The aim of the paper is to show how the analysis and theorization of voluntary associations could make the most of Pierre Bourdieu’s relational sociology. So far, comprehensive adaptation of Bourdieu’s theory on voluntary associations has been insufficient and mostly used only a part of his complete repertoire. There are presentations of Bourdieu’s contribution to organizational analysis and to social movements. But hardly any comprehensive adaptation of his relational sociology to the sociology of voluntary associations. The general contribution of Bourdieu’s theorization to the sociology of associations is sixfold. First, he provides a comprehensive theoretical framework covering (almost) all dimensions and levels of association analysis (from individual agency through mediating meso-level to the field of “sub-systems”). Second, Bourdieu’s ideas of interest-directed participation in social fields are directly relevant to association analysis. The central concept in the analysis of participation is the causality of the probable (Bourdieu 1974). Third, voluntary associations or social movements can be approached as “mini-fields” dynamized by inner domination (Herrschaft) and power relations (c.f. Bourdieu’s criticism of Luhmann’s systems theory and Althusser’s concept of ideological state apparatuses). Fourth, voluntary associations and social movements can be understood as central means of taking part collectively in the struggles of the stakes in different social fields such as the political, religious, cultural or scientific fields. Fifth, Bourdieu’s concept of the causality of the probable opens possibilities to separate between various types of participation. It can be applied both to individual and collective participation. It can also be used as a critique of a one-sided conception of the rational choice theory. Using Bourdieu’s ideas it is possible to make a distinction between reasonable and rational action (and [non]participation). From this perspective, for example, more or less conscious decisions of marginalized actors short of economic, cultural and social capital to refrain from participating or joining in established voluntary associations or political parties may be reasonable. The conception of the causality of the probable is that people are making reasonable choices based on their capitalizable resources (economic, cultural and social capital) and their life experiences internalized in their primary and secondary habitus. They tend to choose such alternatives which seem to lead into good or at least tolerable goals. This concept can analogically be adapted also to choices of voluntary associations in various social fields. The paper argues that voluntary associations acting in social fields also make - more or less consciously - realistic choices, most probably leading to at least reasonable results. The causality of the probable concept is also the key for the understanding of Bourdieu’s concept of interest as the opposite of indifference (or even apathy) to take part in struggles of stakes in certain social field. Sixth, Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic power helps in the understanding of the differences in associational activeness between people in different class or social position. It is a central mechanism in the formation of social groups and collective identities (the transformation of potential groups to actual groups; the symbolic struggle about the nodal points of group and class formation). Voluntary associations have been and still are central agents in the symbolic struggles about coordinates of class and strata formation. The concept of symbolic power is also a important entry point to the analysis of role of the state in the preconditioning of collective action. The paper also discusses critically about the limitations and gaps of Bourdieu’s theory from the point of view of the sociology of voluntary associations. These real or imagined lacunae in Bourdieu’s theory include the structure - agency relationship, the problem of change and the state theory.