Two Concepts of Social Capital: Bourdieu vs. Putnam

Martti Siisiäinen
Department of Social Sciences and
Philosophy
University of Jyväskylä
e-mail: msiisiai@cc.jyu.fi

The paper sets out to compare Robert D. Putnam's concept of social capital with that of Pierre Bourdieu's. Putnam's concept of social capital has three components: moral obligations and norms, social values (especially trust) and social networks (especially voluntary associations). Putnam's central thesis is that if a region has a well-functioning economic system and a high level of political integration, these are the result of the region's successful accumulation of social capital (see 1993). In the United States many social problems are caused by the decline of social capital; a tendency that has been going on for the last three decades (Putnam 1993). Adam Seligman also writes in the same spirit: "The emphasis in modern societies on consensus (is) based on interconnected networks of trust - among citizens, families, voluntary organizations, religious denominations, civic associations, and the like. Similarly the very "legitimation" of modern societies is founded on the "trust" of authority and governments as generalisations" (1997, 14). The same kinds of voices are heard among proponents of American communitarianism. Putnam's ideas are - to a large extent – a continuation of a current within the American theory of pluralism. They are also reminiscent of functionalist conceptions of social integration from the 1950s and early 1960s. The theoretical contributions of the Putnamian concept and the problems that arise in connection with it are discussed in the paper.

But there is also an older concept of social capital, developed by Pierre Bourdieu in the 1970s and early 1980s. Bourdieu's concept is connected with his theoretical ideas on class. He identifies three dimensions of capital each with its own relationship to class: economic, cultural and social capital. These three resources become socially effective, and their ownership is legitimized through the mediation of symbolic capital (see p. 13). Bourdieu's concept of social capital puts the emphasis on conflicts and the power function (social relations that increase the ability of an actor to advance her/his interests). Social positions and the division of economic, cultural and social resources in general are legitimized with the help of symbolic capital. From the Bourdieuan perspective, social capital becomes a resource in the social struggles that are carried out in different social arenas or fields. For example, the problem of trust (which Bourdieu does not discuss much explicitly) can now be dealt with as a part of the symbolic struggle (or the absence of struggles) in society. Trust as a potential component of symbolic capital can be exploited in the practice of symbolic power and symbolic exchange.

The paper starts with an examination of the three components of Putnam's concept of social capital (norms and obligations, trust and social, networks, especially voluntary associations) followed by a discussion of their inherent theoretical problems. In the second part of the paper the three components of Putnam's social capital are looked at from a Bourdieuan perspective. The structure

of the paper is based on Putnam's concept, and its critical tone on Bourdieu's sociology of struggle.

Putnam's concept of social capital

At the beginning of his "Making Democracy work" Putnam says that in drawing his conclusions about Italy's governmental reforms during the last few decades, his purposes are theoretical and his method empirical (1993, 3). In this paper I will concentrate on his theoretical conclusions, especially about civil society. The main question of Putnam's Italian study is: what are the preconditions for the development of strong, responsive representative institutions and a prosperous economy? The governmental reform of 1976-77 in Italy, responsible for establishing new bodies of local government, offers a good opportunity to provide an answer to this question. The main result of Putnam's study is that governmental reform succeeded well in Northern Italy because it was supported by a florescence of "civic community". This was also the main reason for the economic prosperity of Northern Italy in comparison with the Southern part of the country. In areas with a well-functioning local government and a prosperous economy, the public activity of citizens has created an atmosphere of mutual co-operation, vital social networks, equal political relations and the tradition of citizen participation. Behind all of these phenomena radiates the ethos of mutual trust between citizens (Putnam 1993, 6-7).

The activity of a civic community, a major factor behind economic and governmental effectiveness, is measured in Putnam's study in terms of voting activity, the reading of newspapers, and participation in sports clubs and voluntary cultural associations. The result of regional comparison is as follows:

"In the North the crucial social, political, and even religious allegiances and alignments were horizontal, while those in the South were vertical. Collaboration, mutual assistance, civic obligation, and even trust - not universal, or course, but extending further beyond the limits of kinship than anywhere else in Europe in this era - were the distinguishing features in the North. The chief virtue in the South, by contrast, was the imposition of hierarchy and order on latent anarchy" (op.cit. 130).

These differences between horizontal and vertical patterns of organizing social allegiances and alignments had fatal consequences for the development of political actors. "In the North people were citizens, in the South they were subjects" (op.cit. 121). The quality of the civil society "predestined" to a large extent the future economic and political development of the region. Putnam calls this historical ballast (or treasure) "path dependence": "where you can get to depends on where you are coming from, and some destinations you simply cannot get to from here"

(op. cit. 179). The concept of social capital expresses the sociological essence of communal vitality. A solution to the problem of common action and opportunism presupposes the development of voluntary collective action, and it is connected to the inherited social capital in the community. Forms of social capital are general moral resources of the community, and they can be divided into three main components: first, trust (and more generally 'positive' values with respect to development); second, social norms and obligations; and third, social networks of citizens' activity, especially voluntary associations. Here I am mainly going to deal with the problems of trust and voluntary associations. I will discuss moral obligations only these are related to trust and associations.

Trust

When we speak about trust in modern societies we speak about "generalized trust". Individual actors do something for the general good not because they know other interactors but because they trust that their own action will be "rewarded" via the positive development of communal relations (see Newton 1999, 8-). In the modern world we will need trust when we leave the sphere based on familiarity and enter a world dominated by contingency, complexity and risk (see Luhmann 1988; 1991). Trust is needed when role expectations and familiar relationships no longer help us to anticipate the reactions of our individual or collective interaction partners. In situations of this kind, people gather the harvest whose seeds have been sown in the micro interactions of the past (see Seligman 1997). Choices in micro-level interactions produce, first, mutual reciprocity and trust; and second, as a non-intended consequence of these choices, trust on a higher (macro) level, and thereby integrative values (or their absence) (cf. Coleman 1988). This is the basis of social consensus. As Seligman puts it:

"The emphasis in modern societies on *consensus* (italics/MS).... (is) based on interconnected networks of trust - among citizens, families, voluntary organizations, religious denominations, civic associations, and the like. Similarly the very "legitimation" of modern societies is founded on the "trust" of authority and governments as generalizations" (1997, 14)

Well-functioning modern societies have to have a value basis that is based on the voluntary regulation of social relations between persons who are foreigners to each other. Generalized trust creates the basis for "brave reciprocity", and social networks and associations that are not means for realizing the short-term interests of any specific groups. These two factors in turn create trust. The circle is ready: trust creates reciprocity and voluntary associations, reciprocity and associations

strengthen and produce trust (see Putnam 1993, 163-185). The more social capital is used, the more it grows (Coleman 1988). The forms of social capital are self-reinforcing and cumulative by nature. Vicious circles are expressed in society as distrust, breaking of the norms of reciprocity, avoiding one's duties, isolation, disorder and stagnation. The result is the development of a 'non-civic community'. Virtuous (or rosy, see Govier 1997) circles, on the other hand, result in social equilibrium manifesting itself in a high level of co-operation, expanding trust, strong reciprocity, civic activity and collective well-being (Putnam 1993. 177).

One of Putnam's problems is the explanation of the origin of social trust. Modern (or premodern) "thick trust" develops in personal relations (see Newton 1999, 18-20). Social trust in complex, postindustrial (or postmodern) societies comes from two related sources: norms of reciprocity and networks of civic engagement (Putnam 1993, 171). However, in practice norms of reciprocity are functions of networks of reciprocity. Among these networks voluntary associations are superior in importance. In practice Putnam's civil society is reduced to the examination of the functions of voluntary associations. In this way voluntary associations are dealt with as the sole source of trust (see Cohen 1999, 217). In Jean Cohen's words:

"Once the state is defined and dismissed as a third-party enforcer, once law is turned into sanctions that provide for a certain level of social order but no more, once institutions are dismissed as irrelevant to social trust, and once a vital civil society is reduced to the presence or absence of intermediate voluntary associations, no other source is conceivable" (Cohen 1999, 219).

It has to be remembered too that Putnam's voluntary associations in "Making Democracy Work" consist mainly of sports clubs and cultural associations, which have positive functions concerning the development of social integration and consensus. Putnam is not able to deal with distrust, and those social movements and voluntary associations that present challenges to the prevailing consensus or to integrative institutions. In Putnam's theoretical framework, distrust is mostly connected to "pathological" forms of collective action, like the new social movements or organizations that are seen to advance narrow group interests (see Putnam 1993; Mouritsen 1997, 36).

Voluntary associations as sources of trust

Putnam's concept of voluntary association connects his ideas to one of the currents within the American theory of pluralism. Voluntary association is the most important form of horizontal interaction and reciprocity. Voluntary associations influence social interaction and co-operation between actors in several ways (see Putnam 1993, 173-174). Associations first "increase the potential costs to a defector in any individual transaction"; second, "foster robust norms of reciprocity"; and third,

"facilitate communication and improve the flow of information about the trustworthiness of individuals". They "allow reputations to be transmitted and refined"; and, finally, they "embody past success at collaboration, which can serve as a culturally-defined template for future collaboration".

Putnam is not alone in stressing the importance of voluntary associations in the formation and development of modern society. On the contrary, one can make the generalization that voluntary associations and modern democratic nations were born as dialectical twins in such a way that "you can't find one without the other" (e.g. Tenbruch & Ruoff 1983; Richter 1985; Siisiäinen 1986). Following in Luhmann's footsteps, voluntary associations can be regarded as socially organized groups based on mutual trust between the members. It is trust that helps to build and holds together the relations between the members. As a rational form of solving administrative problems and reducing the complexity of the environment (Umwelt) voluntary association is also a central embodiment of confidence (see Richter 1985; Siisiäinen 1998). Putnam's central problem, however, is that in practice he reduces the concept of civil society to voluntary associations of a specific type (sports clubs, cultural associations).

Putnam's ideas about the relationship between voluntary associations continue the long line of studies from de Tocqueville's "Democracy in America" to Bentley (1908) and Truman (1951). In this tradition social interests were identified with organized interests in the form of voluntary associations (visible interests). These were taken as the base for examining the relationship between civil society and the state. A plurality of crosscutting voluntary associations was understood as the main precondition for a stable democracy. Conflicting interests and the problem of non-organized interests were not included in the approach. However, in this tradition (with some exceptions) voluntary associations were tied by definition to the interests of association members (e.g. Bentley 1908; c.f. Weber 1911).

It is typical of Putnam that he does not discuss conflicts between interests (new social movements, parties). This holds true for three kinds of conflicts. First, there are conflicts between those associations that are functional in creating and supporting social consensus, and those associations and movements that are critical of the dominant political values (and of the values represented by the sports clubs and cultural associations studied by Putnam) (conflicts between different parts of civil society). A theory about conflicting interests presupposes different types of trust (and distrust) and different types of association. Some of these associations create trust only among their own members, and distrust of other (hegemonic) organizations. A large part of the groups and informal associations of civil society cannot be discerned by the Putnamian vision. His vision - following in the footsteps of de Tocqueville - is too Euro-American centered to be able to see youth

subcultures or subcultural public spheres. A vision - or theoretical "glasses" - inherited from the 19th century perceives only homological organizational forms inherited from the same century, no more. This limited vision also prevents Putnam from seeing the role of the mass media and of alternative forms of communication (see Shapiro 1997).

Second, Putnam is nothing to say about conflicts between civil society and the political society (and the state). Or, to put it in another way, Putnam does not deal with politics. Because he is not dealing with conflicts or new challenges presented to the political system, his theory can be seen as a kind of wish to escape politics in the de Tocquevillean tradition (see Shapiro 1997; Mouritsen 1997; Cohen 1999; Warren 1999). This means that the Putnamian "theory" can be characterized as continuing the tradition of American "pacific functionalism" of the 1960s; focusing on the integrative functions of voluntary associations (see Mouritsen op. cit.). However, as Putnam only mentions in passing, civil society is (also) the seedbed of social conflicts and conflicting individual and collective actors.

Third, Putnam neglects the vertical dimension of voluntary associations and the power relations that are inherent in all modern associations (at least as a potential tendency). As Max Weber has remarked, voluntary associations are relations of domination (Herrschaftsverhälnisse) in two respects: first, within the association (domination exercised by the leadership upon rank-and-file members), and second, in relation to the outside world (by the organization towards the outsiders) (Weber 1911).

Putnam has little to say about the problems of internal democracy in existing voluntary associations, and their internal power structures. As we know, from Rousseau to present-day discussions of (and in) new social movements, problems of oligarchy (Michels) and bureaucratization (Weber) are still among the most serious obstacles to the development of democratic voluntary organizations and civil society.

Voluntary associations also play a central role in the selection of those issues and interests that are allowed to enter the political arena. This problem was also studied by another, critical current within the American pluralist "school":

"The democratic society is able to survive because it manages conflict by establishing priorities among a multitude of potential conflicts ... He who determines what politics is about runs the country, because the definition of the alternatives is the choice of conflicts and the choice of conflicts allocates power... All forms of political organization have a bias in favor of the exploitation of some kinds of conflicts and the depression of others, because organization is the mobilization of bias. Some conflicts are organized into politics while others are organized out" (Schattschneider 1960, 66, 68, 71).

This selectivity of the political system tends to increase the supremacy of upper strata in the system of voluntary associations and their over-representation in

the leadership of associations. Therefore the picture that the prevailing totality of voluntary associations gives of the variety of existing interests in society is biased. In Shattschneider's words: "the flaw in the pluralist heaven is that the heavenly chorus sings with a strong upper class accent" (Schattschneider 1960, 35).

Voluntary associations and social integration

The US-centredness of Putnam's analysis accentuates the narrowness of his approach in understanding the production of "consensus" on the level of society. This can be concretized by discussing the development of the Nordic welfare state(s) as a compromise between different and conflicting interests (or as a hegemonic project). Comparative studies on trust show that the citizens of the Nordic countries belong to the most "trusting" in the world in the Putnamian sense of the word (see Inglehart 1997; 1999). My argument is that this is connected to the development of the Nordic welfare state's function in guaranteeing (in principle at least, and even though imperfectly) a minimum level of living. This means that political and social welfare institutions increase the capacity of citizens to anticipate the future (and thus, most probably, the level of their confidence). Citizens of the Nordic countries also occupy top positions in international comparison of the number of the memberships in voluntary associations and the number of acting voluntary associations (see Siisiäinen 1999). The Nordic countries are also among those countries in which no general decline of social capital has taken place (as, according to Putnam (and many others) is the case in the USA (Putnam 1995; Siisiäinen 1995; 1999). Besides the Nordic countries, volunteerism and voluntary associations are doing well in many other European countries as well (for example in Holland) (see Van Dept et. al. 1999).

The development of the Nordic welfare state can be understood as a kind of hegemonic project, or a neo-corporatist compromise between different interest organizations, social movements and institutions of the state (for a discussion of these concepts, see Jessop 1983; Siisiäinen 1987). The neo-corporatist practices that led to the Nordic welfare state are no doubt far from the 'ideal speech situation' (Habermas) or deliberative democracy. However, it can be said that it is one of the most successful moves in that direction in societies based on social inequalities. Most probably the Nordic countries also get the highest points in a Putnamian scale measuring the amount of positive social capital (cf. Inglehart 1999)[1].

---

[1] There are, of course, differences between the Nordic countries, which, however, are not dealt with in this paper.

So far this information about the Nordic countries could be interpreted as supporting Putnam's ideas of the relationship between the activity of voluntary associations, and societal consensus based on value compromises. But the problem with respect to Putnam is that these Nordic structures of consensus and "trust" are very often the results of "struggles" between conflicting interests. In Putnam's analysis only those associations are examined which are able to rise above social conflicts. The example of the Nordic countries points to the conclusion that particularly those associations that are critical and in opposition to the prevailing value consensus are the most important in the creation of trust on the societal level and developing a hegemonic system based on leadership in the civil society (see Siisiäinen 1986).

For example, in Finland institutions of the welfare state have sometimes originated as critical social movements, which presented the political system with demands. They were often objected - at least in the beginning - by the economic and political elites. Many of these movements were critical not only of details but also of the whole political system. In the course of time these protest movements have resulted in the establishment of registered associations that were able to take part in the (neo-corporatist) negotiations between the various parties to the conflict and the state. All major movements have become integrated into the political system in this way (see Siisiäinen 1994). A severe problem with Putnam's theory is that it excludes conflicts and conflicting associations from its conceptual apparatus and from the list of preconditions of consensus (c.f. Warren 1999); and thus ignores a central element that has to be dealt with if we want to understand the birth of a trusting society based on compromises of interest.

All this said, it is now time to turn to the conflict and power side of social capital as represented by Bourdieu. To some extent Bourdieu's theorization tries to answer those questions that Putnam leaves untouched (although Bourdieu – as far as I know – has never entered into a debate with the Putnamians at all): the relationship between social capital and power, symbolic power and universal values (trust?), and the preconditions for social consensus.

Bourdieu's social and symbolic capital

Jeffrey Alexander has drawn attention to the affinities between the modernization theories of the 1950s and 1990s theories of the neo-modern. Many of de Tocqueville's themes that were revitalized in the pluralist theorization of the 1950s have reappeared in American sociological and politological discourses (see Alexander 1994; 1995). In a way certain of Putnam's ideas similarly reproduce ideas

of the functionalist and pluralist theorizations of the 1950s. One example of these similarities is the differentiation between the modern, rational form of voluntary associations and the premodern form of familiar groups (voluntary associations based on trust vs. amoral familism based on blood-ties and serving the interests of specific groups). For example, Seligman identifies different forms of fundamentalism as "binary opposites" to associations based on trust (Seligman 1997; 1999).

If Putnam can be seen as carrying on theories of pluralism and functionalism, it is more difficult to characterize Bourdieu in the same terms since he consistently opposes the use of labels of this kind (see e.g. Bourdieu 1991; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1995). However, if we accept Loïc Wacquant's characterization of Bourdieu's whole production "as a materialist anthropology of the specific contribution that various forms of symbolic violence make to the reproduction of structures of domination", we can at least say that the theoretical roots of Bourdieu's conception should be searched rather in the sociology of conflict and structuralist tradition than in the sociology of integration and functionalism. Putnam's idea of social capital deals with collective values and societal integration, whereas Bourdieu's approach is made from the point of view of actors engaged in struggle in pursuit of their interests.

This is how Bourdieu ties together - even though not without problems - the most central of his concepts, habitus and conflict:

"I developed the concept of 'habitus' to incorporate the objective structures of society and the subjective role of agents within it. The habitus is a set of dispositions, reflexes and forms of behavior people acquire through acting in society. It reflects the different positions people have in society, for example, whether they are brought up in a middle-class environment or in a working-class suburb. It is part of how society produces itself. But there is also change. Conflict is built into society. People can find that their expectations and ways of living are suddenly out of step with the new social position they find themselves in... Then the question of social agency and political intervention becomes very important" (Bourdieu 2000, 19).

Bourdieu's formulations leave plenty of room for different interpretations: at one extreme he has been presented as representing a reductionist idea of the actor. On the other hand, he has been seen as a proponent of a constructivist idea of actors making their own choices and their own history, even though they are not totally free and do not employ the categories of thought of their own choice.

In the following pages I will try to show how the points of departure expressed in the citation manifest themselves in Bourdieu's concept of social and symbolic capital, and in the way he deals with the problem of symbolic power and universal (or general) values; and especially with the problem of disinterested action.

Fields and forms of capital

One of the theoretical cornerstones of Bourdieu's sociology is the idea of society as a plurality of social fields. Forms of capital (economic, cultural and social) are the core factors defining positions and possibilities of the various actors in any field. Each social field has a profile of its own, depending on the proportionate importance within it of each of the forms of capital. The forms of capital controlled by the various agents are trumps that define the chances of winning the stakes in the game.

"The field of power is a *field of forces* defined by the structure of the existing balance of forces between forms of power, or between different species of capital. It is also simultaneously a *field of struggles for power among the holders of different forms of power*. It is a space of play and competition in which social agents and institutions which all posses the determinate quantity of specific capital (economic and cultural capital in particular) sufficient to occupy the dominant positions within their respective fields [the economic field, the field of higher civil service or the state, the university field, and the intellectual field] confront one another in strategies aimed at preserving or transforming this balance of forces... This struggle for the imposition of the dominant principle leads, at every moment, to a balance in the sharing of power, that is, to what I call a *division of the work of domination.* It is also a struggle over the legitimate principle of legitimation and the legitimate mode of reproduction" (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1996, 76)

The main components of social resources whose control defines the social position of actors are economic, cultural and social capital (see Bourdieu 1986). Economic capital consists of capital in Marx's sense of the word, but also of other economic possessions that increase an actor's capacities in society. Cultural capital has three forms of existence. It exists, first, as incorporated in the habitus; and is to a large extent created through primary pedagogy, that is, in (early) childhood. Second, cultural capital is objectivized in cultural articles. Third, it also exists institutionalized in cultural institutions and is expressed in terms of certificates, diplomas and examinations (see Bourdieu 1977; 1979; Bourdieu & Passeron 1977).

Finally social capital is

"l'ensemble des ressources actuelles ou potentielles qui sont liées à la possession d'un *réseau durable de relations* plus ou moins institutionnalisées d'interconnaissance et d'interreconnaissance; ou, en d'autres termes, à *l'appartenance à un groupe*, comme ensemble d'agents qui ne sont pas seulement dotés de propriétés communes ... mais sont aussi unis par des *liaisons* permanentes et utiles (Bourdieu 1980, 2).

Social capital thus has two components: it is, first, a resource that is connected with *group membership and social networks*. "The volume of social capital possessed by a given agent ... depends on the size of the network of connections that he can effectively mobilize" (Bourdieu 1986, 249). It is a quality produced by the totality of the relationships between actors, rather than merely a common "quality"

of the group (Bourdieu 1980, 2). Membership in groups, and involvement in the social networks developing within these and in the social relations arising from the membership can be utilized in efforts to improve the social position of the actors in a variety of different fields. Voluntary associations, trade unions, political parties, secret societies (cf. the freemasons) are modern examples of embodiments of social capital. Differences in the control of social capital may explain why the same amount of economic and cultural capital can yield different degrees of profit, and different powers of influence to different actors. Group memberships creating social capital have a "multiplication effect" on the influence of other forms of capital (see Bourdieu 1986; Joppke 1987; cf. Coleman 1988).

Voluntary associations as social capital can be understood as resources produced by the association as a collective and shared by its members. In this way, social capital for Bourdieu is a collective phenomenon, even though it is viewed from the perspective of actors who are exploiting its potentialities. Bureaucratic organization is an effective administrative tool in concentrating social capital and transforming quantity (number of members) to quality (organizational effectiveness). The formation of an association can create a sense of solidarity among a mass of persons, it gives a "name", institutionalizes the capital that is being accumulated. The economic, social and symbolic "profit" that follows from belonging to the association establishes a concrete base for the growth of solidarity. From this perspective, the formation of a voluntary association can (also) be seen as collective and individual strategies of investment aimed at the creation of permanent networks of relations that will make possible the accumulation of social capital (Bourdieu 1986). This social capital accumulated in voluntary associations can be delegated, and thus represented by the leadership of the association; and some part of it even spreads out to rank-and-file members (see Bourdieu 1980, 3; 1986, 251). The development of social networks is dependent both on individual subjective feeling (recognition, respect, and communality) and on the institutional guarantees afforded by the organization.

The second characteristic of social capital is that it is based on mutual cognition and recognition (see Bourdieu (1980; 1986; 1998a). This is how it acquires a *symbolic character*, and is transformed into symbolic capital (1986). In order to become effective, social capital, "objective" differences between groups or classes have to be transformed into symbolic differences and classifications that make possible symbolic recognition and distinction. Social classes implicated by the distribution of economic, cultural and social capital are only "classes on paper", that is, only potentialities, unless they are transformed into meaningful differences, mediated by symbolic capital (see Bourdieu 1985). "Symbolic capital ... is nothing other than capital, in whatever form, when perceived by an agent endowed with

categories of perception arising from the internalization (embodiment) of the structure of its distribution, i.e. when it is known and recognized as self-evident" (Bourdieu 1985, 204). As symbolic capital, distinctions are "the product of the internalization of the structures to which they are applied" (op.cit. 204).

Bourdieu draws a parallel between the concept of symbolic capital and legitimate capital; because it is symbolic capital that defines what forms and uses of capital are recognized as legitimate bases of social positions in a given society. The effectiveness of symbolic capital depends on real practices of communication. In that respect symbolic capital cannot be institutionalized, objectified or incorporated into the habitus. It exists and grows only in intersubjective reflection and can be recognized only there. Economic and cultural capital have their own modes of existence (money, shares; examinations and diplomas); whereas symbolic capital exist only in the "eyes of the others". It inevitably assumes an ideological function: it gives the legitimized forms of distinction and classification a taken-for-granted character, and thus conceals the arbitrary way in which the forms of capital are distributed among individuals in society (see Bourdieu 1986; 1987; 1998a; Joppke 1987, 60).

Symbolic power and "trust" or "capital of recognition"

Trust is not a concept in Bourdieu's sociological vocabulary. Therefore I do not claim that the following represents Bourdieu's authentic views on trust. I am instead trying to locate Putnam's concept of trust within Bourdieu's theoretical co-ordinates, in order to see what it might look like from his point of view. Bourdieu comes closest to the Putnamian concept of trust when he speaks of the "capital of recognition"; the "universal" as the "object of universal recognition"; the "sacrifice of selfish (especially economic) interests that is recognized as legitimate and of "universal values" (virtue); and of all of these as potential euphemisms in the symbolic uses of power (see Bourdieu 1998a; 1998b; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1996). Ideas about "brave reciprocity" and "generalized reciprocity" can be contrasted with Bourdieu's ideas about the (im)possibility of disinterested action, participation in games (the concept of interest and illusion) and the exchange of gifts.

With a slight exaggeration of the differences between Putnam's and Bourdieu's ideas we can formulate a Bourdieuan concept of trust: trust can be understood as a universalized value (virtue) posited as the basis of voluntary, disinterested action and exchange (or interaction). However, in the last analysis, the universal character of trust can be questioned and - as a rule - revealed as a euphemism concealing the hidden, but underlying specific interests of the powerful.

As stated above, Bourdieu's idea is that economic, cultural, and social capital becomes meaningful and socially effective only through the process of symbolic translation. That is why symbolic power, the power to make different entities exist by symbolic categorizing becomes decisively important within the total system of power. Knowledge of the social world becomes the object of political and ideological struggles. Influencing the categories and distinctions through which the world is perceived becomes a major way in changing (or conserving) the social world. It is by seeing things in the legitimate way that the implicit can be made explicit, and potential groups transformed into actual groups (Bourdieu 1985, 202-203).

The use of symbolic power is successful when prevailing "objective" structures are perceived by actors with the help of categories that are the products the same objective structures. This would result in the most absolute recognition of legitimacy; because everyday life is apprehended as self-evident (the quasi-perfect coincidence of objective and embodied structures) (1985, 204). "Symbolic violence... is the *violence which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity...* I call *misrecognition* the fact of recognizing a violence which is wielded precisely inasmuch as one does not perceive it as such" (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1996, 167-168).

The roots or sources of symbolic capital can be almost anywhere, its central criterion is that actors perceive and recognize its existence. In Bourdieu's conception of symbolic power it is important to pay attention to those authorities in whose hands the symbolic capital is concentrated. In modern western democracies the state is the field in which struggles for the monopoly of legitimate symbolic power are (or were?) fought. The modern state has been a kind of super-agent that combines the struggles over legitimate power taking place in different fields. The modern state holds not only the monopoly of physical violence but also, above all, the "*monopoly of legitimate symbolic violence*, i.e., the power to constitute and to impose as *universally applicable* within a given "nation".... a common set of coercive norms" (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1996, 112). This stresses the importance of school and other institutions of socialization in the system of symbolic power.

Symbolic power or violence is also involved in the politics of universal values.

"*Illusio* is in the fact of being interested in the game, of taking the game seriously. *Illusio* is the fact of being caught up in and by the game, of believing the game is "worth the candle," or, more simply, that playing is worth the effort. In fact, the word interest initially meant very precisely what I include under the notion of *illusio*, that is, the fact of attributing importance to a social game, the fact that what happens matters to those who are engaged in it, who are in the game. *Interest* is to "be there", to participate, to admit that the game is worth playing and that the stakes created in and through the fact of playing are worth pursuing; it is to recognize the game and to recognize its stakes... *(I)llusio* is the enchanted relation to a game that is the product of a relation of ontological complicity between mental structures and the objective structures of social space. That is what I meant in speaking about

interests: games which matter to you are important and interesting because they have been imposed and introduced in your mind, in your body, in a form called the feel for the game (Bourdieu 1998a, 76-77).

The notion of interest is opposed to that of disinterestedness, but also to that of indifference. One can be interested in a game (in the sense of not indifferent), while at the same time being disinterested. The disinterested person "does not see why they are playing," it's all the same to them.." (1998a, 76-77).

In discussing the problem of whether interests and universal values/trust are compatible in society, Bourdieu and Putnam share some formal and seemingly similar ideas. One of them - Putnam - seems to think that trust and interest conflict; the other - Bourdieu - that interest and universal values (virtue, capital of recognition) exclude each other. Putnam refuses to deal with interests or interest organizations (as representatives of amoral familism), Bourdieu doubts the possibility of disinterestedness and thus of generalized trust as a general value. In Putnam's approach interest organizations are left out of the study, but neither does he discuss the problems of those groups who do not have any associations of their own (for example, groups with too weak resources to found an association). Bourdieu's theoretical concepts make it possible to discuss the problem of how actors who do not have any interest at all in taking part in the games of modern democracy as expressed, for example, in people's decreasing participation in elections in many democracies (e.g. political apathy or conscious renunciation).

Bourdieu stresses the importance of historical and empirical examination of the problem of universal values and universal truth. All too often, he argues, it appears up that "in a certain field at a certain moment, the logic of the game is such that certain agents have an *interest* in the universal" (1991, 33). So, even behind universal values lurk the specific interests of certain groups. It is also quite often the case that different groups and classes take part in the game (or actually in several games played at the same time in the same field) but are actually playing (or imagine themselves to be playing) different games. Weber notices this when he speaks of the differences between upper-class and folk religions (see Weber 1976). Same kinds of difference can be discerned in the voluntary sector, or in the struggles over the future content of the so-called third sector. In these struggles, members of social movements and voluntary associations may have moral 'interests' in the game, whereas economic elites may be guided by 'rational' economic interests, counting the costs and benefits; and may appeal to universal values and use euphemisms to veil their basic interests.

Great moments for the system of symbolic power come as the lower classes accept euphemistic value banners suggested by social elites. This is what happens all the time in the name of globalization, if we are to believe Bourdieu (Bourdieu 1998b).

What about the great ideas of American pluralism and of the American political system, namely those of volunteering and voluntary action? How do they relate to Bourdieu's conception of universal values and the (im)possibility of disinterested action? What could Bourdieu's position be like on the problem of "brave reciprocity" rising from social interaction or exchange?

Bourdieu tries to overcome the juxtaposition of 'structuralism' and 'phenomenologism' (see Bourdieu & Wacquant 1996) or "economism" and "semiologism" (see Bourdieu 1980b) and solve dialectically the problem of the relationship between structural conditioning and actors' freedom of choice. Bourdieu's own solution is embodied in the concept of habitus. Bourdieu characterizes his own approach as *genetic structuralism* (Bourdieu 1991, 14). According to Bourdieu, the habitus develops through the internalization of the objective structures of the environment in the form of practices. Habitus forms a durable generative principle that guides the actor in his/her new choices between alternatives that are present in a certain conjuncture. Thus the habitus

"produces practices that tend to reproduce the regularities immanent in the objective conditions of the production of their generative principle, while adjusting to the demands inscribed as objective potentialities in the situation, as defined by the cognitive and motivating structures making up the habitus" (1977, 78).

Practices are the result of the co-influence of "objective structures" as manifested in the forms of prevailing alternatives at a certain moment in history, and the "subjective structures" inside the habitus, manifested as dispositions directing the choices of the actor toward alternatives that are homological with the structures that have produced the habitus (causalité du probable) (Bourdieu 1977; 1974). Bourdieu stresses that the habitus cannot be reduced to structures because it is born as practices. It is creative and thus the reproduction of social structures is never one-to-one reproduction but extended and creative reproduction directed by the habitus (Bourdieu 1977). Bourdieu does not deny the existence of "objective" structures and their influence on the formation of habitus;, which, for its part, becomes the structuring structure leading via practices to the development of new structures. It is easy to see the influence of Bourdieu's concept of habitus on Giddens' concept of the duality of structure (see Giddens 1985).

It is possible to accept Bourdieu's repeated protestations that he is not a structuralist. But it is also possible to make the opposite interpretation - with a little help from some bad will - and define Bourdieu as the prototype of a structuralist or reductionist (e.g., Alexander 1995, 128-202). It is easy to find citations from Bourdieu that echo structuralist tones. The strong emphasis placed by Bourdieu on the im-

portance of symbolic power and the difficulties of autonomous, genuine voluntary action make it easy to accuse Bourdieu of reductionism:

"Symbolic power relations tend to reproduce and to reinforce the power relations which constitute the structure of the social space. More concretely, the legitimation of the social order ... results from the fact that agents apply to the objective structures of the social world structures of perception and appreciation that have emerged from these objective structures and tend therefore to see the world as self-evident" (Bourdieu 1991, sit. Alexander 1995, 141).

If we take this citation in isolation from the context of Bourdieu's total production, we can accede to Alexander's accusation of reductionism. But it is also possible to take Bourdieu's claims seriously: to accept that he is only defining the conditions under which symbolic power is effective and successful in influencing actors' practices. And it is also possible to take to heart Bourdieu's brief remarks on the resistance of the dominated (e.g. Bourdieu & Passeron 1998, viii) and share Bourdieu's optimism - that has been growing, especially in the 1990s - concerning the possibility that actors, and actors' social movements will through knowledge and subsequent action, change the world (see Bourdieu & Wacquant 1996; Bourdieu 2000). It is also easy - with the help of a certain amount of goodwill - to find numerous of Bourdieu's formulations specifying the preconditions for the success of symbolic power in reproducing the dominant structures. Another thing is that Bourdieu's theoretical conception does not give much help if we want to analyze the processes of change caused by conflicting agents and movements. This is one of the limits of his approach. However, it seems that Bourdieu is more and more interested in the forces of change in his latest writings (cf. Bourdieu 1998b; 2000).

According to Bourdieu, habitus is not the fate of certain people, but "*an open system of dispositions* that is constantly subjected to experiences, and therefore constantly affected by them in a way that either reinforces or modifies its structures. It is durable but not eternal!" (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1996, 133). But in any case, it is something that preconditions the freedom - and voluntary character - of the actor's choices. And it is also something that we must take into account when we discuss the relation of Bourdieu's theorizations to the problem of generalized trust and altruism.

Further, Bourdieu's idea of society composed of different fields emphasizes the non-reductionist character of his sociology. As fields, all spaces within society are contested; and actors' positions within them have to be fought for continually. This is why Bourdieu does not accept either Althusser's concept of ideological state apparatuses or Luhmann's systems theory. Organizations (e.g.. voluntary associations) must also be understood as fields with their own stakes to be struggled for not as systemic structures (see Bourdieu & Wacquant 1996, 102-104).

We can at least say that Bourdieu is very skeptical with respect to altruistic action that is (at the same time) free of any specific interest of the actor. This gives his position a coloring that is almost dramatically opposed to Putnam's romantic idea of generalized trust. Bourdieu tries to define the situation that makes disinterestedness possible: "If the disinterestedness is sociologically possible, it can be so only through the encounter between habitus predisposed to disinterestedness and universes in which disinterestedness in rewarded" (Bourdieu 1998a, 88). Volunteering is one of the fields dominated by the universal values of altruism and disinterestedness. In a skeptical (or to some extent even cynical) spirit we can say that private interests can be concealed as universal at least in two ways in the "non-profit" or "voluntary sector". First, those who volunteer or are said to behave altruistically can simply try to present the necessary as universal. Second, the interests and calculations of the powerful (for example efforts to cut public spending by demolishing welfare state services) can be presented under positive banners such as flexibility, subsidiary principle, or communality. When individuals can rise above their narrow interests and show that they have adopted the position of the community, the community interprets this as a recognition of collective values. The community will reward this kind of action by affording profit of universalization to the actors in question (Bourdieu 1991, 88).

Bourdieu speaks about the triumph of the universal when such worlds are favored which recognize - at least in words - universal values as virtue. Then why not also trust? This is how Bourdieu sees the impact of universal values on development (cf. Putnam's conception of trust): "The profit of universalization is undoubtedly one of the historical engines of the progress of the universal. This is because it favors the creation of universes where universal values (reason, virtue, etc.) are at least verbally recognized and wherein operates a circular process of mutual reinforcement of the strategies of universalization seeking to obtain the profits (if only negative) associated with conformity to universal rules and to the structures of those universes officially devoted to the universal" (Bourdieu 1998a, 60). The triumph of virtue carries forward the progress of the universal. It presupposes the recognition of the universal, i.e. the primacy of the group and general interests with respect to the individual actor. Putnam seems to believe that the development of generalized trust means that actors really can rise above their specific interests; whereas Bourdieu thinks that "universal values are particular, universalized values, which are thus subject to suspicion (universal culture is the culture of the dominants...)" (Bourdieu op.cit, 90). What values will become universal values will decided in the struggles taking place in different fields of society, that is, through social conflicts.

If we want to follow the lines that are implicit in Bourdieu's ideas about the (im)possibility of disinterested action, we can, for example, have a look at the development of the third sector as a field of symbolic struggle (see Siisiäinen 2000). The disinterested sacrifice of - mostly female - volunteers could serve as an example of following the logic of universal values. This would accord with the notion of the dominant structure of symbolic capital if the increase in volunteering in the third sector were to prove to correlate with the reduction of the welfare services provided by the state and - for example - with the lowering of the taxation of capital incomes. This kind of system would also hide all traces of the pattern of gift exchange that can be a component in many forms of volunteering. In a system of symbolic power, gift exchange is covered by universalizing strategies denying the interestedness of the parties to the exchange. The total structure of exchange gains autonomy from conscious individual choices. Gift givers and receivers "collaborate, without knowing it, in a work of dissimulation tending to deny the truth of exchange, the exchange of exact equivalent, which represents the destruction of the exchange of gifts" (1998a, 94). The task of sociology is to reveal this double sidedness of exchange as a combination of objective and subjective truth. This is where sociology enters the field of struggles - for example - over the third sector, and becomes a part of the struggle over the principles of its construction (see Siisiäinen 2000).

Social problems as sociological problems in Putnam and Bourdieu

The differences between Putnam's and Bourdieu's theoretical approaches are clearly revealed when they are adopted in dealing with concrete problems of society. I have selected Putnam's widely-known article "Bowling alone: American Declining Social Capital" (1995) and the collection of Bourdieu's writings "Acts of Resistance. Against the New Myths of Our Time" (1998b) as my data to show the differences.

In both publications, current social problems are examined in a critical way (e.g. family violence, alienation caused by unemployment and the breaking down of communities, drugs). Putnam is worried - most of all - about the decline of the heart of American civil society, the social capital. Voting activity is going down, distrust of the government has risen in 20 years from 30 to 75% (in 1992). With minor exceptions, membership figures in traditional American voluntary associations (the Red Cross, PTAs, the Lions etc.), in trade unions and religious associations have fallen steadily. And that is not all. The bastions of social capital, the family and the neighborhood, have been through hard times: neither the nuclear nor the extended family is any longer a stronghold of mutual togetherness, and social intercourse between neighbors (e.g. visits) has declined. Therefore it is no wonder that the

proportion of Americans trusting their fellow-citizens decreased from 58 % in 1960 to 37 % in 1993. As civic activity and trust go hand in hand, Putnam concludes that American social capital has been declining for the last 30 years on a wide front.

Putnam identifies four factors behind the decline of social capital in the USA. First, the increasing presence of women in the labor force has lessened the time that is available for building social capital in families, and the resources that this needs. The second factor destroying social capital is social mobility and the rootlessness that follows it (cf. Coleman 1988). The third factor is caused by demographic changes (increase in divorces, decrease in the average number of children per family, decline of real incomes). Especially fatal for the maintenance of social capital is the worsening of the preconditions of middle- class parenthood; because the middle class has traditionally been responsible for the accumulation of social capital in America. Finally, Putnam blames the technological changes that are responsible for the privatization or individualization of leisure. The main obstacle for the construction of social capital during free time is, however, television and its supremacy in the competition over the uses of leisure (Putnam 1995, 74-75).

Putnam also lists measures for improving the preconditions for the deve-lopment of social capital. These include research, the examination of co-effects of macro structures, and putting an end to developments, that were discussed above. As to the development of the third, or voluntary sector, it is interesting to see how Putnam understands the (real or possible) impact of the welfare state – or, in his terms, of public policy - on the formation of social capital. According to Putnam, it is well known that in some instances "public policy has destroyed highly effective social networks and norms. American slum-clearance policy of the 1950s and 1960s, for example, renovated physical capital, but at a very high cost to existing social capital" (1995, 76-77)[2]. On the other hand improving the conditions of schools and charity associations has had a positive effect on social-capital accumulation (op.cit 77).

This discussion, unfortunately, is left on a tentative level compared to the theorizations in "Making Democracy Work". There are some ideas in "Bowling alone" that are inconsistent with the ideas to be found in "Making Democracy work" about the direction of causal relations between the economy, government and social capital. Because the ideas in the book are more profoundly developed, they are the basis for regarding Putnam as a romantic functionalist and pluralist.

Bourdieu's ideas as to the sources and causes of current social problems can be reconstructed by reading his book "Acts of Resistance. Against the New Myths of

---

[2] It is very easy to see the kinship between these ideas and those of many American communitarianists (see e.g. Cohen 1999; Siisiäinen 2000).

Our Time" (1998b). In it Bourdieu wages his war against the negative consequences of globalization - as he understands them - and its main ideology or grand narrative, neo-liberalism. His goal is to analyze and dismantle the myth of neo-liberalism and the euphemisms employed in its construction. Globalization means the birth of a global economy proper, and this system manifests itself in the form of the alleged necessities that different national economies and states are facing at present. Neo-liberalism is the grand narrative of globalization. In public discourses globalization is presented as a mythic inevitability forcing national economies and states to take certain actions. The dominant discourse claims that there are no alternatives to the prevailing development, which is why people take many presuppositions for granted (maximum growth; rising productivity and competitiveness as the ultimate goals of human actions; and the idea that economic forces cannot be resisted) (1998b, 30-31). This *doxa* appears in disguise of euphemisms such as flexibility ("souplesse"); deregulation, corporate trust etc.

Bourdieu's position to the modern state is twofold: first, in his published works throughout the period of 1970s, 1980s and 1990s he speaks of the state as a fountain or super-agent of the symbolic violence that guarantees the system of dominant symbolic power with the help of the monopoly of symbolic classification and categorization; especially in the educational system (e.g. 1996; 1998a). On the other hand, in "Acts of Resistance" he speaks of the ambiguous character of the state: the European welfare state is also a guarantor of social the functions of welfare and human rights such as education, health and social security (1998b, 33-34). The European welfare state can thus also be understood as a kind of compromise, which includes the historical achievements of social movements (e.g. welfare rights).

The myth of globalization is "the main weapon in the battles against the gains of the welfare state.... And it is in the name of this model (pitting European workers against the workers in the rest of the world/MS) that flexible working, another magic word of neo-liberalism, is imposed, meaning night work, weekend work, irregular working hours, things which have always been part of employers' dreams" (1998b, 34). "Conservative revolutions" are dressed up in all the signs of modernity, and present themselves as progressive developments in the name of liberalism. Their consequences can be felt in different spheres of society (such as increasing insecurity, a feeling of distress, lost jobs, suffering, sickness, suicide, alcoholism, drug addiction, domestic violence etc.) (1998b, 36-39). These are all problems that capture the attention of American communitarians and Putnamians as well.

Bourdieu asks for a sociology that would be prepared to take part in a critical venture to develop "economics of happiness" which - in contrast to narrow, short-term economics, "would take note of all the profits, individual and collective,

material and symbolic, associated with activity (such as security), and also all the material and symbolic costs associated with inactivity or precarious employment" (op. cit. 40). After discussing the ambiguous character of the welfare state, Bourdieu draws the following conclusion: "I think that the dominated groups in society have an interest in defending the state, particularly its social aspect" (1998b, 41).

One of the euphemisms developed by social forces that would like to demolish the welfare state is the concept of competence (and the ideology of competence that has been constructed around the concept) which extends the ideas of social neo-Darwinism. In Bourdieu's words, the "ideology of competence serves very well to justify an opposition which is rather like that between masters and slaves. On the one hand there are full citizens who have very rare and overpaid capacities and activities ..... , and then, on the other side, there is a great mass of people condemned to borderline jobs or unemployment" (1998b, 42-43). Competence is in Bourdieu's view the heart of a "sociodicy" that provides justification for the dominant groups' privileges, and which is accepted by the dominated. The structure of inequality is given ethical and intellectual justification at the same time with the help of the ideology of competence: "The poor are not just immoral, alcoholic and degenerate, they are stupid, they lack intelligence" (1998b, 43). The existence of an excluded and under-privileged group, with all the problems consequent upon this, is thus indirectly legitimized.

Conclusion: Putnam or/and Bourdieu

Thus Bourdieu and Putnam van be seen to carry on, and develop further, the ideas of two opposing sociological traditions and apply these ideas to current problems of civil society. Putnam's work preserves many of the ideas of the sociology of integration. His concepts of social capital and trust are directed to questions about mechanisms that strengthen the integration of the values of society, and solidarity and togetherness; and that create consensus and sustain the stable development of society (moving equilibrium). As already noted, it is difficult to deal with conflicts or opposing interests using Putnam's approach.

Bourdieu's main theoretical interests are in the examination of social conflicts or struggles about the stakes in different fields; forms of power/violence; and forms of domination (Herrschaft) and deprivation. Trust - in the Putnamian sense of the word - has no place in Bourdieu's theorization. In those areas where the two approaches overlap (e.g.. social exchange, recognition/trust), the visual angles adopted are almost oppositional.

These different points of departure create a kind of theoretical "path de-pendence": "where you can get to depends on where you are coming from, and some destinations you simply cannot get to from here" (Putnam 1993, 179). From the Putnamian theoretical perspective, conflicts fall outside the process of consensus and integration; social struggles are interpreted as expressions of amoral familism, or of differences connected with the uneven exchange between regions (e.g. Northern and Southern Italy) or between social groups. Many developers of the American theory of pluralism also took into account specific interests, discussed the problem of non-organized or "potential" interests, and saw "the flaw of the pluralist heaven" (Schattschneider); whereas Putnam operates theoretically on the level of societal consensus, deals mainly with organized interests (voluntary associations), and selects his concepts from the corresponding points of view.

Bourdieu for his part excludes from his theory even the idea of 'genuine' consensus and universal values whose central function is to maintain it in everyday practices. Thus it is easy - in fact too easy - to say that because Bourdieu is not talking about trust leading to consensus on the societal level, it is justified to ignore his ideas in any theoretical discussion in which social capital is assumed to be based on trust. This is exactly what many students of trust/social capital do. It happens all too often that his ideas are rejected after receiving only a brief mention (cf. Newton 1999; Misztal 1996) or to ignore them totally (e.g. Seligman 1997; Govier 1997; Putnam 1993). This underlines the narrow perspective of Putnam's theories.

In the last analysis, the choice between Putnam and Bourdieu depends; first, on what problems we are interested in and, second, on our position concerning the dispute between the sociology of integration and the sociology of conflict. Trust and voluntary associations create consensus and economic welfare in Putnam's approach on the condition that the specific interests of certain groups and conflicts between them are cancelled out. Bourdieu's sociological focus is on the conflictual fields, including the inside working of voluntary associations, and on the structures of power and violence that are produced and reproduced/destroyed by agents who have an interest in the game that is played in the field in question.

However, it can be argued that it is possible to see Bourdieu's ideas about the centrality of conflicts as part and parcel of creating a theory of the preconditions (or impossibility) of social consensus or hegemony. But in this case, we need critical theoretical tools to be able to analyze both the opportunity structures improving the creation of consensus and the obstacles to the development of the "ideal speech situation". The stability of a system which includes conflicts needs trust, because "the best point to manage conflict is before it starts" (Schattschneider 1960, 15). Universal values such as trust can only be understood as ideal types without real equivalents. Bourdieu's concepts of the forms of capital and symbolic violence, on

the other hand, are needed for an analysis of the obstacles preventing the realization of the ideal type of "ideal speech situation".

References

Alexander, Jeffrey: Fin de Siécle Social Theory. London: Verso 1995.

Alexander, Jeffrey: Modern, Anti, Post, and Neo: How Social theories Have Tried to Understand the "New World" of "Our Time". Zeitschrift für Soziologie Jg. 23 (1994) 3, p. 165-197.

Bentley, A.F.: The Process of Government. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1908.

Bourdieu, Pierre: Acts of Resistance. Against the New Myths of Our Time. (Transl. by Richard Nice). Cambridge: Polity 1998b.

Bourdieu, Pierre: Avenir de classe et causalité du probable. Revue Française de Sociologie 15 (1974) 3, 3-42.

Bourdieu, Pierre: Choses Dites. Paris: Minuit 1987).

Bourdieu, Pierre: In Other Words: Essays Toward a Reflexive Sociology. Cambridge: Polity 1991.

Bourdieu, Pierre: La distinction - critique sociale du jugement. Paris: Minuit 1979.

Bourdieu, Pierre: Le capital social. Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales 31 (1980), 2-3

Bourdieu, Pierre: Le sens pratique. Paris: Minuit 1980b.

Bourdieu, Pierre: Outline of a Theory of Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press 1977.

Bourdieu, Pierre: Practical Reason. On the Theory of Action. Cambridge: Polity 1998a.

Bourdieu, Pierre: The forms of capital. In: John G. Richardson (ed.): Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. New York: Greenwood Press 1986, s. 241-258.

Bourdieu, Pierre: The politics of protest. An interview by Kevin Ovenden. Socialist Review Nr. 242 (2000), p.18-20.

Bourdieu, Pierre: The social space and the genesis of groups. Social Science Information 24 (1985b) 2, 195-220.

Bourdieu, Pierre & Passeron, Jean-Claude: Academic order and social order. Preface to the 1990 Edition. In: Bourdieu, Pierre & Passeron, Jean-Claude: Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. London: SAGE 1998, vii-xi.

Bourdieu, Pierre & Passeron, Jean-Claude: Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. London: SAGE 1977.

Bourdieu Pierre & Wacquant Loïc: An Invitation to reflexive sociology. Cambridge: Polity 1996.

Cohen, Jean: Trust, voluntary associations and workable democracy: the

Coleman, James S.: Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal of Sociology, vol. 94 (1988) Supplement, 95-120. contemporary American discourse of civil society. In: Mark E. Warren (ed.): Democracy and Trust. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999, 208-248.

Giddens, A.: Yhteiskuntateorian keskeisiä ongelmia. Helsinki: Otava 1985.

Govier, Trudy: Social trust and Human Communities. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Gueen's University Press 1997.

Inglehart, Ronald: Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1997.

Inglehart, Ronald: Trust, well-being and democracy. In: Mark E. Warren (ed.): Democracy and Trust. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999, 88-120.

Jessop, Bob: Accumulation, state forms, and hegemonic project. Kapitalistate 10/11 (1983), 89-112.

Joppke, C.: The cultural dimensions of class formation and class struggle: on the social theory of Pierre Bourdieu. Berkeley Journal of Sociology 21 (1987), p. 53-78.

Luhmann, Niklas: Familiarity, confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives. In: Diego Gambetta (ed.): Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative relations. Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1988, 94-107.

Luhmann, Niklas: Soziologie des Risikos. Berlin: de Gruyter 1991.

Misztal, Barbara A.: Trust in Modern Societies. The Search for the Bases of Social Order. Cambridge: Polity 1997.

Mouritsen, Per: What's the Civil in Civil Society? Robert Putnam's Republicanism and Italy. Aarhus: Department of Political Science, Aarhus University 1999.

Newton, Kenneth: Social capital and democracy in modern Europe. In: Jan Van Dept & Marco Maraffi & Kenneth Newton & Paul Whiteley (eds.): Social Capital and European Democracy. London and New York: Routledge 1999 (p. 3-24)

Putnam, Robert D.: Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. Journal of Democracy Vol. 6 (1995) 1, 64-78.

Putnam, Robert D.: Making democracy work. Civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1993

Richter, Rudolf: Soziokulturelle Dimensionen freiwilliger Vereinigungen. München: Beiträge zur Kommunalwissenchaft 1985.

Schattschneider, E.E.: The Semi-sovereign People. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston 1960.

Seligman, Adam: The problem of trust. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1997.

Seligman, Adam: Trust and Generalized Exchange. Paper presented at the Summer School, University of Jyväskylä, 1999.

Shapiro, Michael J.: Bowling Blind: Post Liberal Civil Society and the Worlds of Neo-Tocquevillean Social Theory. http//www.press.jhu.edu. journals/theory _&_ event/v0011/1shapiro.html

Siisiäinen. Martti: Gamla sociala kitt i upplösning - föreningverksamhetens uppgång och fall. Teoksessa Kurt Klaudi Klausen & Per Selle (Red.): Frivillig organisering i Norden. Oslo: Tano og Jurist- & Økonomieforbundets Forlag 1995, p. 96-114.

Siisiäinen, Martti: Intressit, yhdistyslaitos ja poliittisen järjestelmän vakaisuus. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research 57. Jyväskylä, Jyväskylän yliopisto 1986.

Siisiäinen, Martti: Organizations and the struggle about classes. Jyväskylä: Publications of the Department of Sociology 38, University of Jyväskylä 1987.

Siisiäinen, Martti: Social capital, power and the third sector. In: Martti Siisiäinen & Petri Kinnunen & Elina Hietanen (eds.): The Third Sector in Finland. Helsinki: STKL 2000, p. 3-25.

Siisiäinen, Martti: Social movements, voluntary associations and the development of the welfare state in Finland. International Review of Administrative Sciences Vol. 60 (1994) 2, 249-269.

Siisiäinen, Martti: Voluntary Associations and Social Capital in Finland. In: Jan Van Dept & Marco Maraffi & Ken Newton & Paul Whiteley (eds.): Social Capital and European Democracy. London and New York: Routledge 1999 , p. 120-143.

Siisiäinen, Martti: Voluntary Associations and the Theory of Autopoietic Systems. Paper presented at the 14th World Congress of Sociology, WG01, Session Dealing with Complexity, Montreal 28.7.1998.

Tenbruch, F. & Ruoff, W.: Modernisierung - Vergesellschaftung - Gruppenbildung - Vereinswesen. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft 25 (19869, 263-285.

Tocqueville, Alexis de: Democracy in America I-II. New York Alfred A. Knopf 1951.

Truman, D.B.: The Governmental Process. New York: Alfred A. Knopf 1951.

Van Dept, Jan & Maraffi, Marco & Newton, Kenneth & Whiteley, Paul (eds.): Social Capital and European Democracy. London and New York: Routledge 1999

Warren, Mark E.: Democratic theory and trust. Mark E. Warren (ed.): Democracy and Trust. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999, 346-260.

Weber, Max: Geschäftsbericht. In: Verhandlungen des ersten deutschen Soziologentages vom 19.-22. Oktober. Tübingen 1911, 39-61.

Weber, Max: Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Tübingen: J.B.C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1976.