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- Affluent people (ie in suburbs) tend to be more socially isolated than others, yet increasing social connections is used as major development tool for dealing with the poor – the rich are projecting their deficiencies onto poor? “there seems, in short, to be disjuncture between, on the one hand, the experiences of the affluent and, on the other, the prescriptions for the poor in American life.”

-Anti-Putnam
-points out that Loury, Bourdieu, and Coleman argue that sokp is embedded in social relationships, but realized by individuals.
-Claims that Putnam says that sokp is possessed by people as a resource.
-“communities are products of complicated sets of social, political, cultural, and economic relationships…communities are outcomes, not actors” pg.789 and thus cannot be said to possess anything, sokp.
-“…..they are outcomes of a complex set of power-laden relationships- both internally, within communities, and externally, between actors in the communities and the rest of the world.” 789.
-“Thus understanding of voluntary associations as win-win relationships also allows him to ignore the power relations that play such an important role in intergroup relations”
-good point on exclusion – coleman’s jewish new york diamond traders – good for those in, but an irish catholic would be excluded. pg. 792
-closed open originally Weberian concept.
-“Ultimately, if Putnam is right about the decline in social capital, then he is wrong about the role of social capital in economic development”. social decline in states hasn’t caused economic decline
-“people who realize capital through their networks of social capital do so precisely because others are excluded”