

Appendix N

Social Studies of the Economy: New Directions

Economists commonly define their subject as the study of choices that people make in the allocation of scarce resources. This includes both the goods and services people produce, distribute, and acquire and some economists say, the social and material conditions under which such activities occur. But there is much more to this subject than is commonly recognized by mainstream economics. Numerous sectors of the economy such as academia, the arts and professional organizations are overlooked in economic analyses. Universities, for example, are now inextricably linked to the development of science for commercial purposes. Faculty members often hold patents in conjunction with their respective universities as well as with corporations. The arts are involved in commerce as well, not only in public museums and private studios, but also in design, advertising and most recently the Internet. The professions (e.g. law, accounting) are likewise a central part of the economy. Today, every discipline of the university, every artistic endeavor, and every professional organization in some way both influences and is influenced by social processes in the economy. In consideration of the narrowness of much economic analysis, this appendix will examine the emergence of “social studies of the economy,” a loosely knit number of new fields in the social sciences broadening the scope of how political, social and cultural forces interact in the economy.

For over a century, some economists have challenged the mainstream rationale. These challenges have come in the form of various sub-fields: *institutional economics*, *social economics*, *welfare economics*, *evolutionary economics*, *labor economics*, *radical political economics*, *contextual economics*, *Marxist economics*, etc. Historically and

today, these dissenters have critiqued the limited nature of economics as a both a science and as a normative discipline.¹

Many of these sub-fields noted above remain vital today as both alternatives and supplements to mainstream economic thought. The field of *evolutionary economics*, for example, is represented by the Association for Evolutionary Economics (AFEE). It is an international organization of economists and social scientists devoted to analysis of “socially constructed and politically governed systems.” AFEE publishes the Journal of Economic Issues (JEI). Its intellectual heritage is found in early twentieth-century economists like Thorstein Veblen, John R. Commons, and Wesley Mitchell.²

The field of *social economics* began at the end the 19th century with the works of early economists and sociologists who strived to link the two fields into a coherent analysis of the relationship between society and economics. Max Weber’s work, in particular his voluminous Economy and Society, is perhaps the best known of these earliest attempts to link economics to sociology. Many of the sub-fields mentioned above connect their efforts with Weber’s work, even where they have specialized focuses that go far beyond Weber’s original analyses. For example, a group of economists established the Association for Social Economics (ASE) in 1941 to focus on the relationship between economics and “human dignity, ethics, and philosophy.” Social economists in this association explore the ethical implications of economic analysis, looking at “the individual and political dimensions surrounding economic problems.” They seek ways to better understand how economic policy can be made “to be consistent with the values of the person and a humane community.”³

The adjective that describes each sub-field mentioned above is different (e.g. *social, institutional*), but the noun (*economics*) remains the same, and this is the problem we address. The noun distinguishes economics from other disciplines like sociology, anthropology, psychology, political science, and political economy. These sub-fields have retained the basic premises of economics, with a qualifications. Each adjective (e.g. *welfare*) is a modifier of economics as the main field of study. Each sub-field critiques something assumed or missing in mainstream economics, for example, the notion of “rational man” or “individual choice.” But these sub-fields do not completely leave behind the basic premises in the field. They focus on business and commerce, generally, without looking at the whole society. It is this lack of attention to society and culture that is driving new disciplines outside economics.⁴

The field of *political economy* is the most well recognized field that is different from economics. It is different partly because it draws more information from political, social and legal thought. The study of political economy started with the work of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1755); his work focused on the state administration of economic affairs and lacked any serious analysis of society. Political economists today research the relationship between the government and business, or states and markets. They often rely on the assumptions of mainstream economic thought, but as mentioned above also draw from law, sociology, and political science, thus widening the scope and depth of their field. Political economy has myriad points of orientation that go by names like *liberal, realist, and Marxist*. In this regard, political economy is informed by the social sciences, but political economy is itself generally not a study of society.⁵

Newer fields of study such as socio-economics and economic sociology address deficiencies in both economics and political economy. We will now look at these new fields because of their growing membership and their significance for policymaking the future.

I. Socio-economics and Economic Sociology

Socio-economics and economic sociology have developed within the last two decades as responses to the need for a stronger understanding of the relationship between the economy and the larger forces of society. They overlap in their subject matter and membership but they each have a different orientation and history. Let's look at how they each define their subject matter.

Socio-Economics

The Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics (SASE) was founded in 1989 as both an international and interdisciplinary organization. It has members in over 50 countries on five continents. The disciplines in SASE include economics, sociology, political science, management, psychology, law, history, and philosophy. The membership of SASE includes business people and policy makers in government and world organizations. The purpose of SASE, as members point out on their website, is “to advance the understanding of economic behavior across a broad range of academic disciplines; to support the intellectual exploration of economic behavior and its policy implications within the context of societal, institutional, historical, philosophical, psychological, and ethical factors.”⁶

This discipline is still in its infancy, but its focus is well defined. As mentioned above, socio-economics seeks to advance an understanding of “economic behavior.”

Notably, this does not mean so much an understanding of “social behavior” with an economic motive. Rather, economic behavior is the subject of study, and social relations are involved. Put another way, the field assumes that economic behavior is largely an organizing factor of social behavior, and not so much the reverse. Its research up to this point has focused on the for-profit the business sector, even as it has been moving towards increasing analyses of the non-profit sector.⁷

Members in this field argue that economics is not a self-contained system, but is embedded in society, polity, and culture. This is the notable change in subject matter from most of the sub-fields of economics mentioned above, as it admits the need for the subject of society as part of the context of economics.

SASE focuses on the role and effects of competition in social organization, viewing it as a subsystem encapsulated in a societal context. This societal context expresses important values, power relations, and social networks that are overlooked in economics. At the same time, however, this field’s special attention to *competition* also indicates its link to mainstream economics. Its members do not look substantially at *cooperation*, for example, in its thousand variations in the market system. SASE notes, “The societal context both enables and constrains competition. Socio-economics assumes that interests are not necessarily or automatically complementary and harmonious, and that societal sources of order are necessary for markets to function efficiently.”

It is problematic that socio-economics does not typically analyze cooperation among both corporations and the Third Sector. It also has not yet taken seriously Third Sector competition, as in the activities of religious organizations, universities, and the sciences in the economy. Yet aside from these problems, SASE *is* forging important

critiques of traditional economics, including critical analyses of the concepts of “rational man” and “individual choice,” two dominant foci of older economic theories. SASE argues, in this regard, “Socio-economics further assumes that individual choices are shaped by values, emotions, social bonds, and moral judgments rather than by narrow self-interest. There is no a priori assumption that people act rationally or that they only pursue self-interest or pleasure.”

Thus, socio-economics assesses critically “individualism,” but it does not look at inter-organizational self-regulation. It looks at individual business *firms*, but neglects to analyze the behavior of trade associations. Notice SASE statements again on method:

Methodologically, socio-economics regards inductive studies as co-equal in standing with deductive ones. For example, a study of how *firms* actually behave has the same basic merit as treating *the firm* as an analytic concept in a mathematical model. Inductive inputs and deductive derivations are assumed to correct and thus balance each other. (My italics).

Members have debated the question of whether they should focus solely on the methodological procedures of science, or whether they should develop normative (ethical) principles in this field. The question currently facing SASE is this: Should members think about what ought to be done to improve the economy from an ethical perspective? To date, SASE has answered this question by noting that, “Socio-economics is both a positive and a normative science. That is, it openly recognizes its policy relevance and seeks to be self-aware of its normative implications rather than maintain the mantle of an exclusively positive science.”⁸

This effort to combine the scientific and the normative dimension of studies in the economy is not new to economics. But SASE is calling for the participation of scholars in many disciplines for this task, in philosophy, religion, ethics, and international relations.

Sociologist Amitai Etzioni suggests that members think about the global economy in terms of the “three-sectoral nature of society.” This is a frontier for socio-economic analysis. Etzioni argues:

Far from being divided merely into a public and a private sector, government and market, the civil sector have a major place in any good society, including not merely voluntary associations and not-for-profit corporations, but also places of worship and communities.⁹

Economic Sociology

Economic Sociology is a “theory group” represented as a section within the American Sociological Association. The goal on their website “is to promote the sociological study of the production, distribution, exchange, and consumption of scarce goods and services.” Members in this field seek to facilitate:

[T]he exchange of ideas, information, and resources among economic sociologists, by stimulating research on matters of both theoretical and policy interest, by assisting the education of undergraduate and graduate students, and by communicating research findings to policy makers and other external audiences.

Notably, economic sociology is “ecumenical” in respect to method and theory, utilizing qualitative and quantitative methods. It is defined as “inclusive, eclectic, and pluralistic.” It uses The Handbook of Economic Sociology as a guide for theory and research, which is currently divided into four areas of interest.¹⁰

1. The Economy in Macrosociological Perspective (e.g., references to Weber, Marx, Durkheim, Parsons, Smelser, Polanyi, Schumpeter);

2. The Sociology of Economic Institutions and Economic Behavior (e.g. markets that include labor, production, industrial, financial, services, money, banking and financial services, trade, transportation, networks, diffusion, corporate gift-giving, consumption and consumer behavior, and the informal economy);
3. The Sociology of Firms, Organizations, and Industry (e.g. entrepreneurship, wages, incentives, organizational performance, business groups, industries, industrial districts, strategic alliances, buyer-supplier relationships, director interlocks, and illegal activities);
4. Intersections of the Economy (e. g. the interplay of economic and non-economic institutions, the extension of economic life into social and political institutions, the extension of social and political institutions into economic life, the interplay of the economy and culture, education, gender, religion, ethnicity, leisure, the state, politics, and the environment);

Some members have defined the subject as the “sociological study of economic phenomena.” Others have defined it as the study of the economy and its institutions. It is a study of the patterns of social relationships that develop among people in the economy that are connected with classifications in sociology. Some members focus on gender, race, and class. Others focus on formal and informal relations among organizations in the economy, including different civil orders such as the family, the professions, business, and religious life.¹¹

Here’s where these two new fields of socio-economics and economic sociology agree. The two fields are not grounded on the premises of economics per se. Their micro-unit of analysis is given to what is “social” about the economy, and their macro-unit of analysis is “society.” Now there remain dialectical questions in these disciplines. Are economic phenomena embedded in social relations? Or are social relations embedded in economic phenomena? And how is the whole society embedded in the economy? Conversely, how is the whole economy embedded in society?¹²

There are many concepts in these fields that have yet to be clarified. Economic sociologists, for example, look at markets as though they were social institutions that people construct and can control. Critics respond that markets are also spontaneous and unplanned, beyond the control of any person or even any group of people. Critics likewise argue that markets operate to a degree through impersonal mechanisms, and not only through social networks. Thus, we find another dialectical question: the extent of social control vs. spontaneity.

Arjo Klamer, a professor in the economics of art and culture at George Washington University, raises an important question concerning the names of these fields we have mentioned. Klamer argues that the loss of the “social factor” in economics itself motivates the constant re-emergence of new fields. Indeed, from Klamer’s perspective, the “blindness for the social dimension in the bastion of economists is becoming scandalous.”¹³

The Future of these New Fields

As we have argued, economists often do not examine how their subject operates in relationship with the larger orders of society. The explication of this link between the social and the economic is thus left, at least for the time being, to socio-economics and economic sociology. What are the problems these new disciplines must address?

I propose that these new fields should, among other things, closely study the connection of the market to *associations* in religion, education, science, and the professions. We have spoken in *A CIVIL REPUBLIC* about what is happening with churches building shopping malls, with lawyers and accountants consorting illegally with business executives, with physicists working on weapons of mass destruction, and with

biochemists keeping their discoveries secret, patenting these inventions with business instead of making their discoveries open for scientific scrutiny and public information.

The question for these new fields of study is then: What is the alternative?

Any discussion of alternatives must first take seriously the degree to which associations of the academy, the sciences, the professions, and the non-profit sector have become central to economic activity and thus to the shaping of peoples' lives. We have discussed elsewhere how genetic engineers in the university isolate genes from organisms and add to the genetic material of different organisms. This is now a billion dollar industry, with big money going to both business and universities for the development of such technology. This manipulation of genetic material may also have serious effects on public health (e.g. toxins, genetically modified food, etc.) and on people in economies around the world (e.g. pesticides, "bio-colonialism," etc.) Thus, the commercialization of genetic engineering, questionable unto itself, has also led to the endangering of small farmers around the world, especially to farmers in poorer countries, and compromised the integrity of the world's food supply. Economic sociologists should ask the question: what is the alternative?¹⁴

The collusion between business and government should be a top priority in social studies of the economy. Scientists in business develop toxic-prone chemicals and are then, ironically, appointed to government panels to evaluate them for public use. When scientists evaluate the safety of chemicals that they produced in business to make money, there is a conflict of interest. Countless other examples exist, but the point here is that economists have largely failed to study the effects of the commercialization of science, the academy, the professions, and NGOs. Economic sociologists should work on these

new problem areas, mentioned above, to address the shortcomings of mainstream economics.¹⁵

One problem that needs more careful study by socio-economics and economic sociology is *limited liability* in corporations. American corporations have been given the rights of citizens (i.e. freedom of expression, freedom to enter into legal contracts, freedom from undo prosecution and harassment). But such corporations have not been subject to equivalent punishments for misbehavior. A citizen can consciously harm another citizen and go to jail but if a corporation does the same damage, representatives of that corporation rarely face similar punishments. Most often, when corporations are held accountable, they pay fines that dwarf in proportion to their respective assets. Indeed, corporations may get tax reductions from paying fines, and willfully engage in illegal behavior as a “cost of doing business.”

What is the alternative?

The alternative is in writing state and federal charters that specify the responsibility of corporations to their stakeholders. Social scientists and particularly those involved in SASE and economic sociology should study the possibilities of changing charters and the rules of limited liability. What would change if shareholders, or even management, were routinely held criminally accountable for the actions of those corporations they own? What changes would occur if charter law were to include corporate responsibilities to stakeholders, not just shareholders? What if “limited liability” was restricted, would the nefarious corporate activities stop? What efforts are required for public interest lawyers to institute state charters for corporations that include stakeholders?

These are interdisciplinary questions. I would conjecture that if limited liability were curtailed, shareholders would not spread their investments over so many different companies. They would focus on the ones for which they are legally responsible. They would keep an eye on management and be more personally involved in the company. They would want to know if wastewater was being purified before it is dumped in the river, or whether the company is employing child labor. The system itself would be accountable for negative externalities. What is certain is the need for these fields to address such questions about corporate charters. Public interest law concerns the effects of corporate policies on peoples' lives.¹⁶

So far, we have suggested that there are very real problems neglected by economists, and that these new disciplines can address them. At this point, we will inquire into what key concepts mean in the frameworks we have discussed. This will lead us to a second question: What is the meaning of "society" in connection with the economy?

The Conceptual Frameworks

I propose that economic sociology and socio-economics should include concepts of art, religion, health, education, and the professions in their study of the economy. Most of the social/cultural meanings in markets are defined in other disciplines and other orders of society. For example, for economists art objects have meaning in the market as a price. For sociologists and political scientists, on the other hand, art objects have meanings associated with concepts of status, class, and power. For artists and art associations, art objects have yet a different meaning. Thus, a work of art has economic

meaning in the market and another meaning in sociology as power or status; and for artists it holds a still different meaning in aesthetics.

The social sciences must find a way to highlight the contingent relations among different economic, political, social, and cultural meanings. As discussed above, a work of art has multiple value signifiers, as does education, science, religion, and the professions. There are interesting and unexplored connections between an economic concept (e.g. linked to price), a social concept (e.g. linked to status), a political concept (e.g. linked to power) and an artistic concept (e.g. linked to aesthetics). Let's look at a few of these differences in concepts from an academic standpoint. as we will see, there are several key words that shape the frameworks of these new fields.

What is a social concept?

A “social concept” is different from a political concept and also different from an economic concept. The “social” in its analytical meaning is more comprehensive and inclusive than either a “political” or “economic” concept. It covers more data and anticipates a wider degree of cause and effect, as well as relationships between all three.

Such a statement may sounds academic, but it is clear that all political events can be interpreted from a social (sociological) perspective, while not all human events can be interpreted from a political science perspective. Certain qualities of human interaction in the economy, like *trust, cooperation, affection, and honesty*, can have a political or economic meaning, but they cannot be explained entirely from those frameworks. Indeed, a political or strict economic interpretation can degrade the meaning. The concept of trust is not entirely linked to power or commerce, and it is not simply a political tactic or economic strategy, although it can be. It can also be alternatively linked to hope,

integrity, and faith. Not all institutions and social attributes are political or economic at their root, contrary to the assertions of many economic and political theorists. But all political institutions and attributes are in principle, social. Everything that is political and economic is social, but the reverse is not true.¹⁷

Second, we have noted a conceptual problem with the principles of economics and political economy. They are drawn from the life of capitalist markets, which have a historical parameter, and not from society itself in any essential or inherent sense. The principles of markets are interpreted at a higher level in the discipline of economics than in business itself, but nonetheless mirror its culture. The principle of efficiency in the context of a business firm is thus different from the analytical principles of economists, but it is still above all a mirror of a historically conditional form of capitalism.

Karl Marx critiqued the study of political economy for this very reason. He saw this field as based on the concepts of capitalism, and not from society itself. Stated otherwise, Marx critiqued the acceptance of capitalism as a “natural” or inevitable form of social organization. Thus, in his critique, the “social” become his basis for analysis. Of course, Marx’s rejection of political economy does not mean that social scientists should abandon it today. Rather, social scientists must still take seriously the notion that capitalism, as a market phenomenon, serves as a major force in the organization of society, but it is nevertheless a force with its own logic and history. There is, however, nothing natural about it that suggests we must confuse it with something innate in society itself.

We can see how abstract principles (e.g. productivity, profits, efficiency) in economics differ from their application in managing a corporation. The interests and goals of the economist and the businessperson may be the same in principle, but

nevertheless look very different from academic and commercial perspectives. Yet what they share is a *sustained focus* on these economic principles, which, even at this higher level of interest and abstraction, serves the capitalist ideology. Capitalism becomes the dominant logic of social organization.

Our point here follows in the tradition of those who argue that capitalism is not the result of any inevitable historical process. Nor it is even the best system under which societies may be organized. Rather, our point is that any economy that functions to support a civil society must be linked with other non-economic principles (e.g. social and cultural), and that other sectors in society such as art, religion and the professions must not be reduced to a pure economic or political concepts.¹⁸

These principles of *polity* and *economy* are not the sole subject of socio-economics and economic sociology. Political economy, deeply influenced by analytical economics, makes prime use of its ideas (e.g. competition and game theory). It is thus the task of these newer fields to explore the meaning of concepts such as *associations*, *cooperation*, *race*, *gender*, *nonprofit*, and *oligarchy*, as well as hopeful terms like *civil polity*, *civil regimes*, and *civil investment*.

In sum, social scientists can learn from economics and political economy but they should be wary of working strictly from these traditions. The master principles of politics, government, and economics in the current form of capitalism are not the master principles of an economy organized in society. The field of political economy is vital to sustain, but it does not represent the picture of this whole economy couched in the changing subcultures of society.¹⁹

Innovative Methods of Study

Sociology developed historically through traditions that are different from economics and political economy. Let's look further at these traditions.

Karl Marx developed his thinking in the *dialectical* tradition of Hegel. While retaining the dynamic of the dialectic, Marx “reversed” it to allow for the centrality of material forces (i.e. production) as the defining characteristic of societies. Vilfredo Pareto, most known for the three-volume edition of his lecture notes, Cours d'économie politique (1896, 1897), developed his work in the tradition of political economy, but his methods differed substantially from the political economy of his day. Working from the Lausanne School tradition, his criticism of utilitarianism included sociological observations that were informed by the *evolutionary* perspectives of Marx and Herbert Spencer.

Emile Durkheim worked within the *scientific* (positivist) tradition of St. Simon and Auguste Comte but also added a new orientation. The definition of “social,” argued Durkheim, refers to an autonomous reality, and not just a psychological reality. For Durkheim, “society” was a reality sui generis, i.e. an entity to be treated on its own terms. What is “social” has a life with its own reality. Sociological studies of the economy, for Durkheim, therefore encompassed more than the motivations of individuals. Such studies supposed that society and economy should *not* be understood as merely the subjective interaction of individuals or even judged as a collection of individuals. Rather, Durkheim's methodology required the investigation of the mechanisms of the “social” and “society” with a reality related to, but separate from, individuals themselves.

Max Weber, in turn, developed the traditions of *history* and *hermeneutics* as specific approaches to society and the economy. One important contribution of Weber in

these methodological approaches was the development of what he called *ideal types*. Weber, however, did not confine his work there. Although all these thinkers, and many not mentioned here, contributed to the development of sociological studies of the economy, it is with Weber's work that we will describe a frontier in these new disciplines.²⁰

The Weberian Method

Weber was concerned with the connections and relationships between different orders of society such as the state, economy, religion, and the professions. In Politics as a Vocation, he defined the state as an institution that “possesses a monopoly upon the legitimate use of force.” Politics is an activity in which the state influences the distribution of force, based on coercive power, and is the dominant authority in society. The economy, for Weber, was related to the state but was defined through a nonviolent process of competition. Although Weber did not study the nonprofit sector as such, and his work on the economy has been applied to for-profit enterprises and their relationship to politics, his methodology of *Verstehen* is significant to the development of these new fields of knowledge about the economy.

Weber recommended that to understand the relationships between different orders of society, sociologists must understand (i.e. *Verstehen*) the subjective life of people. This means that sociologists need to account for the role of people as they work in the economy in its various civil orders. For example, politicians would not seek a "true Christian ethic" (e.g. "Ethic of the Sermon of the Mount") or accept the injunction to “turn the other cheek,” but a saint would find this rewarding. He looked at the conflicts in

the different orders of society. For Weber, it was necessary to understand how people make sense of their roles in society.

Weber argued that different principles defined the civil orders of society. For Weber, these principles emerged historically with a common linkage, and he argued with deep insight that a religious ethic is at the root of every economy. Thus, for him, any understanding of society and the economy should by necessity strive to understand the ethics of religions today like Hinduism, Judaism, and Protestantism.

In one of his most well known propositions, Weber, theorized that Protestants had become wealthy because they originally had no "magic wand" to get them into heaven. The doctrines of Protestantism and especially Calvinism were bereft of any guaranteed form of salvation. Thus, while the grace of God was the only true salvation, the manifestation of God's grace (or at least its likelihood) was made known through the blessings of hard work and frugality. Those that succeeded in both acquiring wealth as well as saving it through a spendthrift lifestyle were thus the most likely to be assured a place in heaven. Catholic dogma, on the other hand, did not stress such "evidence" of God's blessings as the assurance of salvation was secured more through "magical" rituals, sacraments, incantations, and prayer. For Weber, these differences in value orientation concerning salvation in turn contributed to the shaping of different economic values. This religious root, he might say, is the reason economic sociologists should dialogue with theologians and religious scholars.

Weber also proposed that bureaucratization had developed across society. For Weber, this was applied to the general economy, not just government. Weber saw bureaucratization as a broad shift from a value-oriented society to a goal-oriented society

based on legal-rational authority, as evidence of salvation gave way to evidence of status and power. The ultimate result, Weber envisaged, could be a "polar night of icy darkness." The increasing bureaucratization of organizations in society could trap people in an "iron cage" of rule-based, rational control. Weber's methodology led him to conclude that socialism in Russia would lead to over-bureaucratization. Russia would not see the "withering away of the state," as Marx had hoped.

Weber is known for his theory of the "ideal-type" and he applied it notably to religion and the economy. He sought to bridge the fields of sociology and economics but Weber was not writing like social economists today. Social economists do not write treatises like The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. They do not analyze the differences between religions and the power, influence, and wealth of followers.

More on Weber's Methodology

Returning for a moment to Weber's concept of *Verstehen*, economic sociologists should interpret the social life of a market. *Verstehen* refers to the subjective understanding of human relations, which is different from an objective (scientific) understanding. *Verstehen* means to comprehend the nature of a phenomenon by close contact or by a long experience of it. It requires grasping the meaning intended or expressed by people, to know and be empathetic toward them, in other words, to understand both the intention and the context of human action.²¹

Social research should be based on data gathered from the subjective world of everyday life. For Weber, such a study is more than good journalism. Weber argued that such studies were necessary for constructing "ideal types," or typologies of action, relationships that served to explain the market in society. To formulate an ideal type,

sociologists must first interpret social action. It is the job of sociologists to interpret this action in the everyday affairs of markets, and not simply as an outside observation.

Weber never described a systematic method for reaching Verstehen or an exact method for determining the “ideal type.” But Weber’s methodology clearly involves a personal inquiry or an historical investigation into the particulars of a phenomenon. The *Verstehen* method can be seen in the method of participant observation, field studies, and the techniques of interviewing. In studies of the economy this includes documentation on corporate charters, trade constitutions, talks with CEOs, workers, consumers, and the writings of key theologians.

Sociologist Lewis Coser describes three kinds of ideal types at different levels of abstraction. First, there are ideal types rooted in historical particulars, such as the "western city," "the Protestant Ethic," or "modern capitalism." They refer to phenomena that appear in historical periods or cultural areas. Second, there are abstract elements of social reality - concepts such as "bureaucracy" or "feudalism." They are found in different historical/cultural contexts. Third, there is an ideal type that Raymond Aron calls "rationalizing reconstructions of a particular kind of behavior." According to Weber, all propositions in economic theory fall into this category. They refer, for example, to the ways in which people would behave with purely economic motives, as in the ideal type of “rational man.”²²

For our purposes here, we add that an ideal type in the study of economies is “civil society.” We propose that this is where economic sociologists and social economists can spend time. What is the link between the capitalist economy and a civil society? It is where we conclude our observations on the future of these disciplines.

II Civil Society

“Society” does not refer to a democratic government, or a capitalist economy. Then, what is it? How can we study and understand such an abstract concept?

One way is to examine what popular theorists have called “civil society.” Civil society is both an idea and an ideal. Philosophers, political scientists, historians, and sociologists have written about the subject but questions remain for social scientists. Is civil society an idea (a concept) or an ideal (a hope)? We begin on that question between the idea and the ideal.

The Idea and the Ideal: Beyond the Senses

An *idea* is the same as an *ideal* insofar as both exist in the mind, beyond physical sensation. An idea can be a “thought” or an impression of something. People viewing what is held in common in different situations infer it and this leads to a concept.

A concept takes an idea one step further into a specification of attributes. Civil society is an idea that, when held in common by more than one person, becomes a concept. But it can also be taken an ideal for advocates of civil development and it can become a proposition about the nature of modern society. It can be all these things.

We need to study ideal types because they link both ideas and ideals with the study of reality. The idea becomes a concept that is part of a theory and the ideal becomes a model for policy studies. They both transcend the empirical world insofar as they are unto themselves not operational. Sociologists work with a concept that links above and below, i.e. with “higher” abstract theory and with details “below” through historical/empirical studies.

So for scholars, civil society has been an idea, a concept, and an ideal. To illustrate the gap between the *idea* and an *ideal*, we can examine the assertion of many writers that civil society is the "Third Sector."

Third-Sector advocates propose that "voluntary organizations" are significant because they stand between government and business as "mediating structures," or as "correctives" to big corporations and big government. They arguably serve as a balance wheel against the "cult of individualism" and oppression. This is true and also not true.²³

Critics of civil society advocates who see the subject as the Third Sector say that these advocates have turned a concept of society into an ideal. Advocates, argue these critics, think that the Third Sector is the solution to society's problems. Such advocates idealize "face-to-face" groups such as families, neighborhoods, and civic organizations, and ignore the "inconvenient realities" of the problems facing such groups and organizations.

Critics point out that not all families are based on love and trust; indeed, they are too often the sources of violence. Neighbors, in turn, often feel no obligation to help one another. Churches may look like sacred places, but denominations fight one another as fiercely as big corporations. Private charities may look altruistic, but they can also be agencies of the state, operating under strict government requirements.

Sociologist Theda Skocpol is one critic who has addressed these problems. She sees danger in a civil-society movement that could reduce the significance of government as a regulator of the economy. Most civic groups are focused on personal concerns, she says. They do not draw people outward into the larger issues of politics and markets. Civic groups do not often act on the political issues of the nation.²⁴

Some sociologists see civil-society advocates as idealists because they overlook a truth about society, as it exists in everyday reality. These advocates overlook the problems of markets, the street gangs, the Mafia, and the dangerous religious cults that constitute less desirable forms of non-commercial and non-governmental organization.

Critics also argue that corruption has always been in the Third Sector. William Aramony, head of the United Way organization, misappropriated United Way funds to maintain a private apartment and a mistress. CEOs in big non-profits and charities often have big salaries and often act like business executives. And this is just the beginning.

There are about 30,000 private foundations in the United States, which range in size from small family foundations with endowments under \$1 million to corporate giants such as the Ford Foundation with an endowment in excess of \$8 billion. These organizations are not politically accountable to the communities in which they reside. These private foundations are not required to report to state and federal tax authorities in a detailed way, as is true of business corporations. In this sense they are less accountable to the government than business.

Third Sector advocates, in turn, defend their position. They argue that cases of corruption are the exception, not the rule for Third Sector organizations. They point to how many nonprofits are supported by, and in some cases founded by, the communities in which they exist. Thus, they are vital to a healthy locality. This cannot be said of big government or big business, both of which have led to a deterioration of community life. Some advocates argue that the Third Sector is removed enough from the capitalist system to avoid being a major part of the problem in the economy. But this is a matter that we have already questioned seriously in A CIVIL REPUBLIC.

Some civil-society advocates argue that a positive future in America is not "business as usual or government as usual." Nonprofit organizations stand more chance of inspiring trust and restoring justice than big business and government. Government and business are too close, as though they were in one family, each serving the interest of the other; they are not really working for the common good. Government should *not* be subsidizing big corporations that destroy the environment, exploit labor, and fail to comply with federal non-discrimination policies. If anything, these advocates argue, governments should be encouraging environmental clean-up projects, and scientific research for an ecologically sustainable future. Third-Sector advocates argue that solutions to moral problems must take place within responsible communities where people are in a more face-to-face relationship, not in some distant federal office or corporate boardroom.

Political scientists who think in terms of civil society have pointed to a decline in community life as evidence for the need for increased civil involvement and civil organizations. Robert Putnam, for example, presents evidence on the deterioration of activities among voluntary associations, measured by indices of participation in church-related groups, labor unions, PTAs, women's clubs, fraternal organizations, and mainline civic organizations. His research showed a decline in "social capital." Social capital represents those faithful reservoirs of trust found in civic networks. Such networks are important, argues Putnam, as people in civic associations often solve social problems better than distant governments or corporations.²⁵

Some political scientists do not agree with Putnam's conclusions. Everett Carl Ladd debunks the idea that America has become a nation of loners. His data on group

participation, voluntarism, charitable giving, trust and confidence in public institutions shows that older levels of engagement are still sustained today. He sees moreover indications of civic improvement. Membership in civic organizations is not so much “dropping” as it is “shifting” from established and traditional groups to new ones. Instead of parents being engaged in bowling leagues, they have shifted into soccer leagues. Fewer citizens are joining established fraternal lodges and veterans groups, but today people are joining environmental groups. Here we see the idea of civil society – one that leans toward the Third Sector as an ideal – studied by social scientists.²⁶

Carmen Sirianni and Lewis Friedman criticize Putnam's documentation on civic decline. They argue that the development of a civil society is dependent upon the way people organize associations. They point to a revival in community life:

Aggregate levels of social capital cannot directly tell us much about democratic vitality or capacities for public problem solving. For instance, levels of church participation in a particular community tell us little about whether that church-based social capital remains insulated or is mobilized for broader forms of community empowerment, whether it is socially exclusionist or reaches across racial and ethnic lines, and whether it facilitates constructive political deliberation or polarizes debate around moral and ideological fundamentals. . . . Aggregate levels of social capital matter, to be sure. But the specific forms of civic association and how these can be mobilized to address an increasingly complex set of problems must be at the center of our attention. Interest group lobbying, bipartisan commissions, and different financing schemes are unlikely to mobilize the kind of community assets, or generate the kind of social trust and political legitimacy, that will be needed to meet what are in many ways fundamentally new challenges.²⁷

Sociologist Michael Schudson does not want to idealize civil society, social capital, or the idea of trust. Schudson tests the "decline of civil society" on the basis of a measure of social trust from the 1950s and concludes that measures of political inclusion

and protection for individual rights are higher today than at any point in American history.²⁸

The debate between the facts vs. the hope, the real vs. the ideal, is ongoing. The well-known book, *Habits of the Heart*, devoted much attention to this debate. In this work, Robert Bellah and colleagues juxtaposed what they call an "inordinate individualism" against the ideals of "commitment and community" in American society. In the re-publication of their book, they have added the idea of "civic membership" to this debate:

The consequences of radical individualism are more strikingly evident today than they were even a decade ago, when *Habits of the Heart* was published. In *Habits*, we spoke of commitment, of community, and of citizenship as useful terms to contrast to an alienating individualism. Properly understood, these terms are still valuable for our current understanding. But today we think the phrase 'civic membership' brings out something not quite captured by those other terms.²⁹

The authors write that "civic membership" is fundamental to the restoration of society. They are writing about the ideal within the real.

Third Sector theorists argue against their critics. They refuse to define civil society as indicative of membership in street gangs or the Mafia. Rather, they define civil society as people working in civic associations. These associations are not perfect, they admit, but they are part of a societal development, a place to solve human problems. Governments must correct injustices, but they cannot do the whole job of "moral restoration" alone:

Take the efforts being made to force deadbeat fathers to meet their child support payments. On the face of it, such measures seem eminently fair and sensible. Surely, the father should assume financial responsibility for his children and help the hard-pressed mother stay off the relief rolls. But money itself is not the problem;

the real problem is the absence of the father. And that problem may actually be aggravated if these measures succeed, for the absent father will feel that he has met his obligations by making those payments, and the single mother, assured of a regular income, will feel free to enter into the most casual relationships and have children without any commitment of marriage. The cash-nexus, as Marxists used to say, is not a viable basis for society -- certainly not a viable basis for the family.³⁰

Sociologist Robert Wuthnow says that Americans are not so much "disengaged" from community life as changing the definition of engagement. In response to the "increased diversity, fluidity, interdependence, and specialization of modern life," people are finding new ways to help their friends and receive help from them. People are experimenting with looser, temporary connections in place of the long-term memberships in hierarchical organizations of the past. Rather than joining the Rotary Club or the Junior League, Americans are coming together in support groups, hobby clubs, and short-term volunteer projects.³¹

Conclusion

The mainstream fields of economics and political economy are vital to sustain in research and conversations concerning society and the economy. Yet it is also clear that their conceptual frameworks remain under question as new fields continue to appear. These new fields we have addressed are called economic sociology and socio-economics, and we argue that there is a need for them to develop interdisciplinary dialogues in the university.

These new fields engage the issues of society at large. Their focus on economic phenomena and economic behavior leads them to study traditional economic organizations such as business and government, but there is much more waiting to be

researched, as we have indicated. The academic work that remains to be developed is about how *society* interfaces, interlaces, and intermingles in the (general) *economy*.

“Civil society” is both an idea and an ideal on a continuum from fact to hope and this difference must be clear in social studies. It means identifying how the terms are used in science and policy. What remains is the development of a “bridging concept” between fact and hope in social studies.

I see that bridging concept in the *dialectic* and studies of what is *latent* vs. *manifest* in the economy. The economy is embedded in society and society is embedded in it. This is the subject of cultural studies (Appendix O) and societal development. (Appendix P).

¹ Many of these sub-fields continue today in ways that we cannot list here. For example, the International Society for New Institutional Economics was founded in 1997 to advance interdisciplinary research. Since 1983, the Journal of Labor Economics has focused on international research in economics. The journal publishes both theoretical and applied research results relating to the U.S. and international data. As the journal says, its contributors investigate labor economics, including supply and demand of “labor services, personnel economics, distribution of income, unions and collective bargaining, applied and policy issues in labor economics, and labor markets and demographics.”

² AFEE says that this legacy now addresses contemporary issues such as: 1. The role of diverse cultures in economic performance; 2. Domestic and international inequalities of income; 3. The roles of social, economic and political power in shaping economic outcomes; 4. Globalization and the increasing weight of multinational corporations in the international economy; 5. The need for expanding use of modern technologies to relieve

want; 6. The urgent need to for awareness of the impact of new technology on the biosphere; 7. The ways in which economic thought is affected by and affects changing economics.

³ Members in this field are mainly economists who share ethical concerns over how human factors shape the market economy and how economic factors shape human lives. See the Association for Social Economics, www.socialeconomics.org. See also Gary Stanley Becker, Kevin Murphy, and Kevin M. Murphy, Social Economics: Market Behavior in a Social Environment (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2001).

⁴ Anne Mayhew, at the University of Tennessee Diversity and Division of Labor, says that the economist Joseph Schumpeter had it right. Schumpeter said that economic rationality is the same process as used by a merchant in double-entry bookkeeping whereby the added value and the lost value of any transaction-or action-is recorded and the sum of such transactions (actions) used to gauge "profit" or "loss." It requires that all actions be measured on the same scale. Anne Mayhew, "Division of Labor, Index of Editorials in Economic Sociology," www.gsm.uci.edu/econsoc/ResourceFrames.htm. Taking this notion one step further. Schumpeter suggests that a key assumption of neoclassical economics is that for almost all human action, a numeraire exists--even if only in the form of ordinally ranked preferences. Mayhew says "thus can all, or almost all of human action, be thought of AS IF made by a commercial firm. If not, then such action lies outside the realm of rational action and is beyond economic analysis."

⁵ In 1755, Jean Jacques Rousseau wrote A Discourse on Political Economy in which he wrote about how the name "economy" was derived from the ancient Greek words *oikos*, meaning "house," and *vomos*, meaning "law." Put together, the words suggest the wise and legitimate government of the house for the common good of the whole family. The meaning of the term was then extended to the government the State, as the great family.

The study of political economy has a long history. The Journal of Political Economy has been publishing research in economic theory and practice since its inception in 1892. Primarily a journal of analytical, interpretive, and empirical studies, it focuses on traditional areas of economic study—such as monetary theory, fiscal policy, labor economics, planning and development, micro-and macroeconomic theory, international trade and finance, industrial organization, as well as focusing on such interdisciplinary fields as the history of economic thought and social economics. See www.journals.uchicago.edu/JPE/brief.html.

The field of political economy has different trends and fashions. For example, today political economy is closely associated with economics and has been developing an interest in global affairs (i.e. international political economy), which is largely by its literature a branch of economics concerned with international trade and finance, as well as state policies. It considers public policies that affect international trade, especially monetary and fiscal policy. Some political economists have been interested in neo-Marxian approaches to development and underdevelopment, for example, the work of Andre Gundar Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein. Also, see The Review of Radical Political Economics (RRPE), which publishes articles on radical political economic

theory and applied analysis from a wide variety of theoretical traditions: Marxist, institutionalist, post Keynesian, and feminist.

⁶ All the quotes that follow in the text about SASE are from their website. See SASE <http://www.sase.org/aboutsase/aboutsase.html>.

⁷ The 16th Annual Meeting of the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics in 2004 had the theme of "Private Powers and Public Domains: Redefining Relations Among States, Markets, and Societies." Its journal called the Socio-Economic Review covers such topics as "the limits and conditions of rational self-interest ... the contribution of social institutions and good governance to the operation of the economy... the design of core institutions of a modern economy in post-communist societies... the role of local networks of firms and civil associations ... in an emerging global economic and political system... the changing nature of work ... and business management ... the environmental, societal, and personal risks and costs of narrowly pursuing economic well being... cultural, cognitive, ideological, and theoretical aspects of economics and economies." See Socio-Economic Review, Oxford University Press.

⁸ The Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics has a journal called Socio-Economic Review. Its members are interdisciplinary and international. This can be seen in the members of its Advisory Committee: Robert Boyer (Economics, CEPREMAP, France), William Coleman (Political Science, Mc Master University, Canada), Richard Freeman (Economics, Harvard University, USA), Jerald Hage (Sociology, University of Maryland, USA), Rogers Hollingsworth (History and Sociology, University of Wisconsin, USA), David Marsden, (Industrial Relations and Personnel Management, London School of Economics, UK), Marino Regini (Sociology, University of Milan, Italy), Wolfgang Streeck (Sociology, Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies, Germany), Robin Stryker (Sociology, University of Minnesota, USA), Kathleen Thelen (Political Science, Northwestern University, USA), and Richard Whitley, (Business School, University of Manchester, UK).

⁹ Amitai Etzioni, From Empire to Community: A New Approach to International Relations (NY: Palgrave, Macmillan, 2004), p. 29. See also Etzioni's interest in "transnational communitarian bodies," p. 154.

¹⁰ The Handbook of Economic Sociology, Ed. Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994).

¹¹ Some studies center on the economic organization of society. The definition of "economic organization" in this case becomes critical. (See my Appendix J, "A Republic of Federations.") Some study the organization of production; others study the organization of distribution and exchange, and others focus on the consumption of goods and services. But the main concern is with business and markets.

¹² Economic sociologists generally work from the premise that the “economy is embedded in society.” They look at a variety of structures: business corporations, market structures, market controls (sanctions, norms, and values), social networks, and market cultures. The assumption is that markets are social institutions and that people construct them. This suggests that when people construct markets, they also control them, but the problem is that markets also evolve and have unintended consequences. As Karl Marx wrote long ago, events happen behind our backs. While people make history, it is not always a history of their own making. See Appendix R for a bibliography.

¹³ Arjo Klamer, “Aiming High,” *Economic Sociology*, Editorial Series, www.gsm.uci.edu/econsoc/ResourceFrames.htm.

¹⁴ Genetic engineering differs from traditional plant and animal breeding in which the genes of only closely related organisms (such as a corn plant and its wild relatives) can be exchanged. That means that GE foods can carry traits that were never previously in food.

¹⁵ For example, these new fields should study how leading medical and science journals fail to disclose financial conflicts of interest among contributing authors. I am referring specifically to a study by the nonprofit Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI). The study examined 163 articles in the *New England Journal of Medicine* (NEJM), the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA), *Environmental Health Perspectives* (EHP), and *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology* (TAP). It identified at least 13 articles where authors did not disclose relevant conflicts of interest that should have been disclosed according to the journals’ policies. CSPI found another 11 articles where there were undisclosed conflicts of interest that might not have directly related to the subject at hand, but should have been disclosed nevertheless.

¹⁶ Lawrence E. Mitchell, *Corporate Irresponsibility* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001); *Defying Corporations*, Ed. Dean Ritz (New York: Apex Press, 2001).

¹⁷ A cultural meaning is more complex still, as it carries the analytical meaning of all previous meanings (social, economic, and political) but becomes more complicated by a symbolic meaning that transcends them. The concepts of wisdom, aesthetics, and philosophical principles have meanings that are beyond the interpersonal and inter-organizational relations of life in society.

¹⁸ For more details see *Trade and Markets in Early Empires*, Ed. Karl Polanyi, et al. (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1971); *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Ed. Walter Powell and Paul DiMaggio (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Joan Robinson, *The Economics of Imperfect Competition*. (London: Macmillan and Co. 1933); Joseph Schumpeter, "The Crisis of the Tax State," in *The Economics and Sociology of Capitalism*, Ed. Richard Swedberg (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), pp. 99-140. See also the Bibliography in Appendix R.

¹⁹ The following are a few references that explain economic sociology: J. J. Smelser and R. Swedberg, "The sociological perspective on the economy," The Handbook of Economic Sociology, Ed. Smelser and Swedberg (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), pp. 3-26; M. Granovetter, "Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness," American Journal of Sociology, 91, 1995, pp. 481-510.

²⁰ Durkheim's perspective is unique and can be seen in his main books, The Division of Labor in Society (1893), The Rules of Sociological Method (1895), Suicide (1897), and The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (1912).

²¹ For Weber, social action is "human behavior to which the acting individual attaches subjective meaning." For these basic concepts see, Max Weber, Economy and Society, Ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. (New York: Bedminister Press, 1968), , pp.3-38.

²² An ideal type is an analytical construct that is a measuring rod to determine similarities and deviations in concrete cases. Weber says that an ideal type is formed by "the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified analytical construct." An ideal type for Weber is not meant to refer to moral ideals. There can be an ideal type of a brothel or of a chapel. And Weber did not mean to refer to statistical averages. Average Protestants in a given region or at a give time may be quite different from ideal typical Protestants. The ideal type involves an accentuation of typical courses of conduct. So, some of Weber's ideal types refer to collectivities rather than to the social actions of individuals. Social relationships within collectivities are always built upon the probability that component actors will engage in social actions. In sum, an ideal type never corresponds to concrete reality but always moves at least one step away from it. It is constructed out of certain elements of reality and forms a logically precise and coherent whole, which can never be found as such in any single case of reality. There has never been a full empirical embodiment of the Protestant Ethic or the "charismatic leader," or of the "exemplary prophet." Other examples of Weber's types include categories of knowing, including: *zweckrational* (rational means to rational ends), *wertrational* (rational means to irrational ends), *affektual* (guided by emotion) and traditional (guided by custom or habit).

²³ When an idea changes into an intense belief, we normally place an "ism" at the end of the word representing it. The idea of the individual when over-generalized becomes a set of beliefs we call individualism. Likewise, liberal becomes liberalism, conservative becomes conservatism, nation becomes nationalism, community becomes communism, republic becomes republicanism, and so on. Here we see the difference between the idea and ideal. "Inordinate individualism," by the way, was a concern expressed in the study of Robert N. Bellah, et al., Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996). The authors' conclusion was that basic changes were ahead for society to meet the need for greater levels of commitment and community. On the other hand, social scientist Francis Fukuyama

proclaimed we have now reached the end of ideology and history with the fall of communist states. He asserted that we live in a world free of ideology where there are now no basic alternatives to the institutions of "liberal democracy" and "enlightened capitalism." He said that we will have a politics centered on bureaucratic problem-solving, limited social engineering and liberal compromises. Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History," The National Interest, Summer, pp. 3-18. But other scholars argue that society changes in qualitative, sometimes revolutionary ways over time.

²⁴ Most volunteer efforts are professionally coordinated, and are sporadic one-time affairs. Theda Skocpol and Morris P. Fiorina, Civic Engagement in American Democracy (Brookings Institution Press, forthcoming.) Skocpol does not think that new civic groups are being developed in compensation for the loss of traditional groups.

²⁵ Robert Putnam, "The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life," The American Prospect, Spring, pp. 35-42. Putnam has gathered new evidence to substantiate his argument. Robert Putnam, Bowling Alone: Civic Disengagement in America (NY: Simon & Schuster, 2000). We should add that Irving Fischer established the idea of "human capital" in 1906. The idea did not survive, yet, was revived in the 1960s with the work of economist Gary Becker. The prestige of Alfred Marshall was too great to allow the idea to prevail at the time. Fischer meant to correct economists' overemphasis in economics on "material capital." Irving Fischer, The Nature of Capital and Income (New York: Macmillan, 1927 [1906]). Marshall dismissed Fisher's concept, writing, "Regarded from the abstract and mathematical point of view, his position is incontestable. But he seems to take too little account of the necessity for keeping realistic discussions in touch with the language of the market-place." Alfred Marshall, Principles of Economics, (New York: Macmillan, 1916 [1890]), pp. 187-788. In the 1960s, Gary Becker began to popularize "human capital" in the field of education. His first articles were in the American Economic Review (1960) and The Journal of Political Economy (1962).

²⁶ Everett Carl Ladd, The Ladd Report (New York: Free Press, 1999).

²⁷ Carmen Sirianni and Lewis Friedland, "Civic Innovation & American Democracy," in Change, Jan/Feb. 1997, p. 16. The authors point to a revival in community life, but they also say that older generations may maintain more civic involvement than the younger in the future, and that current policies will not necessarily be adequate for the kinds of challenges of an "aging society." Problems to be confronted include those associated with chronic illness, long-term care, new dilemmas concerning medical choice, increasing costs of high-tech treatment, and ever-rising expectations about the quality of life in old age. Without civic innovation that mobilizes individual assets of elders in new ways, and without new views of health care - less as a commodity to be distributed and more as a public work to be shared - we are unlikely to address these challenges very well. For other statements about "revival" and about "strengthening communities," see Harry Boyte and Nancy Kari, Building America: The Democratic Promise of Public Work (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996).

²⁸ Michael Schudson, The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life (New York: Free Press, 1998.) Schudson says people can trust too much.

²⁹ Habits of the Heart, op. cit. p. xi.

³⁰ Gertrude Himmelfarb, "Second Thoughts on Civil Society," in Kettering Review, Winter 1997, p. 48. See also Nancy L. Rosenblum, "Civil Societies: Liberalism and the Moral Uses of Pluralism," Social Research 61(3), Fall 1994, pp. 539-562.

³¹ Nancy Rosenblum, Membership and Morals: The Personal Uses of Pluralism (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998); Robert Wuthnow, Loose Connections: Joining Together in America's Fragmented Communities (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).