

Social Capital and Development

A case study of post-conflictual Sri Lanka

Tea Marie Nielsen

Abstract

Development has become a matter of security, and therefore development has a new strong role in the liberal peace-building, though not all theoreticians agree to this hegemony. Social capital has become a global term when discussing development, and though the concept derived from a Western civil society, social capital cannot be ignored as a deeply rooted concept describing social structures of trust, networks and reciprocity in other contexts as well. I use the concept of social capital in the context of post-conflictual rural Sri Lanka to find out whether there is a coherence between social capital and development. I transfer the results of Dhammika Herath's field study to answer my research question. The study consists of six villages, three poor and three non-poor. Embedding two Muslim, two Tamil, two Sinhalese villages. Here he finds a significant coherence between bonding social capital and development, which is the conclusion of my assignment.

Keywords : Development, social capital, trust and networks, liberal peace, radicalisation of development.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	1
1.1 Research Problem and Purpose	1
1.2 Theory	2
1.3 Method.....	4
1.3.1 Research Design.....	4
1.3.2 Operational definitions in the analysis.....	5
2 Central concepts.....	6
2.1 Liberal Peace.....	6
2.2 Civil Society.....	6
2.3 Why development matters to post-conflict.....	7
2.4 Theoretical Review of Social Capital.....	7
2.4.1 Pierre Bourdieu.....	8
2.4.2 James Coleman	9
2.4.3 Robert D. Putnam.....	9
2.5 Social Capital and Development.....	11
3 Material and Analysis.....	12
3.1 Trust.....	12
3.2 Networks and Reciprocity.....	12
3.3 Empirical evidence.....	13
3.3.1 Table 1: Bonding Social Capital (Herath, 2008, p. 72).....	13
3.3.2 Table 2: Bridging Social Capital (Herath, 2008, p. 75).....	14
3.4 Development in the 6 Sri Lankan Villages.....	15
3.4.1 Table 3: rural development index (RDI) (Herath, 2008, p. 146).....	15
3.5 Does social capital lead to development in Sri Lanka?.....	16
3.5.1 Table 4: Natural assets, mean (Herath, 2008, p. 163).....	16
3.6 Discussion	17
4 Conclusion.....	18
5 Referenser.....	21

1 Introduction

1.1 Research Problem and Purpose

The liberal peace thesis has involved a change of policy in post-conflict societies. From state sovereignty to human security, and creating peace through liberal democracies has deepened the focus on civil society. This means that rebuilding the states also means securing development and creating reinforcing synergies between democracy, peace and development, reflected in UNDP's statement "*Without peace, there may be no development. But without development, peace may be threatened.*" (Richmond, 2004, p. 319) the development has become a top-priority.

Yet the path to development is troublesome and a lot of factors play their part in escaping the traps of poverty. Often the peace and development is offered upside down, but today's buzz-word in development is "civil society". But how is it possible for the civil society to play a positive part in the race of economic development? The social capital thesis states that social relations matter to development. But how is this related to development in post-conflict societies? The theory of social capital developed partly of Robert D. Putnam has its empirical evidence in the western civil-society, does that equal the transferability of the theory to post-conflict civil society?

My purpose in this assignment will be to describe the development of "social capital" and discuss; does the level of inherited social capital in the civil societies of post-conflict states influence the level of development? To support this I will take it as a given fact, that a higher level of social capital in civil society cause a higher level of development. With this research problem in mind, I have chosen to support my discussion with a case study of the civil society of post-conflict Sri Lanka. Using Sri Lanka as the specific case gives the possibility to take the

concept of “social capital” from a theoretic level and analyse it in a contextualised level, in the context of a post-conflict society. If one wanted to use the case study to generalize the use of the concept in the context of post-conflict society in a higher plan, one case as subject of a study would not be enough. But as my major challenge is to make clear the theoretical genetic of “social capital” and give an example of how social capital can be operationalised in the post-conflict context, I consider the case of Sri Lanka as appropriate: the past conflict of ethnicity gives reason to look at both building and bridging social capital, the current stabilisation of the situation makes the study free from further erosion of social capital and the information about the country is accessible. I will use the case study of Herath from Sri Lanka published in 2008 as starting point, as his study of the Sri Lankan rural villages covers my research problem and even identifies the indicators necessary to transfer the concept of social capital from Putnam's European and American studies to the post-conflict study.

My motivation to use the concept of “social capital” as subject of discussing of civil society and its role in development springs from Anna K. Jarstad and Timothy D. Sisk (2008) *From War to Democracy, Dilemmas of Peacebuilding*. Here dilemmas of building sustainable peace are considered from different levels of society, and Roberto Belloni draws the attention to the domestic civil societies in war-to-democracy transitions. It is here I find the motivation of considering whether “*it does matter a great deal what kind of tunes a choir sing*” (Jarstad and Sisk,) in the understanding of civil society, the kind of civil society is coherent with the outcome. I will use the level of social capital to explain this difference.

Social capital has become part of an hegemony of development. Nevertheless; not all studies support the thought of development as the solution to all problems. Mark Duffield is one of many who considers the liberal peace as more damaging than good is. Social capital, being a part of the thought of liberal peace, could even be criticized from this point of view.

1.2 Theory

The theoretical starting point of this assignment is the liberal peace thesis. I will mainly use Newman *et al.*'s (2009) *New Perspectives on Liberal Peacebuilding and* Collier's (2000) *The Bottom Billion, why the poorest people are failing and what can be done about it* to argue why development is important in the context of post-conflict societies. Collier emphasizes the traps of poverty, and makes clear that escaping these traps are important to board the ship of development. In the same time as development has become the solutions to the problems, Volker Rittberger and Martina Fischer (2008) marks that civil society has become the new focus in the international binocular when building peace operations are brought to life.

The concept of social capital have a genetic history that I will review before implying on civil society of Sri Lanka. Stephen Baron, John Field and Tom Schuller (2000) explains this in *Social Capital: A Review and Critic*. In the genetic review of the concept, we will also be able to identify important parts and operationalisations of social capital such as trust, networks, and reciprocity. The coherence between development and the level of social capital is also explained in *Social Capital and Economic Development* (Isham, 2002) and even how investment in social capital can create the social foundation of human security are discussed (Colletta and Cullen, 2002, pp. 215-226).

To include a critical perspective on social capital, I will discuss social capital as part of the liberal peace-building agenda and therefore look at Marc Duffield's critic of development as an overall solution. Among other concepts, Duffield identifies a "radicalisation of development" this happens as a part of the "strategical complex" which is the strategical answer of the liberal peace responding to the new wars. In the same time, the different actors interrelated in the Liberal Peace, that can be identified as NGO's, states, military, international organisations and the private sector, has a long list of similarities with the new wars themselves (Duffield, 2005). The investment in social capital could be understood as part of the radicalisation of development, and therefore from Duffield's point of view be damaging.

1.3 Method

The methodology of this assignment will be based on a deductive intake. From the review of social capital as a concept, to the analysis of the coherence between social capital and development in the post-conflict society of Sri Lanka. In my analysis I will use secondary sources to provide an empirical example of the causal coherence between the two variables: social capital and development. I depend my analysis exclusively on secondary sources, as the transferability (Johannessen, 2003 p. 125.) of the results is possible, and a field study on my own is impossible. Never the less Herath (2008) has made his Doctoral Thesis dedicated in describing exactly the causal coherence between the level of social capital and the level of development in Northern Sri Lankan villages.

1.3.1 Research Design

To answer my own research question I will transfer the results from Herath's study from 2008. As the variables of our studies are the same, and our research problems are similar I find the method of transferability feeding. My own research question frames: does the level of inherited social capital in the civil societies of post-conflict states influence the level of development. Within this lies the hypothesis that a higher level of social capital causes a higher level of development. Herath's (2008) research question contains: *“Is there a causal relationship between the level of social capital and rural development in the post-conflict civil society of Sri Lanka, and how does this relationship looks like?”*.

Herath states two supporting hypothesis: *Higher levels of bridging social capital causes higher levels of development, and higher levels of bonding social capital causes higher levels of development.* (Herath, 2008, p. 8.).

The results of the study are found by a two-phased study, commenced in one period of qualitative studies in a field study, and one period of quantifying the results from a survey. The study entities are six rural villages; two of each ethnicity, respectively two Muslim, two Sinhalese, two Tamil villages, one "poor village" and equally "rich villages" of each ethnicity. The other period of the study commenced by a survey of all 416 households, analysed on a quantitative set. By observing the indifference in the levels of social capital in the poor villages and compare them with the levels of social capital in the rich villages, and look at explanatory factors Herath (2008) is able to reach a conclusion.

1.3.2 Operational definitions in the analysis

In the analysis a conceptual definitions will be necessary to secure the intersubjectivity.

The operational definitions that I chose to use in my analysis to estimate the variables, are chosen because of their relevance in Herath's (2008) study, but also because these operational definitions are the ones that my theoretical review points to, when trying to measure social capital in empirical studies. Trust, networks, reciprocity and community-based organisations are the operationalisations made by Herath (2008) as the indicators of social capital. These will therefore also be the ones I will use as parameter controlled indicators in my discussion of social capital in Sri Lanka.

The operationalisation of social capital will be done through trust, networks and reciprocity as social capital is understood as "*a resource constituted by trust, reciprocity and networks*" (Herath, 2008).

2 Central concepts

2.1 Liberal Peace

The liberal peace-building can be said to contain three different aspects: the liberal policy of democracy, the rule of law and the economic marketization. The liberal peace is dependent on institutional transferral, experts imploring “know how” more often than seldom overruling local expertise, for example The World Bank claiming conditionality (Newman et al. 2009 pp. 54-59). The liberal peace thesis derives from the Wilsonian perspective that democracies (and marketisation) tend to be more peaceful, than other forms of government (Paris, 2004 pp. 40-41.).

Especially the last of the three grindstones in the liberal peace-building is interesting, when considering my research question: the marketization involving economic reconstruction, development and poverty-reduction. All development initiatives from the the International Monetary Fund, UNDP, and the World Bank are based on the liberal assumption that without economic development there may be no peace in the long run. This could be considered as a discourse of development. (Newman)

2.2 Civil Society

“Strengthening civil society”^c is established in many of today's post-conflict interventions. It is done in the belief that civil society will contribute to the process of building peace in a positive way. According to Rittberger and Fischer

(2009) the importance of civil society initiatives have since the mid 1990's become acknowledged as a necessity in a post-conflict context.

The strategy of “civil society first” in international peace-building aims at bottom-up approaches and that institutions must be build from grass-root level. Adherents of the civil society first concept points to the importance of creating social cohesion, improve opportunities for political participation, support for disadvantaged and support of development (Rittberger and Fischer, 2009).

The bottom-up approaches and strategy of civil society first is relevant as the concept of social capital strikes into this. Francis Fukuyama has described the link between civil society and economy success in the context of social capital: *“a nation's wellbeing, as well as its ability to compete, is conditioned by a single[...] cultural characteristic: the level of trust inherent in society.”* (Baron et al., 2000).

2.3 Why development matters to post-conflict

Collier (2008) describes how four different traps prevents the poorest countries from jumping the ship of development and keeping them trapped in poverty. This again makes them prone to new conflicts, as lack of prospects, opportunities and a better life creates a situation of hopelessness, and to ad op the circle a conflict makes the country even more poor. The poorer a country is the higher risk is for ending in a civil war. The four traps that further complicates development to the poorest countries are the conflict trap, the natural resource trap, the trap of being landlocked with bad neighbours, and the trap of bad governance in a small country. According to Collier it is necessary to have a positive development to escape these traps.

2.4 Theoretical Review of Social Capital

The concept of social capital has become a part of the understanding of the modern world and.

To understand what social capital encompass, three conceptual levels will be undergone. The ones of Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman and Robert D. Putnam (Baron et al. 2000). The development of “social capital” has gone through a theoretical conceptualising, where Bourdieu' and Coleman's contributions have played the major parts. The two first mentioned influenced the concept in its theoretical genetic, and Putnam's offer to the concept were to make it global and relevant to policymakers worldwide.

2.4.1 Pierre Bourdieu

Pierre Bourdieu is the first who is connected to social capital (Swain, 2004). He studied, in the 1960's and 1970's, culture as a dynamical phenomenon. Social capital as a concept emerged from this interest of the social platform, as a metaphor linked with equal metaphors of ”capital”. The pre-history of the concept can be traced to Bourdieu's concept of ”Habitus” developed in the influential book *Reproduction* by explaining the theory of cultural reproduction that fosters social reproduction of the existing relations between groups and class. Within *Reproduction* the framework of Bourdieu's concept of social capital was established (Baron et al. 2000 p. 3 and Swain, 2004).

Through 1977 and 1982 social capital appeared alongside with economic capital, cultural capital and symbolic capital, together defining the social position of a person. “Capital” both referred to concrete or realist forms of capital such as stored quantities of money, language, and cultural knowledge, but also as a metaphorical term covering power or social advantages. The problem of operationalising Bourdieu's “capital” have later been criticized. The final definition of social capital ended up as ”*the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network[...] which provides each of its members with the backing of collectively-owned capital*” (Baron et al. 2000, page 4).

For Bourdieu social capital is not independent from economic or cultural capital, but can be understood as a multiplier of the two. In Bourdieu's theorizing of the reproduction of class relations social capital is a major part of the analysis along with the two other forms of “capital”, but the concept of social capital

remained underdeveloped. Never the less it established social capital as a field of study (Baron *et al.* 2000. pp 3-5).

2.4.2 James Coleman

Coleman's work on social capital derives from his interest in the meeting between sociology and economics. Social capital was primarily a step on the road to understanding the relationship between educational achievements and social inequality. Coleman's main contribution to the concept of social capital lies in his straightforward sketch of the concept (Swain, 2004 and Baron *et al.*, 2000).

The starting point of Coleman was a critique of the dominance of human capital, arguing that social capital should take a larger credit of the beneficial effect on educational credentials. The concept of social capital was here defined as: *“a particular kind of resource available to an actor [comprising a] variety of entities[containing two elements] they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors – whether persons or corporate actors – within the structures”* to fit this definition to his specific work with education Coleman refined the definition: *“social capital is the set of resources that inhere in family relations and in community social organisation and that are useful for the cognitive or social development of a child or young person”*(Baron *et al.* 2000 pp. 7-8).

Coleman and Bourdieu share some similarities including the point of view that social capital, as other forms of capital, an advantage. But the two did not acknowledge each other, and Coleman never referred to Bourdieu's work. Coleman considered his work on social capital as unintended unlike Bourdieu, and for Coleman social capital as a concept functions because it arises mainly from activities intended for other purposes. Even though Coleman has shaped the contemporary debate he has been object for criticism. Never the less he subjected social capital in the empirical context (Baron *et al.* 2000 p 7-8.).

2.4.3 Robert D. Putnam

Putnam is the one author who have made the concept of social capital popular and made it a mainstream political discourse. His work can be divided in three: the seminal study of regional government in Italy, *Making Democracy Work*, about the differences in regional administrations in north and south (Swain, 2004). The study moves from institutional performance to civic community as an explanatory factor and it is only late in the book social capital is brought in. The second part of his work was “*Bowling Alone*” about civil decline in America, and how bowling used to be the sustainer of the civil society. But even though the educational level is measured to be rising, Putnam identifies the civic engagement as declining even though this is traditionally considered as the other way around. In 1996 Putnam published an article titled “*Who killed civic America*” and pointed out television as the villain. And here he also offered an definition of social capital: “*By social capital I mean features of social life – networks, norms and trust - that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives.*” (Baron *et al.* 2000 pp. 8-9). Identified in this quote is the tree-some networks, norms and trust which dominates the conceptual discussion.

The third part of of Putnam's work shifts focus from trust to reciprocity, as he acknowledge that people can have a high degree of trust they can still be unsocial. People could even lack trust but have will to contribute to building social capital through civic projects (Baron *et al.* 2000, p 10-11.).

Coleman as well as Putnam has been criticized for failing to address issues of power and conflict. Putnam rejects this and made claims an intrinsic connection between egalitarian policies and social capital: social capital is considered incompatible with high levels of inequality. To support this Putnam now puts great emphasis on “bridging” and “bonding” social capital. Bonding social capital refers to the links between “like-minded people”, and efforts to build strong ties within the homogeneous group, but on the other hand, can result in higher degree of exclusion of the people who differs from the group. Bridging social capital refers to building connections between heterogeneous groups. Bridging social capital might be more fragile, but more likely also foster social inclusion (Baron *et al.* 2000 p. 10.). These concepts of bonding social capital an bridging social capital as been refined by Woolcock, Krishna and Uphoof (Swain, 2004).

2.5 Social Capital and Development

The research conducted by Putnam mainly focusses on the developed world, and it can therefore be questioned whether social capital can find its relevance when discussing development in developing-countries. Isham (2002) argues that designers of development cannot ignore the fact, that forms of social capital effects development. Inequality and norms that discourage social contacts between rich and poor in a village would hinder the flow of information for example about agricultural practices from the rich to the poor.

Development according to Isham (2004) is improving well-being: expanding economic opportunities, better health, more education and greater political and civil liberties.

3 Material and Analysis

Putnam's theoretical definition of social capital in *Who Killed Civic America* with its focus on networks, norms and trust, along with the later focus on reciprocity are the elements that I wish use as starting point in my analysis of social capital in Sri Lanka. To demonstrate how social capital works in empirical case I now wish to use the material of Herath, to put social capital into the context of post-conflict civil society, and find out whether the level of social capital affects development.

3.1 Trust

According to Francis Fukuyama, trust is the crucial fact in building the state. To measure differences in the level of trust between communities Herath (2008 pp. 66-68) have used direct and indirect questions, where the direct question asks directly about trust, the indirect questions asks about social experiences to measure how much trust is inherited. An example of indirect question is:

“Suppose that you fall sick and cannot take care of your children. Can you keep you keep your children with anybody beyond your immediately family members? With how many households can you keep your children?” (Herath, 2008, p. 67.)

Within this lies the assumption that the more people you would trust to take care of your child, the higher is the level of trust.

The level of trust is measured from three different levels in the six villages: Bonding trust, or trust among people of a homogeneous group, bridging trust, or trust among a heterogeneous group, and at last Vertical trust, the trust on government institutions and officials (Herath, 2008 pp. 66-68).

3.2 Networks and Reciprocity

Like trust networks and reciprocity were also measured quantitatively with categories from one to five, and utilized both direct and indirect questions. The following quote is an example of an direct question measuring networks and reciprocity:

“Do you have friends or relatives of the same ethnicity as you who can help you get some work done at a DS office easily? How many do you have?” (Herath, 2008, p. 69)

Within this lies the assumption that network have an impact on the opportunities that one villager holds, and this is effected positive or negative of your network. Networks can both refer to “interpersonal networks”, witch represent concrete personal relations, and to “generalised networks”, witch refers to the general connectivity within a village. Reciprocity represents to what extent people help each other (Herath 68-70).

3.3 Empirical evidence

The empirical data points to the direction that a high level of bonding social capital is present and a correspondingly low level of bridging social capital. All six villages proved that the level of bonding trust was higher than the level of bridging trust. The level of reciprocity of networks proved the same: networks and reciprocity tended to be strong in the sense of bonding, but weaker along the lines of bridging networks and reciprocity.

3.3.1 Table 1: Bonding Social Capital (Herath, 2008, p. 72)

	Tamil	Muslim	Sinhalese
Non-poor	21	19	30
Poor	19	14	19

Table 1 (Herath, 2008, p 72-73.) shows the mean score in the index of bonding social capital out of a highest score in forty. Eight indicators constitutes the

measuring in a score from one to five. The minimum score one respondent can get is eight, as there is eight indicators and the lowest score is one, the highest score one can get is forty, as scoring five in all eight indicators would equal forty.

The non-poor villages have higher scores than their poor counterparts, even though this is not as extinct in the groups of Tamils. The all-village mean is 20.

3.3.2 Table 2: Bridging Social Capital (Herath, 2008, p. 75)

	Tamil	Muslim	Sinhalese
Non-poor	10	11	17
Poor	10	9	11

Table 2 is an index of the bridging social capital mean, as in table 1, it is measured with eight indicators in a score from one to five. The all-village mean here is 11, which is lower than in bonding social capital.

It is worth mentioning that results differs from village to village, in both table 1 and table 2. Again the pattern shows that the poor villages have lower scores than the rich ones, except from the Tamil village. These two tables can show as an significant coherence between the better-off villages and the level of social capital. At least in two out of three this is the case.

That the mean-level of bonding social capital on 20 compared to the mean-level of bridging social capital indicates that bonding social capital is more prevalent or it has increased for some reason. Herath (2008) points out that previous studies on war effected societies have concluded, that bonding social capital increases in a conflict, while bridging social capital might decline. This is also the empirical case: interviews showed that some villages experienced more violence, and more deaths also are the ones that have higher scores than the other villages. The history also effects the level of social capital. The study found that historical long-established villages have a higher level of bonding social capital. The Sinhalese and Tamil non-poor villages have the longest history and a significant higher level of bonding social capital. Herath (2008) explains this by the Durkheimian theory of “mechanical solidarity”, that because of the long history they have had time to develop similar norms, values and practices and therefore a strong feeling of “we”. That the poor villages have less bonding capital

than the non-poor is more significant than the coherence between bridging social capital and the level of development. This might suggest that bonding social capital is an important variable to create development.

3.4 Development in the 6 Sri Lankan Villages

Herath (2008) has created an development index to match the context of the six rural villages of Sri Lanka. The development index is made to reflect the development that these villages have gone through. The aspects included in the index were identified in the qualitative period of the study and suggested by the villages themselves. The following variables constitute Herath's rural development index: the total monthly income, total number of schooling years, the standard of the house, the standard of the latrine, drinking water source and availability of drinking water. These indicators can capture the rural development of the six villages in the study. The indicators have been measured in a five levelled scale, and the maximum score is therefor thirty and the minimum is six

3.4.1 Table 3: rural development index (RDI) (Herath, 2008, p. 146)

Type of village	Mean (RDI)
Poor Tamil	18
Poor Muslim	18
Poor Sinhalese	17
Non-poor Tamil	22
Non-poor Muslim	22
Non-poor Sinhalese	24
Mean for all Villages	20

Each household has been given a development score, and these scores are aggregated to maintain a village mean (Herath, 2008 pp. 121-147). According to Herath's index the poor Sinhalese village is the less developed and the non-poor Sinhalese village the most developed.

3.5 Does social capital lead to development in Sri Lanka?

Herath (2008) has run all data through correlation and regression's analysis to find out whether it actually proves a causal coherence between social capital and rural development. In his analysis he finds that exploring the phenomenon of development through bonding and bridging social capital it needs to include other essential variables: natural assets and infrastructure also plays a vital role.

When looking at the six above mentioned indicators of development we see that focus, within the definition of development lies within income, education, housing and latrines. In the correlation analysis Herath found that bonding social capital had a high correlation with income and education: this points again in the direction that bonding social capital has a high degree of relevance to some parts of development. The effect of bridging social capital is not statistically significant. In a third analysis Herath runs other essential variables: natural assets, infrastructure, participation in NGO's, external assistance, and state welfare.

3.5.1 Table 4: Natural assets, mean (Herath, 2008, p. 163)

Village	Tamil	Muslim	Sinhalese
Non-poor	7	4	8
Poor	4	4	4

The natural assets have been measured in a scale from one to five with two indicators; the lowest score therefore is two and the highest score ten.

The natural are found to be extremely important and it has strong influence on all parts of development. But even here there is a strong coherence with bonding social capital: it strongly affects natural assets, especially in the matter of distribution and cultivation (Herath, 2008, pp. 161-178). If we compare the empirical statistics the Tamil non-poor village as well as the Sinhalese non-poor village have a significant higher level of both natural assets and bonding social capital. The mean of the non-poor Tamil village on bonding social capital is 21 and the natural assets mean is 7. When it comes to the

Sinhalese non-poor village the mean of bonding social capital is 30, and the natural assets is 8.

3.6 Discussion

With the theoretical starting point of the liberal peace, and an analysis of the coherence between social capital and development in Sri Lanka I contribute to the hegemony of development as the solution to all problems. But is this actually the case? Mark Duffield (2004) criticises the paradigm of liberal peace in several ways. Duffield views the liberal peace as an attempt of taking control of transformation processes to secure stability. The “radicalisation of development” is one of the critical terms that Duffield uses to explain, why development is not entirely the good. Radicalisation of development covers that focus in development today lies in transformation and an attempt to change the societies, so that they fit into a liberal context. This happens because development today is strongly related to the issue of security and underdevelopment has become a security problem. A heavy increase in the number of external actors and international NGO's in the field of development indicates this.

“The strategical complex” is the strategy of liberal-peacebuilding in the attempt to meet the challenges of the new wars. According to Duffield (2004) the strategical complex encompasses the interaction between NGO's, governments, military, and the private sector and these relations have themselves similarities with the new wars. In some ways the strategical complex tends to be just as bad and damaging as the new wars themselves (Duffield, 2004).

4 Conclusion

My purpose were to look at the theoretical construction of social capital, and afterwards look at a possible coherence between social capital and development in Sri Lanka. I have done this by looking at it, as a part of the liberal peace.

The construction of social capital as encompassing trust, network and reciprocity derives from the genetic of the concept and Putnam is the one who in the end define it as this. The three mentioned theoretical practitioners, Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam, in the field of social capital all regards social capital as something in social life that people “can fall back on”. To Bourdieu its a resource that creates a collectively owned sort of capital. To Coleman its a social structure and resource inherited in family or social organisations that effects a child's or a young one's social development. Finally to Putnam it is features of social life, trust, networks, and reciprocity that together can create a higher degree of common good.

The operationalisation of social capital in Herath's field study is exactly the one of Putnam. By finding indicators to measure trust, networks and reciprocity both what matters to bonding and bridging, Herath is able to quantify the level of bridging social capital and bonding social capital in the six study villages. Furthermore he creates a rural development index to quantify the development. By running the independent variable and the dependent variable in a correlation and regression's analysis, Herath concludes that bonding social capital has a large impact on some parts of development. In a further analysis it becomes obvious that natural assets as well as infrastructure and state welfare are other variables that effects the development. But even here the impact of bonding social capital is significant: in the distribution and cultivation of natural assets. Initiating I asked wether it was possible to use social capital in a post-conflict setting, when the term is actually developed in the developed world. I consider this as an example of a context based operationalisation of social capital, that proves the coherence

between social capital and development: especially bonding social capital has a significant coherence with parts of development.

As I have chosen to look on social capital as part of the liberal peace-building, the criticism of liberal peace is relevant. Mark Duffield criticises the stubborn believe in development as a solution to all problems. The strategical complex and the many actors of the attempt of avoiding the new wars tend to be just as bad as the wars themselves. The radicalisation of the development can be disturbing, because of the wish to transform the society and the many new actors can have different and own agendas.

When considering social capital as a variable that can cause a higher level of development, this opens new questions. How can this be used for policy makers and designers of development? Is it enough to sketch a countries level of social capital or is it possible to effect it as well? How to effect a society's level of social capital is a whole study in itself: how do you increase the level of trust inherited in civil society? Can the extern creation of networks lead to a higher level of networks? How do extern actors foster reciprocity in a society? This analysis of Sri Lankan villages looks at social capital in the level of a household and in the village-level. Is it possible to measure social capital on a state-level?

If we wanted to use this analysis in a further study it would be relevant to look at bonding social capital and its coherence with development in other contexts. It would be highly relevant to look at other empirical cases to try to confirm this coherence. This might also further the understanding of how policymakers can use this knowledge.

5 Referenser

- Newman, Edward, Paris, Roland and Richmond, Oliver P., 2009. *New Perspectives on Liberal Peacebuilding*. United Nation University Press
- Rittberger, Volker and Ficher, Martina (eds.), 2008. *Strategies for Peace, Contributions of international Organazations, States, and Non-State Actors*. Barbara Budrich Publishers.
- Baron, Stephen, Field, Johan and Schuller, Tom, 2000. *Social Capital*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Jarstad, Anna K. And Sisk, Timothy, 2008. *From War to Democracy, Dilemmas of Peacebuilding*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, Nigel, 2004. ” Social Capital and its Uses”. *European Journal of Sociology*.
<http://journals.cambridge.org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=248701> 6th of Januari 2011.
- Herath, Dhammika, 2008. *Rural Development through Social Capital? An inquest on the linkages between social capital and development in war-torn villages of Sri Lanka*. University of Gothenburg.
- Paris, Roland, 2004. *At Wars End, Building Peace After Civil Conflict*. Cambridge University Press.
- Duffield, Mark, 2005. *Global Governance and the New Wars*. Zed Books.
- Collier, Paul, 2008. *The Bottom Billion, Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What Can Be Done About it*. Oxford University Press.
- Johannessen, Asbjørn and Tufte, Per Arne. 2003. *Introduktion till samhällsvetenskaplig metod*. Malmö. Forlaget: Liber