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Introduction

The term “social capital” brings together two seemingly incompatible terms. Human sociability is combined with economic capital. An internal feature of human behavior is paired with an external resource. In this respect, the term “social capital” is comparable to paradoxical terms like “friendly stone” or “human machine”.¹ The latter, the human machine, aptly serves as an example for a semantic synthesis of opposites that cuts both ways. On the one hand, if this term is used to describe a machine, the machine appears humanized; on the other hand, if it is used to describe a person, the person appears technicized. We can transfer this dual effect to the term “social capital”: On the one hand, capital itself appears more social (socialized), when combined with sociability – there is a warm glow to it. On the other hand, the social, thus conceived, is reduced to a mere economic function. These linguistic effects are quite powerful both in theory and practice.

Social capital may be acknowledged as another form of capital apart from economic capital, or as another form of sociability in addition to common social relations. In this collection, these cross-purposes are analyzed and assessed from different interdisciplinary angles. The papers collected in this volume take the tensions contained and concealed in the term “social capital” seriously. The disciplines committed to this task and represented in this volume are economics, sociology, philosophy, and religious studies.

The title “Social Capital, Social Identities” hints at the fact that personal identity transcends an individualistic framework, in which social relations are viewed through the lens of individual interests and benefits only. If identity is “social” from the outset, the independent stance of individuals maximizing their utility and increasing their capital is shattered. The subtitle of this collection “From Ownership to Belonging” opens up a dynamic perspective and suggests that we are well advised to overcome a narrow understanding of social capital based on individual entitlements and ambitions. While revising the notion of social capital, we are prompted to undertake a rapprochement between social capital and the vocabulary of sociability developed in social theory and philosophy at large. This vocabulary includes concepts like belonging, reciprocity, embeddedness, membership, fellow-feeling, attachment, trust, cooperation, the ce-

¹ In his paper, Hans Bernhard Schmid stresses the paradox of social capital – and prescends: “Social capital brings evil into the world.”
Franz Schultheis

Social Capital and Power: A Sociological Point of View

The Two Faces of Social Capital

In contemporary political or economic sciences, reference is most generally made to the works of Robert D. Putnam (1992) when dealing with the notion of social capital. His well-known concept of social capital has essentially three components:

- social networks
- moral obligations and norms
- and last but not least social values.

In this kind of functionalist perspective on social reality, social capital is looked upon as a central condition of social integration and cohesion, economic success and the well-being of nations. And if countries or regions have successful economic systems and a high level of political integration among their populations, these are seen as the results of a high degree of accumulated social capital. This point of view is shared by many researchers and institutions, but there is an older concept of social capital, developed by Pierre Bourdieu in the late 1970s, which gives this notion quite different theoretical connotations and orientations. His idea of social capital was nourished by his ethnographic fieldwork in Algeria at the end of the 1950s and is deeply rooted in a sociological vision of social and economic relationships as being largely based on power, domination, inequalities and class structures.

As in other cases, it seems that the meaning of notions depends on the way of looking at them. For example, if you look at the well-known figure, you might see at one point a sort of cup, symbolizing in a certain way ideas of social integration and inclusion, but at second glance you will perceive two figures in a face-to-face position which could be much more associated with the idea of opposition or conflict. In the case of social capital, one could say that the Putnam paradigm is focused on the sum total, or what we could call by analogy the "gross national product of social capital" as a whole, whereas Bourdieu seeks the organic composition he wants to know specifically how and by whom these goods and values are produced, and how they are redistributed within society and its different social classes and categories of people. In this paper I will present some of the theoretical and empirical implications of Bourdieu's approach, which is very relevant in sociology, but often neglected in the economic...
and political sciences, and show its usefulness for understanding contemporary social and economic realities. I shall start with a look at everyday life and common sense ideas of social capital before turning to the academic point of view.

**Common sense visions of social capital**

One often hears the expression that he or she “has connections” or even “good connections”. One “plays” with these connections or makes skillful use of them (“capitalizes” on them). One might say that somebody “knows the right people”, “influential people”, “has a direct line to someone”, can “pull strings”, is part of an “old boys’ network”, “enjoys protection”, “has his/her sponsors” etc. One hears sentences like “X only got that job because of Y” or “A can only afford to do that because B is protecting him” and even in the school playground there is talk of the “big brother” who will take revenge on anyone who hits his younger brother. These are all popular turns of phrase or commonplaces which seem to point to a broad consensus that the social world is acquainted with forces which have a purely relational character, are unequally distributed, and bring advantages.

According to so-called common sense, such connections are worth their weight in gold and represent a privilege which, on the one hand, comes as a gift or just falls into one’s lap but, on the other hand, must also be worked for and maintained. We then say that we have to build, cultivate or sustain our connections, not let them fade, and if they have faded we must “revive” them again; we must invest in them and handle them gently. In brief: Everyday thinking sees in the phenomenon targeted by the concept of social capital a good which must be produced and reproduced, which can be accumulated and used with profit: in a nutshell – capital. At the same time anyone with common sense also knows that this good is not distributed in an equal way and is not available to everyone to the same degree. With regard to this resource people are more or less richly endowed and privileged. This inequality in terms of social capital can in turn provide the basis for the production or increase of further inequalities, e.g. regarding access to material goods (income, life chances, quality of life) or immaterial values (prestige, reputation, recognition).

We can therefore truly assert that the “common sense of social structure” (Goffman) sees in social capital a central factor determining social reality. Depending on the endowment with money and education one also seems to be endowed with more or less recognized social value (having a well-known name, coming from a good family etc.) and more or less privileged connections, and thanks to these connections one can in turn enjoy advantages over less well-en-dowed contemporaries with regard to access to specific scarce goods and life chances. But we also know that such “connections”, if we have them, can also be used purposefully to increase the two other central resources, or at least to optimize their effects.

**Pierre Bourdieu’s approach to social capital**

Let us turn now to Bourdieu’s vision of social capital. First we have to remember that Bourdieu imported the concept of capital into sociological theory in order to enlarge its semantic field to include other important fields such as cultural goods or social relationships. Bourdieu identifies especially three types of capital closely interrelated with the existence of social classes and the unequal distribution of goods and resources of all kinds: economic, cultural and social capital. All three of them represent what Max Weber called “life chances” (Lebenschancen) and we could also call them resources of action and resources for action, in other words social power. Although Bourdieu agrees that economic capital is the most important and powerful resource and that the other types of capital mostly derive from it, he nevertheless tries to avoid reducing the value of cultural and social capital by insisting on the relative autonomy of both, as we will see later on. Let’s see now how Bourdieu (1983, p. 87) defines social capital:

Social capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership of a group – which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectively-owned capital, a ‘credential’ which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word [...]. The volume of the social capital possessed by a given agent [...] depends on the size of the network of connections he can effectively mobilize and on the volume of the capital (economic, cultural or symbolic) possessed in his own right by each of those to whom he is connected.

By using notions like “capital”, “interest” or “credit” differently and often in a voluntarily paradoxical way, Bourdieu wants to stress the social and symbolic embeddedness of economic facts, as Marcel Mauss did before him in his famous essay “The Gift”, in which he spoke of a gift as a total social fact. Like Marcel Mauss, Bourdieu developed his theory of social capital in the context of traditional societies before transporting it into modernity and to contemporary societies. This means that we are dealing with a double process of exportation and importation: Bourdieu first takes notions that are historically embedded in modern capitalist societies, such as “capital” or “interest”, to pre-modern societies with an anti-economist ethical order in the sense of Max Weber’s idea of frater-
nal ethics. Then Bourdieu describes and analyses the logic of social exchange and relations in those traditional societies by means of the imported modern concepts. In this manner the signification of these notions changes fundamentally by being interrelated with the principles of honor and the obligation of gift-giving and generosity. At this point we have to ask what theoretical status Bourdieu accords to his notion and why it may seem useful to speak of social capital? Are we dealing with a simple analogy or metaphor or, on the contrary, with a systematically conceived and well-founded theoretical concept?

There are at least four different arguments in favor of this kind of enlarged use of the notion of capital. So let us ask: What is the “capital” in social capital?

- Social capital can be used in the production of material and symbolic goods of all kinds.
- On the other hand, social capital itself has to be produced, in contrast to natural resources like geographical location, water power or minerals. It is accumulated collective work and can be passed on as a legacy from one generation to the other.
- Unlike raw materials, social capital is not directly used up in the process of producing goods. But it can be eroded and weakened during the process of producing goods; it has to be reproduced and regenerated by new investments of time and energy (work).
- Social capital can be “reconverted” into economic capital, for example by offering access to life chances or job opportunities found with the help of one’s relatives or friends or into cultural capital by paying the costs of prominent universities.

So we can say that social capital, like other sorts of capital, is produced by collective work and effort; it can be accumulated and reproduced, it may be inherited by one generation from another, it can be incorporated as a sort of subjective quality of individuals and private property, but it also exists at the same time objectively as an essential part of the structures of the social world. Within the objective structures of the social world, it often seems as if economic capital has the most important impact and role and all other kinds of resources and capital derive from it in a direct way. Bourdieu wouldn’t agree: in his theoretical perspective, each sort of capital has a certain autonomy and cannot simply be a function of another type. So we have to underline the genuine “sociality” of social capital.

The ambivalent relation between economic and social capital

Social capital can be derived from economic capital. The transformation from one form of capital to the other is never purely automatic, but requires “work” and effort. This kind of investment often shows benefits only in the long run. Social capital is not simply and entirely reducible to economic capital. It has its own specificity. Even if economic capital is principally at its root, there are specific rules and norms of behavior regulating its production.

A very important specificity of the logic of social capital seems to be that you first have to give without asking an immediate return on your input and that there is always a degree of uncertainty, since a gift potentially may be accepted without being returned. The essential “rule of the social game” is that interactions and exchanges have to be represented as being non-interested, non-utilitarian and non-instrumental. The logic of the gift and the principle of generosity are still present and powerful in modern economic and social life. The economic bases of social capital even have to be masked in order to produce its effects. If the economic implications of social relations are too obvious (for example if one wants to “buy” friendship or to join a club exclusively in order to find new clients) the game does not work. Differences in the distribution of social capital may explain why the same amount of economic capital can yield different degrees of profit and different powers of influence to different agents. Group memberships creating social capital have a “multiplication effect” on the influence of other forms of capital. But even if there are important differences between the two types of capital, the analogies between them are much more important. In his different works, Bourdieu explains that the capacity of individuals to invest in the social networks in which they are involved depends largely on the economic capital they possess, their place in the social hierarchy and the power interrelated with their given social status. As economic capital, social capital is neither a kind of material treasure you conserve in your safe at home nor an amount of money lying dormant in an account at your bank. Individuals always have to work hard with their social capital in order to maintain, to reproduce or to improve it, as Bourdieu underlines when he says: “The reproduction of social capital presupposes an unceasing effort of sociability, continuous series of exchanges in which recognition is endlessly affirmed and reaffirmed” (1997, p. 52). In a certain way, Bourdieu’s theory of social capital seems to integrate all kinds of social relationships, including marriage, friendship, membership in clubs and associations, or our virtual e-relationships like MySpace. All kinds of social institutions, organizations and groups represent ac-
cumulated social capital and at the same time resources for social capital. But this omnipresent character of social capital does not mean that it represents a universal good shared collectively by all members of a given society. On the contrary: social capital represents a resource as unequally distributed in social spaces as other sorts of capital.

Social capital and social space

In opposition to Putnam’s functionalist point of view, Bourdieu doesn’t consider social capital globally in relation to a given nation, society or region. He doesn’t ask about the way in which a social relation or interaction will contribute to the cohesion and integration of the whole of society but on the contrary he is interested in the question of the ways and means by which certain groups or categories of people, such as social classes or social milieus, succeed in accumulating different sorts of capital, like social, economic or cultural capital, and may then use these accumulated resources as privileged life chances and as a means of enabling them to protect these privileges.

Social capital always exists in a structured social world with fundamental inequalities in the distribution of all goods and resources. The quality of one’s social capital depends largely on one’s place in the social sphere and the possession of economic and cultural capital. For instance, marriage traditionally represents a sort of ideal-typical example of the accumulation of capital and resources by creating an alliance between two families. Bourdieu was very much interested in matrimonial strategies of families in traditional and modern societies and found clear empirical evidence for what sociologists call homogamy.

It is evident that Bourdieu’s concept of capital puts the emphasis on conflicts and the power function (social relations that increase the ability of an agent to advance her/his interests) instead of on its function for society as a whole, which doesn’t exist for Bourdieu as a monolithic totality but only as a hierarchically structured space. In his empirical works such as “Social Distinction”, Bourdieu has offered much empirical evidence for this point of view. Bourdieu argues that social capital is a resource connected with concrete group memberships 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” (1983, p. 116). In this way, social capital is a quality produced and reproduced by the totality of the relationships between agents, rather than merely a common “quality” of the group. Membership in groups can be used in efforts to improve social positions in different fields. Voluntary associations such as the Rotary Club or the Lions Club, political parties, secret societies such as the Mafia or the Freemasons, think tanks or alumni organizations of universities like this one represent contemporary examples of embodiments of social capital. At the same time it seems evident that social capital has not only a quantitative dimension – more concretely: the number of people you know – but largely depends on the position of these people in the social space and their social, economic and cultural properties. For example, members of a street corner society in the suburbs of Paris or Lyon can have very large networks of friends, but even if these friends can offer protection in conflicts and some solidarity, their resources in economic, cultural and symbolical capital are not really much help if you are looking for job opportunities. On the contrary, having friends like this may pose real handicaps outside the small world in which they are living and could represent a sort of negative social capital or debt.

The same thing is true when we look at social situations like marriage. Because, as has been underlined by Bourdieu, matrimonial strategies are very important in the accumulation of social capital by families, he has chosen this picture of a bourgeois marriage in order to symbolize the logic and functioning of social capital. In other regions of social space, marriage in the lower classes may bring together a much more substantial number of people at the same historical moment, but the social capital unified at this moment is much less important and powerful, since it is constituted by people having much fewer material and symbolic resources. There are good reasons to think that social capital is becoming more and more important in contemporary capitalist societies, as has been shown by Luc Boltanski, a former assistant of Bourdieu, and Eve Chiapello in their well-known book “The new spirit of capitalism” (2007) and I would like to conclude my presentation with a rapid look at their analyses of contemporary management discourses and the qualities of human capital they requested, listed in an alphabetical order:

- autonomy
- charismatic qualities
- communicative
- creativity
- curiosity
- disposability
- empathy
- employability
- flexibility
- go-between
- good coach
- innovative
- life-long learning
- mobility
- networking
- open-minded
- project management
- self-evaluation
- self-management
- sociability accumulating
- social capital
- social competences
- spontaneity
- to have a social “radar” system tolerance

As we can see, an significant number of the qualities and capacities demanded of modern economic elites find their common denominator in the idea of social capital and networking. We can find quite a lot of career toolboxes for future managers (like presentation instruments and coaching) in order to improve their social capital. As Boltanski and Chiapello showed in a rather convincing empirical study (2007), social capital is playing an increasingly central role in modern capitalist society. The two authors even speak of a “connexionniste” society where networking seems to become a key element of market concurrence.

Modern economic elites seem to find a good deal of their resources of action and influence and of their power in the construction and functioning of social networks. At the same time, access to social capital becomes itself a source of new social inequalities and differentiations. Social capital is much more attached to its owner than financial capital. In order to make it circulate and work, the owner has to circulate himself and this, as underlined by Boltanski and Chiapello, sets natural limits, especially time limits, on the accumulation of social capital. In a “connexionniste” world, important or great men need small people to secure their presence. Because they cannot be everywhere at once, small people must play the role of “stand-ins” in order to overcome the natural limits on the expansion of social capital and to facilitate the combination of the local and the global. The immobility of the small people, the stand-ins, can be seen as a precondition for the profits of the mobile people, who can move around without loss of local influence. As Boltanski and Chiapello underline, this configuration presents a new type of exploitation in the sense that the stand-ins contribute directly or indirectly to the production and accumulation of the social capital of great people without receiving the acknowledgement and remunerations that this merits.

An empirical study of the everyday life of the lower classes (classes populaires) in the city of Geneva from 2007 and 2008 provides some insights into the social inequalities regarding access to and use of social capital.

**Family: the social capital of the small man**

In a study on the topic “Les classes populaires aujourd’hui” (Schultheis et al. 2009), a research team addressed the question of the structures of everyday life among the lower social classes in our present-day societies. Many dozens of qualitative interviews concerning daily life were conducted with mothers of such families from the Geneva region. The so-called “migration background” made up 50 percent of those questioned, which reflects the common thesis that immigration adds to an “underclass” in Swiss society. The interviews addressed in random order the many different facets of everyday life – from the care and education of children, through employment, consumption, sport, and housework to social relationships.

Here the topic of “social capital” returns repeatedly to the forefront of the discussions in a number of different forms, whether with regard to the relationship with work colleagues, living in the neighborhood, the relationship with institutes such as school and its representatives, or simply with regard to leisure time and sociability.

With regard to the above-mentioned thesis it became apparent in most instances during the interviews that the majority of the mothers of these lower-class families worked as child minders and housekeepers and were employed in small to medium-sized middle-class homes (civil servants, entrepreneurs, freelancers) in Geneva, or else had positions as caretakers in the residential buildings in which their families lived. In all of these cases, this manner of paid employment allowed the mothers questioned to combine their work very well with the care of their own children. Practically all of the women whom they relieved of reproductive tasks in exchange for a modest wage had relatively lucrative jobs and recognized status positions. They maintained a trusting, even familiar relationship with their “ground staff”**: the women questioned, most of whom came from Portugal and Brazil, belonged to a certain degree to their extended private sphere and represented an essential resource for their chosen everyday lifestyle and professional career, which went far beyond the purely economic dimension of an exchange of “money” for “services”. Here the child minders and housekeepers held – at least partially – the traditional role of the “governess”, were “confidantes” who were entrusted with the keys of the house and the most valuable possessions (the children). Such a comprehensive
relationship of trust is actually "priceless": and therefore that which is paid is only a fraction of the value that is derived from this relationship, namely time, autonomy, mobility and resources, which one can employ and exchange on the market for the purpose of increasing wealth. Thus, economic capital can be transformed to a great degree into social capital, but still requires the sensed or feigned non-economic interest (sympathy, altruism, etc.) on the part of both sides of the "transaction" in order to show its full effect. To put it another way: as well as the exchange of services for money, another idea of the exchange of immaterial goods (trust, loyalty, etc.) must be added in order to extend such "market relationships" to "social relationships" beyond the mere field of business, thus achieving added value.

Naturally, this also applies from the point of view of the women questioned, who certainly seemed to see in their activities as child minders or housekeepers more than simply a job and who spoke of a close personal relationship with their employers. However, the initial, apparently reciprocal "social capital" of these relationships of exchange seemed on the one hand to allow professional advancement, a higher income and social recognition, but on the other hand guaranteed only a modest income without opening up any trace of career opportunities.

When the mothers of the lower-class families were asked about their everyday lives, it became clear that they spent practically their entire free time in the family circle and that their evenings, weekends, holidays and leisure time were quite simply identical with "family time". On special days the extended family would then be brought into the relationship network, as far as geographically possible, representing a slightly expanded form of primary social networks. In these testimonies, the family as a central reference point is presented as a social solidarity resource beyond any doubt and is drawn so completely into the centre of the entire lifestyle and sensibility that one could well speak of a form of fateful social force (Weber), of a familialistic world view and manner of existence. As discovered in the study mentioned, the reference to "family" served in many respects as a central structuring principle of everyday life and assumed in the interviews primarily the following four varieties or connotations:

- Family as a form of communality, conviviality and lifestyle
- Family as an ethical-moral principle for justifying practices
- Family as a resource of support, solidarity and help that can be mobilized
- Family as a protective space against possible threats from the external world.

There are parallels here with the versions by Thomä in the same volume, who writes of the special quality of "belonging" to such a primary group: "familiarity is not confined to the fact of homology or complementarity between the persons concerned. It creates a new social setting, requires the affirmation of some kind of togetherness, of clinging together, of sharing a destiny, of taking part in a joint endeavor" (cf. Thomä in this volume).

In this view, "social capital" is little more than the "possession" of an individual: it is itself part of this "collective capital" and the member of a group, the belonging to which represents a form of communitization of exceptional quality due to its natural character. One could perhaps also apply Tönnies' classic distinction between "community" (Gemeinschaft) and "society" (Gesellschaft) and assume that this type of social capital qua belonging is a continuation of traditional or pre-modern social relationships, i.e. those organized along non-market and ownership-individualistic lines.

What we learned from the surveyed mothers of Geneva's "classes populaires" about themselves and their lifestyles contrasts clearly with the normative expectations of employers, as identified by Boltanski and Chiapello, who are capable and well versed in the market. Spatial mobility, flexibility in reaction to the demands of the labor market, living according to the pattern of short-term projects instead of long-term career plans, the constant expansion of networks and improving social capital, etc.: none of this can be reconciled easily with a social habitus that is based on down-to-earth family values. The latter seems, also with regard to the experience of migration, to find a "haven in a heartless world" (Lasch 1977) in the "habitat" of the family, which fosters a sense of security and forms a biographical pivotal point. Contacts with work colleagues play hardly any role, while other forms of sociability outside of the family sphere are practically unknown. This "internal exile" of the privatist lifestyle seems to be exceptionally functional and stabilizing under the conditions of everyday routines. The motif of belonging expressed here is largely removed from a physical space and refers primarily to the social space. Considering the large proportion of migrant families in our sample it is not surprising that the form of "rootedness" to a specific place, termed "nostalgia" by Mike Savage in this volume, plays only a minor role. Rather, one could certainly postulate, in alignment with this motif, that the reference to "family" replaces, to a certain extent, the recourse to one's "native land" under the conditions of spatial displacement. Wherever the family is, one is at home.

Sand gets into the cogs as soon as external powers, often seen to be potentially hostile or unwanted (financial authorities, border police, school, landlords, etc.) announce their claims and demands. In such situations, as was made clear repeatedly in the testimonies collected, one remains in a weak position due to a
lack of networks or few economic or cultural resources; one does not know where advice and support can be found and one develops a strongly dichotomous picture of one's own situation in which "we" are confronted by "them", "the others", or "the powers that be". While it was frequently emphasized by the interviewees that they were prepared to do anything for the advancement of their children, at the same time they demonstrated their own powerlessness in dealing personally with the representatives of the relevant institutions and in securing their goodwill. Institutional thresholds are difficult to cross if one has no recourse to go-betweens who can appease or circumvent the gatekeepers.

For the career women who employ them, the settled and steadfast nature of the mothers surveyed – who often hold many jobs simultaneously, all of which are characterized by proximity and constant availability – are the essential pre-requisites for spatial mobility, the free disposal of time and professional flexibility upon which their career plans are based. As was often mentioned in the interviews, at times consciously, these employers, themselves mothers, do not seem to have any problems in dealing with institutions like the school, its headmaster or teachers and can, in the event of a problem, successfully activate their "contacts" time and again.

So we could finish by saying that social capital in the era of the new spirit of capitalism is produced collectively, but the majority of producers play the role of stand-ins at the rear of the stage of society while a minority of great actors at the front of the stage succeeds in transforming an accumulated collective good into a sort of personal quality and private property.
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