

Creative and Social Capital: Concepts, Problems and Contradictions

Tomas Kačerauskas¹

Vilnius Gediminas, Technical University, Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies, Vilnius

Creative and Social Capital: Concepts, Problems and Contradictions. The article deals with creative and social capital (SC) in the light of creative society. SC has both positive and negative aspects. The first are trust, economic development, ecological consciousness, etc. The latter are intolerance for certain individuals, stagnant relations, depression of the initiatives, etc. The negative aspects have been connected with the lack of creative aspirations within a social group. There is a dialectical relation between social and creative capital (CC). Although creative workers need certain support from their social environment, creativity does not only use social ties to spread creative results, but also ignores them by appealing to a new creative community. The comparison of SC and CC opens very different approaches towards society. In the case of SC, we still have the privileged classes who consolidate the whole society. Even in the case of the creative class we face the relics of (Post)Marxist economic approach if we correlate the activity of so called creative class with economic prosperity of a region. In the case of creative society, we have very different approach. If every person is more or less creative, we do not have the creative classes or parties as holders of CC any more. This (neo)liberal approach means also the dissemination of any form of capital, as well as elimination of attitude formed by economic priority in our societies.

Sociológia 2019, Vol. 51 (No. 3: 235-249)

<https://doi.org/10.31577/sociologia.2019.51.3.11>

Key words: *Creative capital; social capital; creative society; cultural symbols; an individual and the society*

Introduction

It seems that both social capital (SC) and creative capital (CC) presuppose the principle of contrast by analysing them. Nevertheless, these two capitals² are inseparable from each other; they are two sides of the same phenomenon. SC is an old term escalated by the sociologists sometimes in very different directions³. In general, it refers to the social interties and community interactions, it connects individuals and supports one or another community, in the case of our investigation – creative society. The question arises of what tendencies dominate in SC.

The traces of SC we find already in *The Politics* by Aristotle (1984) who uses the term “zoon politikon” by appealing to co-habitation, customs and

¹ Address: Prof Dr Tomas Kačerauskas, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies, Trakų g. 1, 01132 Vilnius, Lithuania. E-mail: Tomas.Kacerauskas@vgtu.lt

² We speak also about human capital (Hoyman et al. 2009), logistic capital (Štreimikienė et al. 2012) etc.

³ Comp. Bourdieu 1985 and Putnam 2002.

traditions. Beside this, Aristotle pays attention to the polis, i. e. city-state as a reservoir of politics that bond the people.

The definitions of SC have been analysed by the scholars for some decades. According to Pierre Bourdieu, it is “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationship” (Bourdieu 1985: 248). Coleman defines the concept as an entity that includes “social structures” and “certain action of actors <...> within the structures” (Coleman 1988: 98). Baker defines the term as “a resource that actors derive from specific social structures and then use to pursue their interests” (Baker 1990: 619). Schiff characterizes the concept as “the set of elements of the social structure that affects relations among people and are inputs or arguments of the production and/or utility function” (Schiff 1992: 161). Burt characterises it as “friends, colleagues, and more general contacts through whom you receive opportunities to use your financial and human capital” (Burt 1992: 9). We will come back to the different concepts of SC in the first chapter (1. SC: concepts and problems).

The reservoirs of SC are different institutions (schools, churches, state organizations, political institutions) where traditional values have been cherished and an individual has been educated in the spirit of a community. An individual is subordinated to a community that “protects” him (her) by limiting his (her) individual excesses dangerous for the community as an integral organism. According to Anderson (1991), the communities including nations are imagined, i. e. created by the media and the most prominent individuals within them. On the other hand, we can also speak about the communities as individuals concerning integral society: despite the segregation of the communities, they should have certain “family resemblance” (Wittgenstein 2001), otherwise, they will not compose any integral society such as a nation, the members of which are tied by a common language, religion and culture. Different nations must be tied sufficiently by religious and cultural heritage in a multinational state, otherwise, their divorce rate would threaten. In other words, the more motley communities compose the society, the bigger need is to accumulate SC. Speaking about the individuals, the more different they are, the stronger their ties should be in SC, which is like a credit source for the individuals who nourish social attitudes and implement social aims.

A question arises whether it is the case of creative individuals and creative society (Adomaitytė et al. 2018; Reimeris 2016). It seems that the priority of the society towards an individual is Platonic attitude that does not fit for a creative individual and creative society. It seems there is no necessity for SC by maintaining that creative individuals have a priority over the society and the creative society consists namely of them. If we treat society as a sum of creative individuals eccentric towards it, then the society is not sustainable and

disintegrates unless it is spliced with sufficiently hard creative ethics and creative ecology that limit individual expression. This idea presupposes again the necessity of SC: *what are creative ethics and creative ecology if it is not SC that nourishes creative workers' feeling of community?* Here we face the thought that *creative society as nothing else needs SC*. It is a cardinaly contrary statement to R. Florida's (2012) statement that creative class⁴ needs CC instead of SC and that they are two inconsistent species of capital (Peck 2005). Although elsewhere Florida (2017) presents the revised understanding towards creative class, the collision between SC and CC remains relevant. The discourse of creative class has the theoretical roots in economic approach towards society. As a result, we can not ignore Marxist attitude and Neo-Marxist criticism towards class power (Harvey 2001).

The discourse of SC is a kind of Marxist capital discourse's extension, too. As mentioned, the main theorists of SC are P. Bourdieu (1985), R. Putnam (2000), and Coleman J. (1990), although a similar phenomenon with different names have been also described by other sociologists⁵ before them. In a recent quarter-century SC has been developed in many social sciences including business management, economics, urban studies, social geography, etc. As mentioned, CC contrasted to SC has been developed by R. Florida (2012).

The main aims of the paper are as follows: (1) to criticize the Florida's conception of CC as eliminating SC; (2) to present the middle way between CC and SC and to show that they are not opposing to each other, rather complement each other; (3) to analyse the different aspects of dichotomy and dialectics of SC and CC; (4) to develop the idea of creative society.

First of all, the concepts and problems of SC from the perspective of creativity will be reviewed (*1. Social capital: concepts and problems*), later different social ties will be analysed (*2. Bonding and bridging social ties in creative society*), and finally, the crisis of SC from the perspective of globalism discourse will be investigated (*3. Criticism of social capital and the problems of creative capital*). SC and CC in each of these chapters will be compared.

Social capital: concepts and problems

SC has been discussed in thousands of papers, some of which are the champions as the most cited articles in social sciences (Portes 1998; Woolcock et al. 2000; Pretty et al. 2001; Adler et al. 2002). Most of the authors who analysed this social phenomenon are enthusiastic about SC by stressing, first of all, its role in economic development (Woolcock 2000), urban sustainability (Rich 2012), ecology policy (Pretty et al. 2001), and the decrease of crimes

⁴ R. Florida speaks more about creative class instead of creative society.

⁵ Comp. L. J. Hanifan (1916).

(Rich 2012). However, some voices are very critical by appealing to vagueness and one dimension of this term (Tittenbrun 2014) and to ambiguity of cohesion/diversity in general (Grabher – Stark 1997). As a result, the term “social capital” is a good example when speaking about the rise and decline of certain scientific concepts. Nevertheless, I pay more attention to the relationship between SC and CC in the perspective of creative society instead of the criticism towards the term “social capital” or its implied content.

From the very beginning, we face certain ambivalence and contradictions between different understandings of SC. I. Matonytė (2004) shows what different contents of SC have been presupposed by P. Bourdieu (1985) and R. Putnam (2000). As a result, we have also various evaluations of this social phenomenon from very negative to very positive. Nonetheless, a scientific way appeals to a problematic approach that includes both positive and negative sides. In this paper, I try to connect negative aspects of SC with a certain deficit of CC by appealing to the dialectical interties between these two sides of the same complex social phenomenon. Consequently, as R. Florida (2012) suggests, it is impossible to neglect or even remove SC with the help of CC.

Beside mentioned definitions presented by Bourdieu (1985), Coleman (1988), Baker (1990), Schiff (1992) and Burt (1992), the most integrative definitions of SC have been suggested by Portes (1998), Woolcock et al. (2000), Pretty et al. (2001), and Adler et al. (2002). According to A. Portes, “social capital stands for the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures” (1998: 6). A. Portes speaks about both positive and negative aspects of SC. First, social environment could be “powerful motivational force” (Portes 1998: 8) for an individual; second, sociality provides certain safety, trust or even guarantee for individual activity. However, SC as a form of social control can depress and even block any creative aspirations of an individual. A. Portes (1998) summarises the negative consequences of SC as “exclusion of outsiders, excess claims on group members, restrictions on individual freedoms, and downward levelling norms” (1998: 15). Speaking about the creative society, we also face a certain exclusion of not creative persons; otherwise, creative community would have no limits, consequently, no community. Nevertheless, excluded outsiders often become a core of a new creative community within a certain creative school. Additionally, creative community tolerates or even appeals to the outsiders but not because of tolerance⁶ within it, but of the need in creative communication and renewing, otherwise, it would lead every social group to destruction and downward levelling environment. What concerns excess claims of the community on the individuals, it could be reversed in the creative

⁶ As stresses R. Florida (2012) with his 3 T’s.

society. In other words, we can speak about excess claims of an outstanding individual on his (her) social environment. However, it is only possible if an individual has a sufficient creative freedom. As a result, the mentioned negative aspects of SC could be connected with the lack of creative aspirations within a social group.

M. Woolcock and D. Narayan (2000) connect SC with norms and networks while the latter “enable people to act collectively”. The authors analyse communitarian, networks, institutional and synergy views. The authors notice that sometimes SC hinders social development and “social solidarity <...> does not necessarily lead to economic prosperity” (2000: 233). Additionally, strong bonding ties can lead to “narrow sectarian interests” that finally “have negative economic consequences” (2000: 234). Besides this, too strong social ties can block technological development too (Grabher 1993). The institutional view presupposes institutional environment for the activity (and vitality) of social groups. Having in mind a stagnant character of formal institutions, creativity of social groups is hardly possible. M. Woolcock and D. Narayan stress that state-society relations “may degenerate into conflict, violence, war or anarchy” (2000: 240). Like A. Portes (1998), the authors appeal to mafia that has very strong social relations but is undesirable in any state. On the other hand, this intolerance could namely follow from a similar character of strong social ties both in mafia and in a totalitarian state. Although creative groups including scholar groups have all attributes of mafia or gangs⁷, they are creative not because of their strong social ties, rather on the contrary. Though creative workers need certain support from their social (and creative) environment, creativity does not only use social ties to spread creative results, but also ignores them by appealing to a new creative community. This dialectical relationship between SC and CC will be analysed in the next chapters. Speaking about M. Woolcock and D. Narayan, it is obvious that the economic approach that is not mentioned is presented in their views. In other words, SC has been evaluated by them according to its impact on economic development. Nevertheless, creativity in its nature is uninterested in the economic sense of view, although a material reward could be a certain stimulus for creative activity.

According to J. Pretty and H. Ward (2001), the term of SC „captures the idea that social bonds and social norms are an important part of the basis for sustainable livelihoods“ (2001: 210). Besides this, the authors state that “connectedness, networks, and groups and the nature of relationships are a vital aspect of social capital” (2001: 211). Vitality is the other side of creativity including social creativity. As a result, the authors imply that SC is directly

⁷ Comp. T. J. Scheff 1995.

proportional to CC although they do not use the latter term. Having in mind previous considerations about stagnant social ties, it could astonish. Furthermore, the authors speak about trust (ensured by sufficient SC) that liberates resources. Here we face twofold creative aspects: we can speak about both creative resources analogous to economic ones and creative liberation. Anyway, these results are absolutely contrary to the results of R. Florida's (2012) considerations that SC blocks CC. By developing the idea of dialectics between these two kinds of capital, the considerations of J. Pretty and H. Ward are very important.

P. S. Adler and S.-W. Kwon (2002) define SC as “the goodwill that is engendered by the fabric of social relations”⁸ (2002: 17). The authors pay attention to the fact that “social ties can be used for different purposes” (2002: 17), consequently, even for the destruction of these ties. The authors distinguish three types of relations (market relations, hierarchical relations, and social relations) and appeal to different reservoirs of SC while interweaving these relations. Additionally, this typology can be enlarged by one more type of relations, i.e. creative ones. Creative relations are peculiar because of the fact that they transfuse all other relations by changing the whole family of human relations. Since P. S. Adler and S.-W. Kwon appeal to the resources and material benefits, their discourse stays an economic one. However, the biggest benefit of SC is namely non-economic, i.e. its impossibility to be converted into one type of relations, for example, market (economic) relations. In other words, SC functions in terms of being all the above mentioned relations, i.e. being a metaphor. As a result, it is not enough to state that social “capital, in all its forms, is a relation, not a thing” (2002: 27). Being a metaphor and being all the other relations, it is also a meta-relation. Speaking about the community or even society, this rather poetical than metaphysical nature of SC is another creative aspect.

As mentioned before, some recent considerations on SC are absolutely negative. For example, J. Tittenbrun (2014) states that it is neither social nor capital. On the one hand, it does not exhaust all social relations⁹; on the other hand, it misleads by appealing to economy. According to J. Tittenbrun, this notion is “ahistoric” (2014: 457), it is a “postmodern <...> form of fetishism” (2014: 459). The conclusion of the author is as follows: the notion of SC “should be banned from science” like other “misnomers” or “buzzwords” (2014: 459). In my opinion, the main problem of J. Tittenbrun is namely his inability to treat the notion of SC as a metaphor, i.e. his too narrow approach

⁸ In the same paper, P. S. Adler and S.-W. Kwon present more detailed definition as follows: „Social capital is the goodwill available to individuals or groups. Its sources lie in the structure and content of the actor's social relations. Its effects flow from the information, influence, and solidarity it makes available to the actor“. (2002: 23).

⁹ J. Tittenbrun appeals to A. Schütz, who speaks about relations with our previous generations.

despite his appeal to the field beyond economy. However, he uses psychoanalytical connotations (fetishism) instead of economic ones (capital). This decapitation does not change anything – after all, the scientific dictatorship could be even stronger. Second, we can use the term “social capital” even by appealing to (creative) communication with our predecessors: we “credit” our historical heroes who build our social environment. Unfortunately, J. Tittenbrun does not use such a phenomenological approach, although he appeals to A. Schütz (1967). And last but not least is the fact that any critic (including J. Tittenbrun) of the notion “social capital” namely appeals to SC, i.e. to the community of scholars, the ties of which are based on the notion of “social capital”.

The mentioned positive and negative aspects of SC have been shown in the Table 1. However, the positive and negative aspects are inseparable in different situations of real life. For example, the narrow interests are the aspect of specialization and creativity must have certain limits in respects of ethics and ecology. Finally, the unlimited creativity can lead to psychical diseases (Rank 1989).

Table 1: The aspects of social capital (SC)

The positive aspects	The negative aspects	References
Social environment motivates the individuals; sociality provides safety, trust and guarantee for individual activity	SC blocks the creative aspirations of an individual	Portes, 1998
SC enables people to act collectivity	SC does not necessarily lead to economic prosperity; strong SC can lead to narrow interests; too strong SC can block technological development; creativity is hardly possible	Woolcock and Narayan, 2000
SC is an important part of sustainable coexistence; SC provides vitality, trust and creativity for society	–	Pretty and Ward, 2001
The resources and material benefits of SC	The social ties could be used for different purposes including destroying of SC	Adler and Kwon, 2002
–	Being neither social nor capital, SC is an ahistoric notion	Tittenbrun, 2014

In the next chapters CC and SC will be compared in a broader context of creative society.

Bonding and bridging social ties in creative society

The discourse of Bourdieu and his followers reflects the different forms of capital (not only SC) as privilege of certain individuals and groups that ensure the social cohesion. As mentioned, the discourse of creative class develops this Post-Marxist approach. However, the concept of creative society is something different if it presupposes the creative individuals within it. What about the social cohesion, i. e. the bonding and bridging ties in such neoliberal “imagined community” (using Anderson’s (1991) term) as creative society?

Every society has both bonding and bridging social ties (Birendra et al. 2018; Phua et al. 2017; Kim 2017; Plotka 2018). On the one hand, individual creative activity disharmonizes the aspirations of his (her) community and society; on the other hand, the source of every creativity including an individual one is creative communication that is possible only in a certain (professional) community and (creative) society: the first one ensures the changes of creative ideas and the latter one – creative environment. Besides this, the product of creativity appeals to certain members of both professional community and creative society while they recognize, reject or ignore it. As a result, individual and different creation needs communication that influences as circulation of SC both in a minor (bonding) and major (bridging) circle of social body.

However, bonding and bridging ties of SC’s circulation are eccentric towards each other though they depend on each other (Sapin et al., 2016; Bouchillon, 2014). Bonding ties, unlike bridging ones, help to keep touch between the community members who cluster into certain groups, “fraternities” (that consist of the members of social networks), that are revolutionary towards the society. On the one hand, these “fraternities” are autonomous concerning the society; they break the society into certain groups and parties. On the other hand, the members of these “fraternities” belong to worldwide global consumer society that oversteps the borders of separate national societies thanks to the technologies that serve the mediated society. As a result, bonding ties in social networks of the mediated society create new bridging ties and new reservoirs of global SC (Birendra et al. 2018; Phua et al. 2017); these reservoirs have been nourished by global symbols such as “football” (Behrens et al. 2018; Collins – Heere 2018), “rock” (Eastman 2012), “Hollywood” (Mossig 2008), “hip-hop” (Clech 2016; Emdin – Lee 2012), “opera” (Kotnik 2016; Coons 2014), “Ikea” (Dodd 2017) etc. This list includes references to conflicting global communities that overstep the borders of national societies despite their conflicts. As a result, the communities represented by different cultural symbols split the society (this time a global one) that has been already split by the national communities. Creativity can be measured through the relation with

cultural symbols: those who create them are to be considered as more creative while those who consume them or compensate the lack of creativity – less creative. Nevertheless, every creative worker is also a consumer of these symbols even if he (she) does it in critical or ironic way.

We face the ambiguity of relationship between creativity and sociability already in Plato's (2004) considerations. On the one hand, Plato speaks about the important role of pieces of art in education. On the other hand, he suggests to control and even to exile the creative workers if they threaten to destroy social order.

R. Florida (2012) speaks about individual occupations, individual creativity and individual activity that do not only ignore our dependence on society, but also make it eccentric. Plato tries to avoid namely this. In other words, we destruct SC while searching for individuality and difference (Hospers, 2003), i.e. forming CC. Nevertheless, by creating, every individual appeals to a certain (creative or consumer) society and steady channels off creative communication while these channels are to be connected with the circulation circles of SC. However, after introducing the new cultural symbols, every new influential work also creates new communicative channels and changes the content of SC (Bouckenoghe – Menguc 2018; Doniy 2017). And vice versa, SC circulates only while getting creative impulses from the individuals (a community regarding society could be treated as an individual). As a result, CC is an aspect of SC and vice versa.

Criticism of social capital and the problems of creative capital

It seems that religious and national communities weaken. However, SC of these communities is so fundamental that it nourishes both religious conflicts (terror acts) and ideas of national independence (singing revolutions) during a long-aged official discourse (ideology) of “society without prejudices” and “nations’ friendship”, using Soviet jargon. The harder SC is, the more it is denied by official (formal) mass communication. Not only political resistance to the latter but also creative initiatives have been supported by SC that circulates in not official channels as a certain anti-ideology. Under certain political circumstances, the latter turns to formal ideology that also causes political and creative resistance.

SC forces the individuals to cluster into traditional (national, religious, cultural) communities. If SC is not attractive enough in order to stop emigration, we can speak about its crisis that not necessary coincides with economic and political crisis. A question arises whether the crisis of SC has been accompanied by the decline of CC. If we recognize that the biggest reservoir of SC is an urban environment, the cities are in extreme danger (Hall 1998). The researcher of civilizations Toybee (1979) pays attention to the fact

that the decline of political power and of economic potency has been accompanied with the rise of creativity. We face a similar situation in Lithuanian state exhausted by wars, plague and hunger in the second half of 17th century. In this time, Vilnius baroque school has flowered in Lithuanian capital while it has given an impulse to cultural development of the whole region. However, this intensification of CC's circulation has been also accompanied by strengthening SC as its base: after "own" Unitarian church triumphed over "alien" Orthodox Church, the society of Grand Duchy of Lithuania has been integral as never. As a result, *the contraposition of SC and CC is not reasoned*.

Nevertheless, creative individuals do not only emigrate but also leave national or religious community after they feel themselves as the agents of global culture thanks to the media. As a result, the media not only consolidate a nation (Anderson 1991) but also deletes the borders of it by appealing to the global community.

Florida (2012) concludes that SC connected with the traditional closed society (nation) becomes an obstacle to spread new creative resources. Closeness and cultural shallows help accumulate SC like silt in an old channel; on the contrary, openness does not allow stopping the river pushed by a creative water. According to Florida (2012), creative society must be open to different creative ideas and creative people that weaken SC by migrating. Beside others, Florida gives the geographic arguments. Similarly, Harvey (2001) speaks about geographic aspects of class power. In opposition to that, creative society has no more any stable and settled place in order to accumulate SC that also ensures certain stability and security. Table 2 shows the different negative aspects of SC from the point of view of CC.

Table 2: Comparison of CC and SC, according to Florida (2012)

Social capital (SC)	Creative capital (CC)
Traditional closed society	Global open society
SC presupposes stable and settle environment	CC presupposes vital and liquid environment
Old media channels	New media channels
Old economy	New economic relations
Technological inertia	New technologies

The criticism of SC in Table 2 can be compared with the criticism shown in Table 1. Like Florida (2012), Portes (1998) states that SC blocks the individual creativity. According to Woolcock and Narayan (2000), SC blocks new technologies while Innovation Index is one of Creativity Indices for Florida. While Tittenbrun (2014) states that SC is ahistorical notion, Florida appeals that it is an old concept. However, we can rephrase Adler and Kwon (2002) by

saying that creativity could lead to destroying (Törnqvist 2004) of even the very creativity without such stabilising element, as SC. Additionally, Florida's approach is very economic and even anti-ecologic. In general, creativity presupposes human expansion towards the nature. Beside this, old technologies and new technologies could be hardly separated from each other.

The following question arises: is melting of SC under the media influence and new technologies a positive or negative phenomenon? It seems that SC is a relict to be removed if it is an obstacle for the circulation of CC. Florida namely states this. However, this statement is grounded by a certain worldview attitude, i.e. by a conviction that creativeness and openness have an unconditional priority. My contra-statement is as follows: creativity and openness of a society are not to be reached at any cost; on the contrary, a society is creative and open only after it perceives its limits of creativity and openness. In other words, creativity without creative ethics and creative ecology is destructive towards society. Besides this, the deficit of security and safety work against creativity; creativity is also lost after the voices of the media blanket individual aspirations. Individuals lose their creative potency and creative intentions, they become the products of the media under their influence.

Florida stresses that SC and CC are contrary and creative communities stimulate variety, innovations and economic growth. For this sake, Florida appeals to the so called Melting Pot Index that shows the percentage of people born not in that society. Florida connects this index with a creative and open society and states that the society nourished by the immigrants is a source of innovations, novelties and economic growth. According to him, society must not only be open as possible but also tolerant, otherwise, CC would not circulate within it. To put it differently, the more washed SC is, the more place CC has. According to Florida, weak social ties are not the defects; on the contrary, they allow new people and new ideas integrate faster. Finally, it contributes to creative communication and changes of the ideas.

Discussions and conclusions

On the one hand, SC and CC, as many others, reflect the Post-Marxist economic approach towards society split into the social groups as holders of certain capitals. On the other hand, both of them show very different capital's aspects beside economic one. The comparison of SC and CC opens very different approaches towards society. In the case of SC we still have the privileged classes who consolidate the whole society. Even in the case of the creative class presented by Florida we face the relics of Post-Marxist economic approach since Florida correlates the activity of so called creative class with economic prosperity of a region. As a result, the content of CC is the creativity

to be reduced into economic competitive ability. In the case of creative society, we have very different approach. If every person is more or less creative, we do not have the creative classes or parties as holders of CC any more. This (neo)liberal approach means also the dissemination of any form of capital, as well as elimination of attitude formed by economic priority in our societies.

In the light of these considerations, the discussion concerning positive and negative aspects of SC leads to very different questions. On the one hand, it is not enough to stress that SC ensures trust, economic development, ecological consciousness, etc. On the other hand, it is not enough to criticize it because of intolerance for the non-members of a certain social group, stagnant relations, depression of the initiatives while these negative aspects of SC can be connected with the lack of creative aspirations within a social group. What if we do not have any more holder of SC in a creative society that cancels economic base of discussions? However, what about CC? Criticism of Florida's creative class, the limits of which are not clear, leads not only to the idea of a dialectical relation between SC and CC. For example, although creative workers need certain support from their social environment, creativity does not only use social ties to spread creative results, but also ignores them by appealing to a new creative community. The criticism of the notion of "CC" from the perspective of creative society leads to the idea that a creative component allows to enlarge a narrow economic view while creativity in its nature is an uninterested view although the material reward could be a certain stimulus for a creative activity. On the other hand, we can treat also SC beyond mentioned narrow economic approach. For example, we can use the term "social capital" even by appealing to (creative) communication with our predecessors: we "credit" our historical heroes who built our social environment. On the other hand, any criticism of the notion "social capital" namely appeals to SC, i.e. to the community of scholars, the ties of which are based on the notion of "social capital".

A contraposition and comparison of SC and CC open many questions not analysed in this paper. How are these categories used in public discourse and what kind of attitudes do they produce? What kind of values reflect these two different categories? Should we, social scientists, abandon the notion „industrial society“ with its satellite terms including the term „social capital“ for the term „creative society“? What are the links between neoliberalisation and CC? In what societies do these terms apply? Do we refer to European or/and Western societies? Is this a universal analysis that could be applied to „third world countries“, too? What about forms of capital in the light of postcolonialism?

Tomas Kačerauskas is head of Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies, Faculty of Creative Industries at Vilnius Gediminas Technical University. Recent research areas are as follows: creative society, creativity studies, and theories of communication. He is author of more than 120 publications in 8 languages (English, Russian, German, Polish, Slovak, Ukrainian, Latvian, Lithuanian) including 5 monographs and translation of M. Heidegger's "Being and Time" into Lithuanian. According to Web of Science data, his Hirsch index is 9 and his average citations per items are 2,14. As a keynote speaker, he took part in the conferences in Turkey, Hungary, Poland, Portugal. He was lecturing at the universities in Italy, Netherlands, Colombia, Portugal, and Poland. He leads the international scientific project Conception of creative city within Central Europe: Historical images and empirical indices (2016 – 2018).

REFERENCES

- ADLER, P. S. – KWON, S.-W., 2002: Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept. *The Academy of Management Review* 27 (1): 17-40.
- ADOMAITYTĖ, G. – ŽILINSKAITĖ, V. – SEDEREVIČIŪTĖ-PAČIAUSKIENĖ, Ž. – VALANTINAITĖ, I. – NAVICKIENĖ, V., 2018: Shift of Creativity Concepts: From Mysticism to Modern Approach. *Filosofija-Sociologija* 29 (3): 203-210.
- ANDERSON, B., 2001: *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- ARISTOTLE, 1984: *The Politics*. Transl. by C. Lord. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- BAKER, W. E., 1990: Market Networks and Corporate Behaviour. *American Journal of Sociology* 96: 589-625.
- BEHRENS, C. – MEYER, T. – PIERDZIOCH, C., 2018: Football Clubs and Philanthropy: An Empirical Analysis of Volunteering, Match Quality, and Donations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 53 (5): 594-614.
- BIRENDRA, K. C. – MORAIS, D. B. – SEEKAMP, E. – SMITH, J. W. – PETERSON, M. N., 2018: Bonding and Bridging forms of SC in Wildlife Tourism Microentrepreneurship: An Application of Social Networks Analysis. *Sustainability* 10 (2): 315.
- BOUCKENOOGHE, D. – MENGUC, B., 2018: Understanding the Dynamics between Supervisor-Follower SC, Work Engagement, and Employees' Creative Work Involvement. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* 35 (2): 238-251.
- BOURDIEU, P., 1985: The Forms of Capital. In: Richardson J. (ed.): *Handbook of Theory and Research for Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood, pp. 241-258.
- BOUCHILLON, B. C., 2014. Social Ties and Generalized Trust, Online and in Person: Contact or Conflict – the Mediating Role of Bonding SC in America. *Social Science Computer Review* 32 (4): 506-523.

- BURT, R. S., 1992: *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- CLECH, P., 2016: *Mobilités sociales et rapports au pouvoir institutionnel: une élite du hip-hop en banlieue rouge (Social Mobility and Relationships with Institutional Power: The Case of Hip-Hop Elites in French Community)*. *Politix* 29 (114): 149-175.
- COLEMAN, J. S., 1990: *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- COLEMAN, J. S., 1988: SC in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 95-121.
- COLLINS, D. – HEERE, B., 2018: Sunday Afternoon SC: An Ethnographic Study of the Southern City Jets Club. *European Sport Management Quarterly* 4: 439-458.
- COONS, L., 2014: *Artiste or Coquette? Les Petits Rats of the Paris Opera Ballet*. *French Cultural Studies* 25 (2): 140-164.
- DODD, S., 2017: Participatory Building Communities and the Production of Design Knowledge. *Journal of Architectural Education* 71 (1): 103-107.
- DONIY, N. E., 2017: Economic and Social Aspect of Creativity. *Scientific Bulletin of Polissia* 3: 123-126.
- EASTMAN, J. T., 2012: Rebel Manhood: The Hegemonic Masculinity of the Southern Rock Music Revival. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 41 (2): 189-219.
- EMDIN, C. – LEE, O., 2012: Hip-Hop, the „Obama Effect“, and Urban Science Education. *Teachers College Record* 114 (2): 203-206.
- FLORIDA, R., 2012: *The Rise of Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books.
- FLORIDA, R., 2017: *The New Urban Crisis: How our Cities are Increasing Inequality, Deepening Segregation, and Failing the Middle Class – and what we Can do about It*. New York: Basic Books.
- GRABHER, G., 1993: *The Embedded Firm: On the Socio-Economics of Industrial Networks*. London and New York: Routledge.
- GRABHER, G. – STARK, D., 1997: Organizing Diversity: Evolutionary Theory, Network Analysis and Postsocialism. *Regional studies* 31(5): 533-544.
- HALL, P., 1998: *Cities in Civilization*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- HANIFAN, L. J., 1916: The Rural School Community Center. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 67: 130-138.
- HARVEY, D., 2001: *Spaces of Capital: Towards Critical Geography*. London and New York: Routledge.
- HOSPERS, G. J., 2003: Creative Cities: Breeding Places in the Knowledge Economy. *Knowledge, Technology & Policy* 16 (3): 143-162.
- HOYMAN, M. – FARICY, C., 2009: It Takes a Village: A Test of the Creative Class, SC and Human Capital Theories. *Urban Affairs Review* 44: 311-333.
- KIM, H. H., 2017: Of Bonding and Bridging: Ethnic SC and Contingent Employment Among Immigrant Women in Korea. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 26 (2): 181-205.
- KOTNIK, V., 2016: Opera as Social Manifest: Madlena Zepter's Private Opera House and Theatre as Corporate Gift to the Serbian Nation. *Trames – Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences* 20 (3): 229-271.

- MATONYTĖ, I., 2004: Socialinis kapitalas: nuo mokslinių tyrimo perspektyvų prie empirinių pastebėjimų. Gero valdymo klausimas (Social Capital: From Scientific Research to Empirical Observations. The Question of Good Management). *Sociologija – Mintis ir veiksmas* 1: 22-37.
- MOSSIG, I., 2008: Global Networks of the Motion Picture Industry in Los Angeles /Hollywood Using the Example of their Connections to the German Market. *European Planning Studies* 16 (1): 43-59.
- PECK, J., 2005: Struggling with the Creative Class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29 (4), 740-770.
- PLATO, 2004: *The Republic*. Transl. by C. D. C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- PORTES, A., 1998: SC: Its Origin and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1-24.
- PRETTY, J. – WARD, H., 2001: Social Capital and the Environment. *World Development* 29 (2): 209-227.
- PHUA, J. – JIN, S. V. – Kim, J. J., 2017: Uses and Gratifications of Social Networking Sites for Bridging and Bonding Capital: A Comparison of Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat. *Computers in Human Behavior* 72: 115-122.
- PLOTKA, W., 2018: An Outline of a Phenomenology of Solidarity: Beyond the Bridge Problem. *Filosofija – Sociologija* 29 (3): 167-175.
- PUTNAM, R. D., 2002: *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Singapore: Simon & Schuster.
- RANK, O., 1989: *Truth and Reality*. New York: Knof.
- REIMERIS, R., 2016: Theoretical Features of the Creative Society. *Creativity Studies* 9 (1): 15-24.
- RICH, M. A., 2012: 'From Coal to Cool': The Creative Class, SC, and the Revitalization of Scranton. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 35 (3): 365-384.
- SAPIN, M. – WIDMER, E. D. – IGLESIAS, K., 2016: From Support to Overload: Patterns of Positive and Negative Family Relationship of Adults with Mental Illness over Time. *Social Networks* 47: 59-72.
- SCHEFF, T. J., 1995: Academic Gangs. *Crime, Law & Social Change* 23 (2): 157-162.
- SCHIFF, M., 1992: Social Capital, Labor Mobility, and Welfare: The Impact of Uniting States. *Rationality and Society* 4: 157-175.
- SCHÜTZ, A., 1967: *The Phenomenology of Social World*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- ŠTREIMIKIENĖ, D. – BARAKAUSKAITĖ-JAKUBAUSKIENĖ, N., 2011: Application of Logistic Capital Management Theory Model to the Economic Growth Cycle in Lithuania. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy* 17 (2): 352-368.
- TITTENBRUN, J., 2014: Social Capital: Neither Social, Nor Capital. *Social Science Information* 53 (4): 453-461.
- TÖRNQVIST, G., 2004: Creativity in Time and Space. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 86 (4), 227-243.
- TOYNBEE, A. J., 1979: *A Study of History*. New York: Weathervane Books.
- WITTGENSTEIN, L., 2001: *Philosophical Investigations*. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing.
- WOOLCOCK, M. – NARAYAN, D., 2000: Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy. *The World Bank Research Observer* 15 (2): 225-249.