excluded a large sector of the U.S. population: African Americans. But my point here is that the concept of equality establishes the need to correct violations of justice. The new term "health disparities" is intended to hide and deny any need for correction. Like *social capital*, the term *health disparities* has become very fashionable. And, in both cases, the explanation is the same: the terms serve the social order that feeds them.

I should note that some fans of social capital refer to the French author Bourdieu, a progressive author who used the concept of social capital. They say to me: "listen, Navarro, you are simplifying. Bourdieu is a progressive author, and he uses the term social capital as well." I have great respect for Bourdieu's work, although I do not agree with much of his narrative. Bourdieu is internationally known but, in his lifetime, he was ostracized by the French establishment. I knew Bourdieu, and I am aware that in his ideological struggle, in order to make his case, he had to use the terminology of the intellectual terrain of his adversaries (the sociological establishment is profoundly conservative in France). Most of his work dealt with culture and how culture empowers people. When he spoke of social capital, he meant something very different from the social capital of the U.S. liberal and conservative establishment. In the U.S., social capital is promoted to encourage the integration of people into the capitalist system. In France, Bourdieu saw social capital as a way of developing an alternative to capitalism. He did not want to make social capitalists. Precisely the opposite: he wanted to help people resist capitalism.

The enormous dominance of the U.S. in the social sciences explains why social capital is now being promoted everywhere, not only by the U.S. State Department (Putnam has been speaking at conferences worldwide under its auspices) but also by the World Bank—a major transmission belt of neo-liberalism—and many other agencies. These organizations promote social capital as a solution to poverty, holding up Indonesia as an example, while ignoring countries such as Venezuela that are successfully reducing poverty through a combination of state interventions and popular mobilization. In the developed world, there have been strong attacks on the welfare state, which was an outcome of labour agitation and action over the state, an agency that is itself subject to class, gender and race forces. It would be useful if social scientists could recover their research focus on these points. Smart's article offers an invitation to do so. It should not be ignored.

Vicente Navarro, Department of Health Policy and Management, The Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health, 624 North Broadway, Baltimore, MD, 21205, U.S.A. E-mail: vnavarro@jhsph.edu

References

de Tocqueville, Alexis
2000 [1831] Democracy in America. Translated, edited and with an introduction by Harvey Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Navarro, Vicente
2002 Critique of Social Capital. International Journal of Health Services 32(3):423-432.
2007 Neoliberalism as a Class Ideology; or, the Political Causes of the Growth of Inequalities. International Journal of Health Services 37(1):47-62.

Navarro, Vicente, ed.
2007 Neoliberalism, Globalization, and Inequalities: Consequences for Health and Quality of Life. Amityville, NY: Baywood.

Putnam, Robert D.
2000 Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Social Capital, Civic Engagement and Trust

Jo Anne Schneider *George Washington University*

Smart's essay on social capital in this issue rightly points out the confusion caused by multiple uses of the concept. His discussion of the relationship between corruption and social capital is long overdue. He also raises important points regarding the need for anthropologists to pay more attention to social capital within the state. My goals in this commentary involve amplifying and clarifying several issues he raises in his essay, specifically confusing social capital with civic engagement, trust and linking social capital. I also discuss the ways that the Canadian government and World Bank use these concepts.

Before focusing on these issues, the role of anthropology in understanding social capital deserves attention. While I agree with Smart that academic anthropology has largely ignored the concept, applied anthropologists have played a role in its development. Much of this work focuses on the poor and marginalized, as in Stack's (Lopez and Stack 2001) observations of the importance of power for social capital in poor communities and Newman's (1999) discussion of connections between cultural and social capital for inner city teens. Anthropology's traditional role as providing voice to those often ignored by policy continues to fuel works like these.

However, recent anthropological work on the state tends to focus on symbolic and textual issues, like the ubiquitous references to "neo-liberalism." A few anthropologists like Smart who study actual relationships and state activities note the importance of social capital connections. Stack's (1996) study of African Americans using

social capital developed through government employment in the North to thwart racism and bonding social capital in the rural South, and my observations that most government contracts were awarded based on previous positive relationships (Schneider 2006b), are two examples. Furthermore, applied anthropologists have played a role at the World Bank, in government, and in other institutions. While often overlooked in academic circles, anthropological attention to culture, power and context continues to have a quiet influence in this way. Smart's encouragement for anthropologists to study up is perhaps best seen as a call for the core discipline to address these issues.

Social Capital and Civic Engagement

As Smart notes, social capital scholarship has actually diverged onto two paths: (1) those focused on the importance of networks to facilitate access to resources for individuals following Coleman and Portes, with some reference to Bourdieu, and (2) social capital as a surrogate for civic indicators following Putnam. While the first definition continues to influence program design particularly for marginalized populations, Putnam's definition has gained currency in policy circles. I focus primarily on Putnamesque usage here.

While Putnam clearly understands that networks of social capital are not the same as civic engagement, his raison d'etre for exploring social capital focuses exclusively on its role in fostering civic engagement and functioning communities (personal communication). This stems from a de Toquevillian vision of people developing relationships through civic institutions that lead to collective action. These relationships of social capital spur people to working together for the common good or civic engagement. Putnam's understanding of social capital as a community level good and his use of questions regarding generalized trust to measure social capital arise from this assumption.[1] He notes that diverse communities less often develop these common efforts and his recent work focuses on factors that inhibit community-wide trust and positive efforts to build social capital across communities (Putnam and Feldstein 2003).

As I have discussed elsewhere (Schneider 2006a, 2007), social capital sometimes leads to civic engagement, but not always. Social capital also has many roles independent of civic engagement. However, many of Putnam's followers fail to see the distinction between the two terms, glossing social capital as civic engagement. It is a short step from there to using social capital as a generalized term for community health, as indicated in crime statistics or similar indicators. Like "community" before it, social capital comes to mean everything and nothing. Smart's discussion of health research amply illustrates confusion evident in much of the policy literature. The limited usefulness of social capital in policy largely stems from this conceptual confusion.

Returning to understanding social capital as dependent on specific, reciprocal, enforceable trust rather than generalized weak ties would clear up much of this confusion. As Smart points out, personal connections are so important in China precisely because of generalized mistrust. Likewise, agencies with a proven track record get government contracts because government and non-profit organizations have developed these long term relationships (Schneider 2006b). Specific trust also influences citizens' relationships with government. If people experience government regularly collecting trash, providing services, or protecting public health, they are likely to forgive negative incidents in the expectation that they will be corrected. However, if the police regularly arrest neighbours without cause or corruption abounds, as in many impoverished communities, reciprocal mistrust develops between government and community. Civic engagement does not occur due to this mistrust. Instead, as with the U.S. African American community for much of its history and immigrant communities today, energy goes into individual networks and organizations that benefit the marginalized group. Bonding social capital, always an important base, becomes the only trusted source when others, particularly government, can not be trusted.

Linking Social Capital

World Bank scholars developed the concept of linking social capital, emphasizing it in their work, precisely to address this long established mistrust. Szreter and Woolcock define linking social capital as "norms of respect and trusting relationships between people who are interacting across explicit, formal or institutionalized power or authority gradients in society" (2004:655). While ties to government would necessarily involve linking relationships, the term also includes relationships with private funders, employers, social workers, school staff or any other unequal power relationship. They go on to note that lack of these relationships powerfully influences community quality of life. As with Smart, they observe that linking social capital can lead equally to nepotism and corruption or to more positive community development.

Linking social capital evolved as a working policy tool rather than a theoretical concept, however. Unlike the sloppy scholarship critiqued by Smart and others, the World Bank's social capital initiative involves a melding of Bourdieu's with Putnam's objectives, as well as some inno-

vative scholarship. Internally, the bank reports uneven application of these various concepts but the idea of helping marginalized communities develop these trusting ties underlies many recent efforts. This is evident in the Indonesian case Smart outlines in his piece. Calls for specific inclusion of women and other marginalized groups in community planning in several World Bank initiatives are meant to develop linking relationships in communities in need. This attention to developing linking relationships becomes an avenue for community empowerment and engagement in the development process. While community involvement in funding development efforts may be a "technical" approach, the design of these techniques includes these social concepts.

Implementation on the ground often lost these distinctions but these attempts were used in further refinement. It is this kind of discursive theory to practice and back again that has served as the hallmark of anthropology's theoretical developments as well as creating the potential for truly context driven policy. But reaching that potential would involve long, hard work in various communities. External critiques are a necessary part of this work but without the bridging and linking ties between those providing outside observations and program administrators, their utility is minimal at best.

The social capital Policy Research Initiative (PRI) Smart discusses in his essay provides another example of efforts to use social capital in policy. In 2003, I was one of several social scientists presenting an overview of social capital to government officials from a wide range of Canadian government departments at a PRI-sponsored interdepartmental workshop on social capital at Meech Lake. Most of us did not use Putnam's definition in explaining the concept and its utility to these government workers.

We were privileged to watch as the various government participants discussed ways to operationalize the concept. Their efforts reflected two predictable themes. On the one hand, enhancing social ties was seen as an important part of improving the lives of the elderly, expanding opportunities for the poor and integrating immigrants into Canadian society. This involved such problems as connecting the marginalized to others in the community as well as better outreach from government.

The second issue discussed both here and at later PRI conferences involved ways that government could ensure inclusion for these marginalized populations. The logic behind this concern was similar to World Bank's linking social capital: how can government develop trusting ties with those most in need of its services? As such, it represents a positive attempt to expand social equity. In this discussion, social capital became a vehicle to create links to communities and, in some cases, involve them more fully in civic life. It was sometimes coupled with references to other civil rights and equity strategies like hiring from targetted communities and community involvement in planning.

As with many policy initiatives, the PRI efforts also drew from several theoretical traditions. For example, a later conference on social capital and immigration featured Putnam and Woolcock as keynote speakers. The presenters included several sociologists as well practitioners talking about their programs. The audience included a combination of academics, policy makers and local agencies that offered programs. I do not recall any anthropologists presenting at this conference. The range of uses for social capital varied greatly, raising concerns regarding theoretical confusion.

I do not know if and how the concept was actually implemented in Canadian government initiatives, but the fact that a central government think tank would look carefully at this concept shows a stronger relationship between academic theory and government practice than is evident in the United States. While these initiatives may ignore the existing social capital that influences policy, initiatives that understand that government needs to pay attention to relationships as part of policy development suggest an effort to use social capital theory to improve social life. The various small initiatives government agencies presented aimed at reaching out to various disenfranchised populations suggest that social capital is indeed considered a tool to increase social equity.

Conclusion

How then, could anthropology play a greater role in analyzing the "economy of practices" Smart rightly outlines where the elite use social capital to their own ends or participate in efforts to create context specific, power conscious relationships between the populations we traditionally study and government? While I cannot speak for the Canadian discipline, U.S. academic anthropologists tend to shun interdisciplinary work and are most comfortable critiquing the status quo from the outside. Playing a greater role would involve both analyzing the current array of relationships as Smart suggests, and discovering ways to more productively develop bridging and linking ties with other scholars and government in order to change them.

Jo Anne Schneider, Anthropology Department, George Washington University, 617 Coleraine Rc, Baltimore, MD 21229, U.S.A. E-mail: jschneid@gwu.edu.

Note

1 Standard questions include "Do you trust your neighbours" or "the police." These questions measure generalized trust and are used in Putnam's Saguaro seminar questionnaire, the U.K.'s social capital study and the World Bank's social capital instrument (Gootaert and van Bastelaer 2002).

References

Gootaert, Christiaan and Thierry van Bastelaer, eds.
2002 Understanding and Measuring Social Capital: A Multidisciplinary Tool for Practitioners. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Lopez, Lisette, and Carol Stack
2001 Social Capital and the Culture of Power: Lessons from the Field. *In* Social Capital and Poor Communities. Susan Saegert, J. Phillip Thompson and Mark Warren, eds. Pp. 31-59. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Newman, Katherine
1999 No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City. New York: Alfred A. Knopf and the Russell Sage Foundation.

Putnam, Robert, and Lewis Feldstein
2003 Better Together: Restoring the American Community. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Schneider, Jo Anne
2006a Small Nonprofits and Civil Society: Civic Engagement and Social Capital. *In* Handbook of Community Movements and Local Organizations. Ram Cnaan and Carl Milofsky, eds. Pp. 74-88. New York: Springer.
2006b Social Capital and Welfare Reform. New York: Columbia University Press.
2007 Connections and Disconnections between Civic Engagement and Social Capital in Community Based Non-profits. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 36(4):572-597.

Stack, Carol
1996 [1974] Call to Home: African Americans Reclaim the Rural South. New York: Basic Books.

Szreter, Simon, and Michael Woolcock
2004 Health by Association? Social Capital, Social Theory and the Political Economy of Public Health. International Journal of Epidemiology 33:650-667.