**DESCRIPTION**

* The aim of this project is to determine the Portuguese Overseas Identity in the Atlantic Ocean basin between 1642 and 1755 by application of Social Network Analysis.
* On one hand, the research studies **how emerged the sense of the belonging of the Portuguese towards their maritime possessions in Africa and America and**
* on the other, reviews **the social position of the marginalized individuals of those colonies**. The collective identity was defined by Alberto Melucci as a long-term process of **establishing networks of active relationships between actors who interacted, communicated to each other and negotiated values and terms of coexistence**.
* Portuguese Overseas Identity will be understood as a process which was constructed and **negotiated through relationships between the individuals and bureaucratic colonial structure.** D. J. Watts, P.S Dodds and M.E.J. Newman (2002) observed that social networks, by being searchable, allowed ordinary people to reach, in a few steps, distant important actors, only by using their personal networks. Furthermore, by application of distinctiveness approach by D.J. Brass, M. Kilduff and A. Mehra (1998), it is proved that the marginalized individuals were more likely to create identity and promote such group as a basis for social interaction and, consequently, shared identity within-structure.
* The colonial social network was not naturally given but was a **fruit of the dialogue-based approach and the result of investment strategies,** both based on individual and collective needs.
* **The social relations between the inhabitants of the Portuguese colonies and the metropolitan institutions were established and reproduced consciously, resulting in durable obligations**, felt subjectively at individual level as gratitude (pt. *gratidão*), respect (pt. *respeito*) and mercy (pt. *mercê*) or institutionally guaranteed (rights).

**HYPOTHESIS**:

* It is assumed that the Portuguese colonialism **united single individuals rather than excluded** them, **making even the most marginalized groups to strive to integrate within the colonial system** and to create supranational social networks.
* It is also supposed that a specific awareness and sense of belonging of the colonial inhabitants of the periphery to the colonial system has been created.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS:**

* How did the Portuguese administration contribute to birthing the overseas identity of its inhabitants, especially those apparently marginalized from the point of view of the colonial system?
* How slaves, Indians, freed slaves and women created communities?
* How those social actors formed a collectivity and recognized themselves as being a part of it:
* Did they become aware of belonging to a colonial structure?
* What types of relationships did involve both sides?
* How did colonial social networks change over time?
* Were the relations between colonial communities and the Lisbon administration based also on cooperation and trust?

**GLOBAL LEVEL: Relations between LISBON and ITS COLONIES:**

***Maybe the COLONIES were much more central that we could ever imagine!***

***The global level shall be a background and sort of historical narrative for the ego networks of the “marginalized” individuals such as: slaves, indigenous, women etc.***

* Structural position of the colonial system: who is on the periphery? Who is central? Who is in the core?
* What kind of network patterns can we observe in the Portuguese colonial system? Is it focused only on one actor (Conselho Ultramarino and King) or more triangulation? Are the networks concentrated or scattered? How much reciprocation? How much cooperation?
* Can we determine the regions of greater density? Any particular Brazilian state or African colony?
* How does a Lisbon-colonies network affect person’s ability to access the metropolitan institutions?
* How does the colonial structure of a given social network between Lisbon and its colonies affect the formation and/or maintenance of collective norms?
* How does the Lisbon institutions (Conselho Ultramarino and King) affect the likelihood of social ties forming amongst individuals?
* What role does geographical proximity/distance play in formation of social networks?
* Are actors who are similar to one another or some characteristics (slaves, non-slaves, free black etc) more likely to form a tie?
* How often does Lisbon communicate with its colonies? How much reciprocal is this communication? Who is more active – Portugal or colonies (which colony)?
* Directions of ties? More Portugal-colonies or colonies-Portugal?
* Are the peripherical individuals embedded in their own cliques. Do they shift power away from the central actor (in this case Overseas Council & King)?
* How do the colonial system affect individual outcomes? How do the information/rights/ flow across the network from one individual to another?
* How dynamic was a Portuguese colonial system? Did the social networks patterns change through the centuries? Were always the same actors in the central and on the peripheries?

The dynamic changes shall be based on the reigns of the following kings:

D. Filipe I : 1581-1598

D. Filipe II: 1598 - 1621

D. Filipe III: 1621 - 1640

D. João V: 1640 - 1656

D. Afonso VI: 1656-1683

D. Pedro III: 1683 - 1706

D. João V: 1706 - 1750

D. José I: 1750 - 1777

D. Maria I: 1777 – 1816

**ACTOR LEVEL IN COMPLETE NETWORK:**

**To determine the structural position of the individuals who made the Portuguese empire work.**

* Who is popular, peripheral or a good mediator in colonial networks?
* Who is important to that network? King? Overseas Council? Gubernators?
* Who occupy a central position in a network (centrality) W
* Who is the most involved and active in the network?
* Indegree centrality: who has prestige/popularity in the networks?
* Outdegree centrality: who is the most expansive in the network?
* Betweenness centrality: who links other actors together?
* If the individuals (such as slaves, women, Indians etc) are not central, how do they have access to the information and on who do they rely?
* Do individuals in certain positions have different individual outcomes? How different, regarding to social networks theory, are slaves from the non-slaves?
* How are individual outcomes and the colonial system intertwined?
* Who bridged between different part of the colonial system?
* How do individuals in certain network position differ in their individual outcomes