

HOW PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING CHANGES THE MEANING AND PRACTICES OF CITIZENSHIP

COMO O ORÇAMENTO PARTICIPATIVO TRANSFORMA O SENTIDO E AS PRÁTICAS DE CIDADANIA

MARTA NUNES DA COSTA¹

(UFSC/Brasil)

ABSTRACT

What does it mean to be a citizen today? In an era where boundaries are being questioned, where identities are being transformed, where social and political claims are being updated from the traditional ‘recognition’ or ‘redistribution’ discourse to a more globalized discourse supported by a theoretical appeal to human rights, it is important to clarify where the ‘citizen’ stands, morally and politically speaking. This paper is supported by *a)* a strong moral and political reading of citizenship, echoing some republican tradition where citizenship is associated with virtue; and *b)* the assumption that there is a strong correlation between virtuous citizens and a virtuous republic or ‘democracy’. In order to reflect upon the transformations of the concept of citizenship I will look at some of the practices it involves, more precisely, I will look into the participatory budgeting experience in Portugal trying to show how the progressive implementation of such measure promises to bring Portuguese’s democracy to a new level with a more robust practice of citizenship. This paper has three moments: first, I will situate myself from a theoretical standpoint, regarding the concept of citizenship I want to defend. I will show how the way in which we conceive citizenship *a)* will determine the forms and shapes democracy can take and *b)* will influence the future of democracy, insofar it can contribute, enhance or undermine democratic aspirations and goals. Second, after arguing for an active sense of citizenship I will advance the argument that the future of democracy lies in participatory practices, in which the citizen plays a key role. Third, I will turn to a case study in order to illuminate my theoretical argument. Having participatory budgeting experiment in Portugal as paradigmatic case of analysis, I will identify some elements present in the Portuguese case that corroborate our hypothesis that the future of democracy must rely in participatory mechanisms and practices.

Keywords: citizenship; participatory budgeting; democracy; equality; inclusion.

RESUMO

O que significa ser um cidadão nos dias de hoje? Numa época onde as identidades estão sendo transformadas e as reivindicações sociais e políticas deixam de estar assentes num discurso tradicional do “reconhecimento” ou “redistribuição” e passam a ser projetadas num discurso mais globalizado, suportado por um apelo aos discursos humanos, urge clarificar onde se posiciona o cidadão, quer moral quer politicamente. Este artigo assenta a) numa leitura “forte” de cidadania, entendida no seu sentido moral e político, e ecoando a tradição republicana em que cidadania se associa ao conceito e prática da virtude; e b) na premissa de que há uma forte correlação entre cidadãos virtuosos e uma república ou democracia virtuosa. De forma a refletir sobre as

transformações do conceito de cidadania, concentro-me neste artigo sobre algumas práticas que estas transformações envolvem, e mais precisamente, tomarei a experiência do orçamento participativo em Portugal como caso de análise, tentando mostrar como a progressiva implementação de medidas como esta promete trazer a democracia portuguesa a um novo nível, **assente** numa prática mais robusta de cidadania. Este artigo tem três momentos. No primeiro, situar-me-ei do ponto de vista teórico, no sentido de expor o conceito de cidadania que quero defender. Pretendo mostrar, assim, que a forma como concebemos à partida o conceito de cidadania a) irá determinar as formas que a democracia pode tomar e b) irá influenciar o futuro da democracia, já que pode promover ou minar as aspirações e objetivos democráticos. Segundo, depois de defender um sentido ativo de cidadania, avançarei o argumento de que o futuro da democracia assenta em práticas participativas, nas quais o cidadão desempenha um papel fundamental. Terceiro, tomo o estudo de um caso de forma a iluminar o meu argumento teórico. Tendo como caso de análise paradigmático a experiência de orçamento participativo em Portugal, irei identificar os elementos presentes no caso português que corroboram a nossa hipótese de que o futuro da democracia deve assentar em mecanismos e práticas participativas.

Palavras-chave: cidadania; orçamento participativo; democracia; igualdade; inclusão.

Introduction

What does it mean to be a citizen today? In an era where boundaries are being questioned, where identities are being transformed, where social and political claims are being updated from the traditional ‘recognition’ or ‘redistribution’ discourse to a more globalized discourse supported by a theoretical appeal to human rights, it is important to clarify where the ‘citizen’ stands, morally and politically speaking.

This paper is supported by *a)* a strong moral and political reading of citizenship, echoing some republican tradition where citizenship is associated with virtue; and *b)* the assumption that there is a strong correlation between virtuous citizens and a virtuous republic or ‘democracy’. In order to reflect upon the transformations of the concept of citizenship I will look at some of the practices it involves, more precisely, I will look into the participatory budgeting experience in Portugal trying to show how the progressive implementation of such measure promises to bring Portuguese’s democracy to a new level with a more robust practice of citizenship.

This paper has three moments: first, I will situate myself from a theoretical standpoint, regarding the concept of citizenship I want to defend. I will show how

the way in which we conceive citizenship *a)* will determine the forms and shapes democracy can take and *b)* will influence the future of democracy, insofar it can contribute, enhance or undermine democratic aspirations and goals. Second, after arguing for an active sense of citizenship I will advance the argument that the future of democracy lies in participatory practices, in which the citizen plays a key role. Third, I will turn to a case study in order to illuminate my theoretical argument. Having participatory budgeting experiment in Portugal as paradigmatic case of analysis, I will identify some elements present in the Portuguese case that corroborate our hypothesis that the future of democracy must rely in participatory mechanisms and practices.

I. Contextualizing Citizenship - what is to be a citizen? From *modus operandi* to *modus vivendi*

As Benjamin Barber notices in *Strong Democracy*, citizenship is generally associated to territorial boundaries, although some other forms may occur. Citizenship is a subject matter that has been discussed from a vary of forms and perspectives - either from a political standpoint, generally associated to a set of rights and duties; from a cultural standpoint, where 'imagined communities', to borrow Benedict Anderson's famous expression and reference to his work play a key role; from a sociological standpoint, with intersections with the political and cultural ones; or simply, from a historical standpoint, grounded on the analysis of the history of making citizens, of becoming citizens, and of 'having' citizens, which cannot be dissociated from the process of constitution of the nation-state as the trigger figure for the entire process.

The opening of physical borders happening in Europe for the past decades, along with the correlative contamination between cultures and the proliferation of religious or spiritual beliefs (intensified by media tools and technological development), has a direct impact in the ways in which the self constitutes itself as citizen. What does it mean to be a citizen today, in general, and in Europe, in

particular? Most of the 'claims' that were generally taken for granted in a previous period of time where each nation knew exactly its 'territory' have been transformed once boundaries started being conceptualized in a non-physical way. Therefore, the quality of citizenship is also transformed calling for redefinition.

Defending a Strong Reading of Citizenship

Historically, 'citizenship' was associated to direct democracy. Already in Ancient Greece citizens were those who belonged to the city, and, on virtue of that, they could take part of political processes of decision-making. Of course, only a very limited number of people where in fact 'citizens' of Athens - women, for instance, were excluded because they were unable to fight for their city, which was one of the major duties of citizenship at the time.

Aristotle, in *The Politics* points out that the definition of citizenship depends on the type of constitution but 'our definition of citizen is best applied in a democracy'. Rome, while never being a direct democracy, stressed the importance of willingness to fight for Rome, and for that reason, it was equally willing to expand the concept of 'citizenship' to foreigners. Generally, there was a tendency to associate citizenship with ownership of property, mainly because in earlier times, property made possible to acquire a broad education and to have the leisure to study and take part in politics. Democratic Athens rejected property qualifications for citizenship, but in the views of many critics it was the role of the uneducated poor with no time to take part in politics unless they were paid to do so which undermined Athenian democracy. Republicans like Rousseau also believed that property ownership provided the individual with economic resources for individual independence. Those who depended upon the will of others for their livelihood were not their own masters and could not, according to this view, be truly self-governing nor have the status of equal citizens. The French Revolution represented a paradigmatic political shift, insofar from then on those without property stated to claim the right to be considered and treated as full

citizens.²

In the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*, still, these universal rights were only held by men. Women were excluded for the well-known reasons - their place was to stay at home with the children. Nevertheless, the republican ideal of citizenship granted a pivotal role to the character of the citizen, i.e., a good citizen is an individual who is active in politics, who is willing to fight for the nation, and who cares more for the public good than for his specific particular interests.

This republican tradition is linked to the recognition of the substantial importance of representation in government, progressively articulating the necessity of representation along the existence and expansion of democracy as a political and social model. From 'direct democracy', which stressed individual participation in the decision-making process we arrive at 'representative democracy' where, while maintaining the participatory premise alive, strongly relied on representative mechanisms in order to make 'democracy' efficient and enlarge its scope.

For our purpose it is important to retain the fact that there was, in the West, a transformation of the hard nucleus of the concept of citizenship - from a primary set of political rights (right to participate, right to vote) individuals and communities fought to expand this set in order to incorporate civic rights (giving individuals equal protection of their freedoms - freedom of association or speech) and social and economic rights as well. It is this combination of rights of different dimensions of human life that constitute citizenship in its practice. However, from this already changed starting-point (and reflecting different influences in the making and molding of democracies, from USA to France) we arrived at different conceptualizations of citizenship. On the one hand, one finds a pure liberal view that stresses citizenship primarily in legal and administrative terms; on the other hand, one finds a republican view, where citizenship cannot be dissociated from an active political role. For the sake of my argument I want to recover the republican approach to citizenship, given that only a strong concept of citizenship

is able to transform democracy and take it to the next level.

Citizenship and Human Nature

Different approaches to citizenship reflect also different conceptualizations of the human nature, which have a direct impact in how democracy is going to be perceived as well.³

If one endorses a reading of human nature as intrinsically social, then men must choose between citizenship and slavery. When Rousseau, in *The Social Contract*, said that 'Man is born free yet he is everywhere in chains' I interpret it as saying that it is our duty, as citizens, to invent, transform and redefine artificial freedom within and through politics, and not merely to rescue natural freedom from politics. There is no such thing as 'natural freedom' - there is only what we know, and that is the relations we establish with other fellow beings, relations that can be of dependence, interdependence, or independence. From this standpoint we can see how citizenship and community come together. From the moment one accepts the premise that man is a social being, i.e., bound to live in community, bound to live with others, then citizenship cannot be treated as a merely artificial category, among a larger set of other artificial categories. Citizenship becomes the category *par excellence* that can define man. This happens in a two-fold manner. On the one hand, given that ties among human beings are natural, by attributing a civic component we are turning these ties into something voluntary, into something that we, as human beings, will and want. On the other hand, this will does not derive from the fact that we are afraid of losing our life (as it was assumed in the social contract theory) nor or losing our property. This will derive from the fact that we recognize an intrinsic and essential interdependence between human beings, therefore, recognizing and simultaneously committing ourselves to the creation of a common world, i.e., a world shared by all.

If this reasoning is correct, as Barber also argued in *Strong Democracy*, then citizenship acquires a more robust and substantial definition and

conceptualization. Citizenship cannot be treated only as a matter of having formal rights, being political, economical, social, cultural; citizenship must imply a dimension of interrelation, of inter-dependence, of sharing and, of course, of participation, because one can only share if one takes the time to be with others, therefore, to engage in a public discussion in a public sphere.

II. Democracy and Participatory Practices

From what we have seen so far it is clear that the concept of citizenship projects us to a sphere of interaction and participation. In this section I want to explore the relationship between citizenship and democracy, arguing that the future of democracy must rely on participatory practices, i.e., on practices where the citizen fulfills its purpose and where the category of citizenship plays a key role. In order to do so, I will take participatory budgeting experiment in Portugal as paradigmatic example, trying to answer to a two-fold question: first, from what we have seen so far, a strong democracy requires strong citizens. Is there enough evidence to say that participatory budgeting (PB) contributes to the empowerment of citizens in general? In other words, do people who participate in PB become more enlightened individuals? What is the impact of deliberation in individuals' enlightenment? Second, a robust definition of citizenship that relies in participatory practices supposes that citizens, by being politically engaged, have the necessary tools to control the agenda. What can PB tell us about the relationship between control of the agenda on the one hand, and participation on the other? Does participation entail control of the agenda, and if so, under which conditions?

This two-fold question reflects two major concerns regarding the state of affairs of current democracies. The first concern reflects the belief that democracy is improved when individuals are more enlightened, i.e., if individuals are more knowledgeable, then, one would assume, individuals would be in a position to participate (better) and to deepen democracy as such. The second concern

addresses the generally called 'democratic deficit', i.e., that while people are better educated than fifty years ago, and there are more college degrees than ever before, nevertheless, there is a general 'apathy' by individuals/ citizens and even a lack of will to politically engage. Why is that?

John Stuart Mill used to say that healthy democracies need active citizens, but governments prefer passive citizens. John Dewey, on the other hand, said that the ills of democracy could only be cured with more, not less, democracy. Participatory budgeting meets the requirements, or expectations, of both philosophers, and this is one of the reasons why PB is so important to redefine the democratic paradigm.

Characterizing the participatory budgeting experiment

Participatory budgeting is an experiment that directly addresses these two issues: on the one hand, it brings continuity between the model of 'representative democracy' as we know it, and the model of 'participatory democracy' that supports 'stronger' conceptualizations of democracy. On the other hand, it creates a space where participation can happen, within a model of governance that mainly relies in representative mechanisms, and which contradicts the 'apathy' that so many commentators accuse individuals of suffering from. Participatory budgeting seems to create an alternative space for active citizenship, and possibly, it announces a future of a better (and stronger) democracy. So, what is participatory budgeting?

Participatory budgeting directly involves local people in making decisions on the spending and priorities for a defined public budget. PB processes can be defined by geographical area (whether that's neighborhood or larger) or by theme. This means engaging residents and community groups representative of all parts of the community to discuss and vote on spending priorities, make spending proposals, and vote on them, as well giving local people a role in the scrutiny and monitoring of the process and results to inform subsequent PB decisions on an annual or repeatable basis.⁴

PB is essentially an open and democratic process of participation that allows common citizens to deliberate and to make collective decisions about budget allocations. This includes neighborhood discussions and decisions about several kinds of priorities. The PB also has distinctive analytical and practical moments: first, a moment of diagnosis, second, deliberation, third, the process of decision-making itself, and fourth, the follow-up or accountability and control that decisions are being implemented. Rules can change year after year in order to overcome possible obstacles and improve them, making them more fair and just.

Porto Alegre was the first city applying PB, in 1989/90. PB was the result of a combination of factors: on the one hand, the strong associative life in the city; on the other hand, the existence of political will, namely, within the Partido dos Trabalhadores. Porto Alegre has now over 20 years of experience. Two decades of trial and error, correction and enhancement of participatory practices, combined with representative mechanisms of democracy.

While there is a general consensus on what PB means (as standing for a set of ideals and practices – inclusion, participation, deliberation, control of the agenda, accountability of works, and so on), there is not a universal model that could be applied to different cases. In fact, different cities call for different models. Nevertheless, one could witness for the past two decades (and specially since 2006 in Europe, being Lisbon the first European city to implement PB) a contamination across the globe, from Brazil to other countries of South America, Europe, North America (with interesting experiments going on in Chicago and New York City since 2011), Asia and Africa. PB has been recognized by the United Nations as one of the most innovative, important and decisive processes to enhance and deepen democracy in its several levels. First, because PB transforms the paradigm of democracy into a new thing, since it redefines the relationship between several democratic dimensions of representation, participation and deliberation; second, PB creates a political space that grants visibility to those

who act, who speak, who claim, who represent and who are represented; finally, PB forces us to revise the current democratic practices, projecting democratic ideals in articulation with global concerns and global causes.

However, the success of PB experiments across the world relies in several coordinates: first, the relationship between central/federal government and its cities - for instance, Brazil's federal system allows municipalities to have 15% of all public spending. In Portugal, the financial independence granted to local councils is conditioned by LEO (Lei de Enquadramento Orçamental). Second, the history and strength of associative life in the city, which has proved to be a decisive factor in the success rate of PB implementation. Third, the political will to implement such measure; fourth, the kind of citizenship that underlines the city and the nation, among others. For our purpose I would like to focus on the third and fourth coordinates, by looking at the Portuguese case.

The Portuguese Case

For those who know little of the Portuguese case it is worth mentioning that there is a radical difference between the Brazilian and the Portuguese PB: while in Brazil, and Porto Alegre in particular, PB is a *decisional* process where citizens' input actually counts for something, in Portugal PB experiments tend to be only *consultative*. This may be explained by several phenomena: either the lack of variables as existing in Porto Alegre; the lack of civil and social mobilization of citizens; the lack of politicization or even the fact that PB was the result, not from specific demands from society, but instead from a program named EQUAL, which promotes the adoption, creation and development of participative networks.

Despite the small number of experiments going on in Portugal, Portugal was the first country to bring PB to a European capital, like Lisbon, in 2006/7. Since then there has been a visible increase in citizen's engagement and participation. Although Lisbon is the most visible case of PB in Portugal (with the

exception of São Brás de Alportel, a small village in the south of the country and where PB is a decisional process) I will focus my attention in Cascais.

Cascais is a village nearby Lisbon (30 kilometers) with 206 429 habitants. The council of Cascais has 11 representatives ('vereadores') currently defined by the existing coalition between the Social Democratic Party and the Popular Party (5-2). The municipal assembly is constituted by 37 deputies, and Cascais has 6 regions ('freguesias'), namely Alcabideche, Estoril, São Domingos de Rana, Carcavelos, Parede and Cascais.

Cascais started implementing PB in 2010-2011. In 2011 there was a budget available for PB experiment of one million euros. Of this amount, to each project approved could be allocated the maximum amount of €300,000.00. In 2012 the budget was increased to € 2,1 millions.

Contrary to most of PB experiments in Portugal, the model of PB applied in Cascais follows the deliberative and decisional trend, and not the consultative one. This is explained by the particular political agenda set forward by the two parties of the coalition. Officially, and according to these parties, the goal of PB is to reinforce citizens' participation as well as to promote a stronger civic society, engaged with the definition of priorities at local governance level. In order to promote this dialogue between civil society (or the 'represented') and the representative bodies, the Council fosters multiple activities that aim at increasing political engagement and an informed (or enlightened) citizens' participation.

PB in Cascais is structured in a way as to promote three distinctive moments of civic engagement: citizens can participate during a) the moment of discussion, b) presentation of proposals and c) voting of selected projects. Proposals are presented during the assemblies that are open to public participation, organized in strategic places through out the Council. Participation happens in an individualized manner (each citizen can speak, propose and vote) and during the voting moment, citizens can choose to participate in person or online. The most voted projects are implemented during 2012/2013.⁵

PB process has five stages: *first*, the moment of defining PB for that year.

This includes defining the methodology used, constituting and training technical teams, creating mechanisms for popular participation, determining the budget for each year, and defining the principles and rules of the participatory process as such.

Second, there is the moment of Participatory sessions. Here, the main goal is to promote the presentation of different proposals, fostering the collective definition of priorities. From a normative point of view we can identify the practical recovery of a conceptualization of common good that becomes viable and experimental. The goal is to determine which proposals are the most fit to move to the next stage.

Third, there is the moment of proposals' analysis. This task is accomplished by several services existing in the Council. Proposals should meet the criteria defined in article 17 of 'norms of participation'.⁶ Each proposal is then transformed in specific projects that will be open to citizens' voting process. Once this is done, the list of the approved projects is made public.

Fourth, there is the moment of participation. Here, there are three modes of participating, namely, in the Internet, in the Council's van that travels around the different regions of the council, or in different public offices.

Fifth, there is the moment of presentation of results to the public. These will be incorporated in the next stage of PB.

Between 2011 and 2012 there was a visible increase in citizens' participation. By the end of 2011, seven thousand citizens had chosen 12 projects which were implemented during 2012; in 2012, citizens could vote on 32 projects and from the initial seven thousand citizens we counted with the active participation of more than twenty three thousand citizens. The growing interest by citizens in the PB initiative as alternative mode of political participation and civic engagement led to an increase of the budget PB, from one million to 2,5 million euros for the year of 2012/2013.⁷

I just presented a brief description of what is happening today in Cascais, showing how PB is evolving and being implemented. Next, I will show why PB

matters.

III. Why participatory budgeting matters

"Autonomy is not the condition of democracy; democracy is the condition of autonomy. Without participating in the common life that defines them and in the decision-making that shapes their social habitat, women and men cannot become individuals. Freedom, justice, equality, and autonomy are all products of common thinking and common living; democracy creates them." (Barber, 2003:8)

and

"To be free we must be self-governing; to have rights we must be citizens. In the end, only citizens can be free." (Barber, 2003:xxxv)

Benjamin Barber argued that the fundamental problem of liberal democracy is the lack of active participation. In order to arrive at a stronger model of democracy, it is necessary to promote participatory institutions. For Barber these had to meet the following criteria: *first*, they had to be realistic and workable; *second*, they had to be compatible with the primary representative institutions of large-scale societies; *third*, they had to address problems of society such as prejudice, uniformity, intolerance; *fourth*, they had to deal with obstacles from Modernity, which may limit participation, such as technology, scale, and parochialism; *fifth*, they had to express special claims of strong democracy as a theory of talk, judgment, and public seeing.

PB seems to meet Barber's criteria.⁸ *First*, PB is an innovation while it remains compatible with the most fundamental institutions of democratic societies. PB articulates participatory mechanisms with already existing representative institutions, granting a space for deliberation as well. PB differentiates itself vis-à-vis other forms of participation because it introduces some novelty in addressing problems of exclusion, prejudice and intolerance.⁹

Second, PB functions as a 'school of citizenship', insofar by allowing people (traditionally excluded from participatory politics) to participate, PB brings politics to the level of immanence, making it at reach of ordinary citizens.

Citizenship, I have argued, is a combination of rights and duties, more so in a democratic context where it requires engagement in civic and political life. PB has the potential to expose, in a great manner, the virtues of democracy and of citizenship. It allows space for dialogue, confrontation, deliberation, by providing a space where people are forced, by circumstances, to listen to others, to learn to care and to think beyond their individual and private interests. Under this light, PB has the potential to transform individuals in tolerant, caring, and fair citizens, by recognizing that citizenship is essentially an activity, an exercise of acting and of experiencing democracy by doing.

Third, if one pays a closer look at the relationship between different democratic virtues – following Dahl's model of participation, equality, enlightened understanding, control of the agenda, and individual autonomy - we conclude that PB in its exemplary role of participatory institution has the tools to deepen and strengthen democracy via the development of governmental accountability, enhancement of active citizenship (informed and knowledgeable citizens) and promotion of social justice, insofar power (of setting and controlling the agenda) is more democratically distributed. PB offers a platform that disrupts the traditional power relations and dynamics of inclusion/exclusion. As such, PB contributes to the creation of a new political model and a new political culture, ruled by transparency and accountability. By demystifying the budget, PB shows how most of political decisions are in fact at reach of ordinary citizens. This transforms the entire traditional way of doing politics –on the one hand, it forces politicians to be accountable and responsible vis-à-vis others; on the other hand, it fosters a sense of individual and collective responsibility, since citizens become more alert, critical and demanding.

Although I am pointing out the virtues of PB as exemplary tool for a stronger sense of citizenship and a stronger model of democracy, PB itself is not exempt of criticisms. As conclusion, I must return to the two questions that set the tone of my argument; on the one hand, the question of knowing if PB does produce more enlightened individuals (and what is the relationship between more

and better understanding and participation); on the other hand, the question of knowing if there is a direct correlation between increase of participation and increase of power in setting the agenda.

A classical objection to PB is that PB is just a more apparently democratic way for ‘some’ to appropriate the State power and enhance their private interests with democratic legitimacy attributed to the process itself. There is a real menace within PB, insofar ‘some’ or ‘the few’ (the more educated and knowledgeable people) can speak in a convincing manner, persuading ‘the many’ to follow or accept their proposals. Under this light, it seems that PB would tend to perpetuate forms of oligarchic government, under ‘democratic’ appearances. However, one cannot reduce rhetoric or the art of speak in public to mere manipulation or demagogy. If or when PB is used as a tool to manipulate ‘the many’, then all of PB’s democratic expectations would fall down to earth, and we would still be left with the democratic deficit problem. That is why it is crucial to counter-balance this threat by fostering an active sense of citizenship as I argued in this paper.

This can be done by several means. First, from a structural point of view, it is essential to assure the sustainability of the process. Experience has shown how PB improves year after year, and how each city develops its own specific model. It would be important to elevate PB to the status of a formal political institution. This would accomplish two things: first, it would avoid the volatility of political and electoral calendars; second, it would place a burden both in political structure/ government and individuals to reflect upon the budget and to decide about it.

Second, in order to overcome the democratic deficit (or a less efficient participation) it is crucial to inform citizens about what PB is and what each citizen can do and expect. The danger intrinsic to PB as mentioned above derives mainly from the fact that people are still mis- or uninformed, therefore, if they don’t know *what* PB is, what can PB do and what can they gain from it, PB will remain hostage of ‘the few’ that claim to represent ‘the many’. If PB wants to succeed as democratic tool, government must take proactive initiatives to reduce

the exclusion of those who are less likely to participate, as well as to make special efforts to reduce internal inequalities, and to avoid the concentration of knowledge and perpetuation in power within ‘new bureaucracies’ created by the process. These proactive measures include the educational system as a whole.

Third, PB has the potential to link political democracy to economic democracy. Given that PB is about distributing in a fair and just manner, municipal re- sources, poor people will gain, initially, ‘more’ than rich people. However, this economic compensation is a first necessary step to deepen economic democracy and reflect the ideal of equality that is one of the foundations of the democratic ideal. Middle classes are encouraged to participate, not looking for the meeting of basic needs, but instead for other needs which are also important and deserve attention - like cultural needs, public spaces, etc.

From what we have seen, it is clear that PB announces a new model of governance, which relies in a stronger partnership between government and citizenship.

Notes

¹ Visiting Professor at Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil.

² See the range of rights claimed in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen* (1789), which was the preamble to the draft constitution of France.

³ I am closer to a Kantian conceptualization of the human nature: the idea that man is an end-in-himself, that each individual has a specific purpose, that man qua individual and species has a moral destination, that each of us has duties towards oneself that can only be fulfilled with others. This makes my reading of human nature a compromise between social-contract theory - for whom man is a lonely, isolated, individualistic being - and pragmatic theory, seeing man from a pragmatic point of view, with a flexible, transformative attitude and position.

⁴ <http://www.participatorybudgeting.org.uk/documents/Valuesleaflet.pdf>

⁵ Rules of participation are available at the following link: http://www.cm-cascais.pt/sites/default/files/anexos/gerais/op_2012_-_normas_de_participacao_2012.pdf

⁶ The criteria for the acceptance of proposals is the following: a) the proposal should be within the possible range of action of the Council; b) the proposal must be specific in time and space; c) it must present itself dressed as ‘investment’; d) maximum amount available for each project is of 300 thousand euros; f) the proposal must be capable of fitting in at least one of the regulative axes of Council’s strategy of sustainability; g) it must also be compatible with other projects led by the Council.

⁷ Available at: <http://www.cm-cascais.pt/noticia/resultados-do-orcamento-participativo-de-cascais-2012-mais-um-milhao-de-euros-para>

⁸ It is worth recognizing that Barber wrote this on 1984, and PB was experimented the first time only in 1989/90, so it is important to acknowledge his vision.

⁹ For instance, in Brazil PB was seen by many as a tool of the poor, insofar it created a space where non-educated and very low income people could engage and create their own voice, therefore, representing themselves and filling the gap in the representative relationship, projecting it to an horizon defined by large scale politics. Under this light we corroborate the hypothesis that PB as an experiment results in empowering of the people. Porto Alegre remains an example of this empowerment, exposing the relationship between people’s participation and effective works that grants basic goods to the majority of the population. This empowerment was possible due to a combination of factors: *first*, PB grants a space of visibility for those who did not have a voice. People (and poor people) become actors and exercise their citizenship in an entirely new manner. The data from research that has been done show that the majority of PB participants and PB delegates are low income and have low levels of education. This also means that PB mainly affects individuals from historically excluded groups, with very little resources. Research also shows, however, that on second stage of PB, which requires delegation of powers and choosing representatives, these tend to be more educated people. Despite that, it is important to acknowledge this new space that is created. A preliminary remark could be made here, namely, the fact that PB still has to find and create new ways of how to reach and mobilize middle and upper classes (and perhaps its origin could also explain the different model of PB that is applied in Europe).

Bibliography

ANKERSMIT, Frank (2002). *Political Representation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

AVRITZER, Leonardo (2009). *Participatory Institutions in Democratic Brazil*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

AVRITZER, Leonardo (2012). "Democracy beyond aggregation: the participatory dimension of public deliberation," *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 10. Available at: <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art10>

BARBER, Benjamin, 2003.(1984) *Strong Democracy - Participatory Politics for a new Age*, University of California Press.

BECK, Ulrich (1997). *The Reinvention of Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

BOBBIO, Norberto (1999). *Estado, governo, sociedade – para uma teoria geral da política*. 12. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

DAHL, Robert (1991). *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

DAHL, Robert (2000). *On Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press

FISHKIN, James S. (2005). *Realizing Deliberative Democracy: Virtual and Face to Face Possibilities* W. Maurice Young Centre for Applied Ethics, University of British Columbia.

GUTMANN, Amy, and Thompson, Dennis (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?*, Princeton University Press.

GUTMANN, Amy, and Dennis Thompson (1996). *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

GUTMANN, Amy, and Dennis Thompson (1999). Response to Jane Mansbridge. In *Deliberative Politics. Essays on Democracy and Disagreement*, edited by S. Macedo. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KRUGER, Sandra and Friedrich, Dawid, (Eds) (2012). 'Political Representation in the EU: A Second Transformation?' in *The Challenge of Democratic Representation in the European Union*, Palgrave-MacMillan.

LERNER, Josh and Secondo, Donata (2012). "By the People, For the People:

Participatory Budgeting from the Bottom Up in North America," *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 2. Available at: <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art2>.

MANSBRIDGE, Jane (2003). "Rethinking Representation." *American Political Science Review* 97:515-528.

MANSBRIDGE, Jane (1983). *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

MANSBRIDGE, Jane (1999). Everyday Talk in the Deliberative System. In *Deliberative Politics. Essays on Democracy and Disagreement*, edited by S. Macedo. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MANIN, Bernard (1997). *The Principles of Representative Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MILL, John Stuart, 1993. *Utilitarianism, On Liberty, Considerations on Representative Government*, EveryMan Editors.

PITKIN, Hanna (1967), *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

PLOTKE, David (1997). "Representation is Democracy." *Constellations* 4:1, 19-34.

ROUSSEAU, Jean-Jacques, 1968. *The Social Contract*, translated by Maurice Cranston, Penguin Books.

SAWARD, Michael (2010). *The Representative Claim*. Oxford University Press.

TALPIN, Julien (2011). *Schools of Democracy: How Ordinary Citizens (Sometimes) Become Competent in Participatory Budgeting Institutions*. ECPR

YOUNG, Iris Marion (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Internet Sources:

http://www.cm-cascais.pt/sites/default/files/anexos/gerais/op_2012_normas_de_participacao_2012.pdf

<http://www.in-loco.pt> " www.in-loco.pt

<http://www.cm-sbras.pt>" www.cm-sbras.pt

<http://www.equal.pt>" www.equal.pt

<http://www.op-portugal.org>" www.op-portugal.org

<http://www.participatorybudgeting.org>" www.participatorybudgeting.org