance. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 33 (4), pp. 406–436.
- Hermano, H. (1997): *Galeras Cariocas: Territórios de Conflitos e Encontros Culturais*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ.
- Honneth, A. (1997): *La Lucha por el Reconocimiento*. Barcelona: Crítica (1st edition in German, 1992).
- Hutchby, I. & Moran-Ellis, J. (eds.) (2001): *Children, Technology and Culture: The Impacts of Technologies in Children's Everyday Lives*. London: Routledge.
- Irigaray, L. (2000): *Democracy Begins Between Two*. London: Athlone Press.
- Johnson, S. (2001): *Emergence: The Connected Lives of Ants, Brains, Cities and Software*. New York: Scribner.
- Lanham, R.A. (1993): *The Electronic World: Democracy, Technology and the Arts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lauritzen, P., Joerg, F. & Hoskins, B. (2004): *What About Youth Political Participation?* Strasbourg: Éditions du Conseil de l'Europe.
- Marín, M. & Muñoz, G. (2002): *Secretos de Mutantes*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Márquez, G.G. (1967, 1995): *Cem Anos de Solidão*. Lisbon: Publicações Dom Quixote.
- Marshall, T.H. & Bottomore, T. (1950, 1992): *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Pluto Press.
- Martins, J. de Souza (2004a): Para compreender e temer a exclusão social. *Vida Pastoral*, XLV (239), November–December, pp. 3–9.
- Martins, J. de Souza (2004b): A dupla linguagem na cultura caipira. In Pais, J.M. et al. (eds.): *Sonoridades luso-afro-brasileiras*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, pp. 189–226.
- Melucci, A. (1989): *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Menser, M. (1996): "Becoming-heterarch: on technocultural theory, minor science, and the production of space". In Aronowitz, Stanley et al. (eds.): *Technoscience and Cyberculture*. New York: Routledge.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1984): *Fenomenología de la Percepción*. Barcelona: Península.
- Moya, J.S. (2003): "Ciudadanía y juventud: el dilema entre la integración social y la diversidad cultural". *Última Década*, 19, November.
- Muggleton, D. (2000): *Inside Subculture: The Postmodern Meaning of Style*. Oxford: Berg.
- Nachez, M. & Schmoll, P. (2003/2004): Violence et sociabilité dans les jeux vidéo en ligne. *Sociétés*, 82, 6–16.
- Negrin, L. (1999): The self as image: A critical appraisal of postmodern theories of fashion". *Theory, Culture and Society*, 16 (3), 99–118.
- Pais, J.M. (1993): Aventuras, desventuras e amores na ilha de Santa Maria dos Açores. *Análise Social*, XXVIII (123–124), pp. 1011–1041.
- Pais, J.M. (2001): *Ganchos, Tachos e Biscates: Jovens, Trabalho e Futuro*. Porto: Âmbar.
- Pais, J.M. & Cabral, M.V. (eds.) (2003): *Condutas de Risco, Práticas Culturais e Atitudes Perante o Corpo: Inquérito aos Jovens Portugueses*. Oeiras: Celta Editora.
- Pais, J.M. & da Silva Blass, M.L. (eds.) (2004): *Tribos Urbanas: Produção Artística e Identidades*. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.
- Plummer, K. (2003): *Intimate Citizenship: Private Decisions and Public Dialogues*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Postman, N. (1983): *The Disappearance of Childhood*. London: W.H. Allen.
- Rector, M. (1994): *A Fala dos Jovens*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Reguillo, R. (2004): La performatividad de las culturas juveniles. *Revista de Estudios de Juventud*, 64, 49–56.
- Reynolds, S. (1998): *Energy Flash: A Journey through Rave Music and Dance Culture*. London: Picador.
- Rosaldo, R. (1994): Cultural citizenship and educational democracy. *Cultural Anthropology*, 9 (3), 402–411.
- Russell, S. & Norcig, P. (1995): *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Saunders, N. (1995): *Ecstasy and the Dance Culture*. New York: Saunders.

- Soja, E.W. (1989): *Postmodern Geographies*. London: Verso.
- Stevenson, N. (ed.) (2001): *Culture & Citizenship*. London: Sage.
- Stevenson, N. (ed.) (2003): *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Questions*. Glasgow: Open University Press.
- Urry, J. (2000): Global flows and global citizenship. In Isin, E.F. (ed.), *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*. London: Routledge.
- Virilio, P. (2000): *Cibermundo: A Política do Pior*. Lisbon: Teorema.
- Willard, M.N. (1998): Seance, tricknology, skateboarding and space of youth. In Austin, J. and Willard, M.N. (eds.): *Generations of Youth: Youth Cultures and History in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 327–346.
- Wooden, W.S. & Blazak, R. (2001): *Renegade Kids, Suburban Outlaws: From Youth Culture to Delinquency*. Belmont (CA): Wadsworth.
- Zukin, S. (1995): *The Cultures of Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.

4.3 Social Capital and Political Socialization. The Brazilian Youth*

Rosana Katia Nazzari

1. Introduction

Globalization has imposed deep transformations in socioeconomic and political-culture structures from different countries in the last few decades; an altered production profile with the opening of markets; promotion of enterprise privatizations and an accelerated process of technological development. At the same time, while international corporations found themselves fortified, national states tended to weaken in face of the globalization process¹.

Latin American Countries were affected by these transformations. In the political field, in spite of advancements promoted by the constitutional process, an ever-growing discontent and feeling of frustration was observed in a significant fraction of its population with the new democracies. This raises numerous conjectural questions about the future of Latin Americans, as well as about the possibilities of establishing democratic regimes socially reintegrated in the region. Faced with these problems, there was a proposal to guide the elaboration of the study by investigating to what degree social institutions such as family, school, and communication media have contributed to generating social capital among the youth². Therefore, as reference, on one hand, the impacts motivated by the recent globalization situation in marginal societies, and on the other, the political socialization process to which Brazilian youth are submitted.

The central problem of this study consists of verifying if political socialization agencies contribute to promoting favorable youth social capital indexes. The main social capital variables are assurance, cooperation, and citizen political participation that collaborate to develop public policies, so that they become effective in the development of communities.

Typically, studies about this subject matter presuppose the integration of political, social, and economical circles. They advocate that social relations

* Abridged version of the researcher's doctoral thesis, defended on the 20th of August 2003, presented at the IV European Ceisal Congress of Latin-americanists „Desafios Sociales en América Latina en el siglo XXI”, in Bratislava, 4th to 7th of July, 2004. In symposium: SOC-9 – Políticas de la Juventud: enfoque contrastivo Europa – América Latina.

1 Look up studies by Furtado (1998), Gonçalves (1999), and Arrighi (1996).

2 Throughout the study, the term „youth” and „adolescent” will be used as synonyms.