

population is near to the average of European countries. Thus, health care ought to be of high quality and equally available for all. However, the actual situation, as described by Losonczi, is very different.

First, she deals with the problems arising at the level of national planning and government. Although 'man is the highest value' is one of the declared basic principles, in practice persons not participating in the production of the GDP, and thus ill persons, are latently considered to be less valuable than others, and health care, being within the non-productive sphere, is treated as a gift by the state. In consequence, the amount spent on health care in relation to GDP is lower than in other similarly developed societies. The salaries of physicians are relatively low and the material equipment of the health service (hospital buildings, medical instruments etc.) is in poor supply and often bad condition. These conditions have resulted in the spread of quasi-market conditions. Patients usually give a 'gratitude payment' (this is the exact translation of the Hungarian term) to their doctors. This market, however, operates far from perfectly. The amount of the 'gratitude payment' for a given medical treatment is not fixed, and therefore patients tend to overbid each other, fearing that otherwise they will get less than optimal care. It is also not clear to whom the 'payment' ought to be made—to the chief doctor or to the doctor actually treating the person—and what part should be given to the nurses, etc. The doctors usually accept the 'payment', otherwise their income would be relatively very low. Their salaries are, however, centrally determined with the tacit knowledge that in this way they are able to supplement their incomes. But not all medical doctors receive this kind of supplementary income; the estimates vary at between 25 and 50 per cent.

These conditions lead, according to Losonczi, to the defencelessness and alienation of both patients

and doctors. Patients feel defenceless because doctors do not have enough time to attend to their problems, because they do not have the right to choose the doctor or the hospital (they have to go to the health care unit in their place of residence) and because in the overcrowded hospitals it is often impossible to provide them with appropriate amenities.

Medical personnel are likewise in a defenceless situation. They are under the continuous pressure of the demands of the health authorities, on the one side, and of the dissatisfaction of patients on the other. The authorities demand that they cure sick people, but also that they keep the number of days of sickness under control. Since it is tacitly assumed that part of the demand for sickness benefit is motivated simply by the desire to escape from work, they have to defend themselves against the suspicion of careless treatment and of providing unduly expensive forms of treatment. Thus, an important part of their working time is used in producing certification for the treatments they have given. They are forced to try to supplement their incomes by accepting 'gratitude payments'. This is known, but neither officially accepted nor prohibited by the higher authorities. Losonczi also argues that the medical profession is more hierarchically organized, and the relations of its different levels more authoritarian, than in other professional groups, so that a medical doctor at the lower levels of the hierarchy is less able than other professionals to disagree with his chief and to express an independent view concerning the treatment of his patients.

Losonczi does not formulate concrete reform proposals for the health system, but only stresses that it would be necessary to make the relations of doctors and patients, and of the different levels of the health service more equal and more partnership-like, so that situations of defencelessness might become less acute or even disappear.

Rudolf Andorka
Karl Marx University of Economics
Department of Sociology
Budapest, Hungary

Pierre Bourdieu: *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984. 613 pp.

Pierre Bourdieu's *La Distinction* (originally published in French in 1979) has now appeared in an English language paperback edition. It takes up issues of stratification and lifestyle, a subject that has much waned in popularity over the last decades. It should

be remembered that there was a time when social scientists like Stuart Chapin and Lloyd Warner would investigate the way a person's living room was furnished, how he spent his holidays and leisure time or to which voluntary associations he belonged, and then

were able to discern his 'social class' position. Although vestiges of this approach to stratification can still be found in the more recent work of, among others Laumann and Pappi, it cannot be denied that mainstream stratification research has concentrated on other, more structural processes and has made education, occupation and income as such its main concerns. Bourdieu's contribution, in many ways original and innovative, is in other ways very traditional, if not classic. One basic line of his thinking is truly Weberian, holding that a lifestyle is a major instrument in maintaining status boundaries. This is given a Durkheimian and Goffmanian flavor by stressing that lifestyles are a social ritual, roles that members of status groups play as a means of impression management. In contrast with the traditional approach, it is not consumer and behavioral choices as such, but the tastes underlying them, that are the core of Bourdieu's concept of lifestyles. Bourdieu holds that tastes (i.e. the distinctions one makes) are crucial in showing status marks.

On the empirical side, the book draws on a wide variety of survey data, which I find to be very admirable. The main sources are two surveys, conducted in the 1960s by the author himself, but he supplements these with secondary analyses of some 50 other surveys. This enables him to address a very wide range of phenomena, such as aesthetic preferences in the realms of popular music and photography, holiday destinations and eating habits and political preferences and participation. However, most central is the relation that the different status groups have with the realm of 'legitimate' (high) culture, arts and aesthetics.

In effect, Bourdieu unfolds a two-dimensional model of stratification, the axes of which he labels to be 'capital volume' and 'capital composition'. To this end, he distinguishes 'capital' into 'cultural' and 'economic' components. 'Cultural capital' refers to the knowledge and understanding of arts and literature and, in general, the codes that lubricate the interaction between the well-educated, whereas 'economic capital' can be equated with the disposal of wealth and income, but also with the mastering of knowledge with respect to the commercial and monetary system. The dimension of 'capital volume' then refers to the amount of resources that people have available, whereas 'capital composition' refers to whether it is mainly of a cultural or of an economic kind. A clear differentiation with respect to capital composition only arises at the higher level of capital volume. As a consequence, it makes somewhat more sense to characterize Bourdieu's model of social space (pp. 128–129) as built up from two (correlated) status hierarchies. If characterized by occupational position,

there is a cultural hierarchy that ranges from unskilled industrial workers through administrative and service personnel, lower grade teachers and artists, to university professors as the highest rank. The economic hierarchy starts off with farmers and farm workers, and goes through sales workers and small shopkeepers to reach its peak with large business owners and industrialists. Positions are not confined to either of the two ladders, but can be found in between as well. (Bourdieu's prime example of a group with high economic and cultural status are the professionals.) The analysis proceeds, on the one hand, by outlining the relationships between objective social positions. Education, income, gender and residence are all brought to bear on the differentiation between the cultural and economic ladders, the former being closely connected with education and its higher positions being more urbanite and feminized, whereas the latter is closely related to income differences and its higher positions are more regionally located and more male dominated. On the other hand, the two hierarchies are distinct with respect to lifestyle, where the cultural hierarchy leads from popular culture towards a taste for modern and *avant garde* art forms, where modernity and purity are the ruling values, and the economic hierarchy represents the difference between the needy and the conspicuous consumers, where traditionality and opulence are the major values.

Bourdieu's view is extremely deterministic, as can be seen in the notion of 'social reproduction', that is at the end of his reasoning. His is a view in which there seems to be no place for deviation from the standards, mobility between status positions or historical change of the standards and positions themselves. However, the empirical evidence that actually bears upon this conviction is rather meager. If one holds to the thesis of social reproduction, the obvious things to show are that maintaining a lifestyle in accordance with some prior position on the two status hierarchies has consequences for the career one makes, the friends one attracts and the life chances one experiences. Intergenerational and career data are needed to test these assumptions rigorously and little of the data in this book are addressed to this, whereas evidence in his earlier works is far from conclusive. In my opinion, the importance of Bourdieu's distinctions still has to be shown to stand up to empirical test. No doubt, such tests would bring out substantial deviation, mobility and historical change. Nevertheless, I think that Bourdieu draws our attention to dimensions and phenomena of social stratification that are very real and important subjects for analysis.

The book is very French, as the author warns his

readers in the very first sentence of the preface to the English-language edition. This statement does not pertain to the specific role that cultural consumption and cultural resources play in the distribution of goods and prestige in society. Indeed, as the author points out, many parallels are to be found in other societies, including the English speaking societies. Writing this review while being in a position to get better acquainted with the American university system, I can only confirm this. The close connection that exists in the United States between the fine arts and the universities (all of which appear to have their own art galleries, stages and classical music broadcasts) seems to me unparalleled in Europe. Even more striking to me is the conspicuous display of fine taste that can be found here in every single museum hall, every exhibition and even concerts, that carry the name of donors, sponsors and other modern would-be descendants of Maecenas.

However, the book is very French, not to say provincial, in other respects. Many of the views expressed are neither unique nor new, but the author has denied himself the opportunity to relate them to earlier attempts in the internationally renowned literature. The idea of an anthropological look at modern society has its predecessor in Lloyd Warner and the Yankee City school. Indeed, the concentration on lifestyles as a means to analyze class phenomena, was *en vogue* in sociology several decades ago and it is now as vulnerable to criticism as it was then: for example, in regard to its lack of understanding of the wider political structures and power processes that work through institutions rather than direct interaction. The idea of differentiating the general status ladder into a cultural and an economic hierarchy has its parallels in the literature on occupational situations, in 'New Class' theories, in the distinction between entrepreneurial and bureaucratized modes of production and the two-dimensionality of intergenerational mobility and associational contiguity of occupations that Laumann and Guttman and Blau and Duncan have found.

The choice with respect to techniques of data analysis is very French as well. Apart from plain cross-tabulation, Bourdieu applies Benzecri's non-

linear principal components analysis (or correspondence analysis), an exploratory technique that has not (yet) won wide acclaim in Anglo-Saxon oriented sociology. It is best regarded as a way of mapping a wide variety of data in a low-dimensional space, where no assumptions have to be made about sampling, measurement level, measurement error, causal order or the mechanisms that gave rise to the observed associations in the first place. The technique is to be admired for its capacity to handle a broad range of data and depict these in a suggestive way, but it remains an exploratory technique: the data are treated as absolute givens and no theoretical argument is used to inform the analysis. I find this quite remarkable—though not uncommon—for someone who defends a strong theoretical position. Bourdieu despises the 'pseudo-refinements of statistical analysis—e.g. path analysis' (p. 22), but his confused statements about 'constant variables' (p. 22), the significance of statistical significance (p. 22) and the (statistical?) independence of independent (exogenous?) variables (p. 94) make this position rather dubious.

Finally, the book may be very French in its discourse itself. At least, this is what the author claims in the preface, but I would not be willing to generalize this to all French sociology, nor imply that its style is restricted to French discourse. The lighter parts of the text consist of an abundance of cross-tabulations (these make fun reading in themselves: where else could one learn such facts as that 64.9 per cent of French manual workers like to sing after meals, as opposed to 45.3 per cent of professionals (p. 199); or that 9.8 per cent of farm workers take a bath or shower every day, as opposed to 43.2 per cent of professionals (p. 205)) and the figures, and the excerpts of qualitative interviews illustrated with photographic material are without doubt responsible for the popularity of the book. The text itself is quite impenetrable. Bourdieu defends its 'long complex sentences' as a way of 'reconstituting the complexity of the social world in a language capable of holding together the most diverse things while setting them in a rigorous perspective' (p. xiii). This I find hard to buy.

Harry B. G. Ganzeboom
State University of Utrecht, Netherlands
and University of Arizona, U.S.A.

Lars Mjøset (ed): *Norden dagen derpå*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 1986. 372 pp.

The five Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, form a little Europe

apart. They have a number of joint institutions, on the levels of states, trade unions, business, academia, and

there is a common labour market. They provide important export markets and a first step of foreign direct investment to each other. With the help of the Finnish-Swedish and the Icelandic-Danish connection the peoples of Norden can communicate with each other in their native or ex-colonial languages. In relations to the outside world, although Denmark is also a member of the EEC and the three westernmost Nordic countries are part of Nato, they often act in conjunction. They present common candidates for office in UN and other inter-state organizations, in the Western trade union organizations, in international scientific organizations. Together, these five small countries constitute a force of some significance, about 90 per cent of the population and about 80 per cent of the GDP of the smallest of the 'Big Seven', Canada.

The Nordic countries are all Lutheran. They have all independent farmers' parties—rather successfully urbanized in recent times—strong farmers' organizations and labour unions. With the exception of Iceland, they have all strong or, as in Finland pivotal, Social Democratic parties that have set a crucial imprint upon their politics and their societies. All the Nordic countries have a leftwing—Socialist or Communist—force of some importance and influence as well, on and off participating in governments in Finland and Iceland, a necessary part of the parliamentary base of Social Democratic governments in Norway and Sweden, at times also in Denmark. The bourgeois parties, as parties to the right of Social Democracy are officiously called in these countries, are plural in all countries, with only the Icelandic Independence party occasionally climbing to the 40 per cent electoral level, and only the Norwegian Right above 30 per cent among the rest.

The Nordic countries are all wealthy countries, with a wealth originally built on the basis of efficient exports of primary or semi-finished commodities, industrialized with a high technology edge of a currently impressive quality. Their economic growth performance in the 1973–1985 international crisis period has for all five of them been above the EEC average, with the Norwegians and the Finns on top. Except for Denmark, they have been remarkably successful in keeping unemployment down currently below one per cent in Iceland (non-standardized rate), 2–2.5 per cent in Norway and Sweden, about five per cent in Finland. Only Denmark, at about eight per cent, is on the sad OECD average. Women have a relatively strong position in the Nordic countries, and the rate of employment is internationally very high.

Within this overall common pattern, there are also

significant differences. The state has much less economic clout in Denmark than in the other countries. The three Scandinavian countries are extensive and expensive welfare states, whereas Finland and Iceland in these respects are below the Western European average. The characteristic economic policy instruments differ. Norway is the country of state planning, of price and wage controls, and lavish public subsidies. Finland has a record of continuous devaluations, of large-scale public works, of comprehensive incomes policy package deals, and a special trade relationship with the Soviet Union, which in the crisis has functioned counter-cyclically. Sweden has largely relied on her re-training and mobility-furthering active labour market policy, supplemented in the crisis with huge temporary industrial subsidies and competitive devaluations. The Icelandic state provides substantial support to the overwhelmingly dominant fishing industry and operates continuous devaluations. Danish economic policy is largely confined to open market operations, dependent as it is on the international capital market and linked to the D-Mark. The Norwegian economy has a very special feature because of the role of North Sea gas and oil in it, 16 per cent of GDP around 1980. Finland was till about 1970 an out-migration country, mainly with a Swedish destination. Denmark and Norway (and tiny Iceland) are predominantly small business economies, whereas Finland and, particularly, Sweden combine a strong labour movement with big and well organized business.

The Norwegian title of the book under review means 'The Nordic countries the day after', and the subtitle is 'The Nordic economic-political models and their problems in the 1970s and 1980s'. It is a study of the political economy and the economic policies of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, their prewar background, their postwar expansion, and their recent difficulties in the crisis. The research effort has been collective, a product of Nordic cooperation and Nordic research grants, but the final report has been written by Mjøset alone, which gives the book a singular unity.

The idea of one Nordic model of political economy, with national variants, is discarded for five national ones, defined in terms of main export sectors and forms of political mobilization. The analysis combines an investigation of industrial structures and political institutions, viewed as being under pressure from the world economy and international politics, and issuing in economic policies. The 'regulation school' of political economy of Aglietta and others and the political theory of 'corporatism' have supplied theoretical inspiration, but the main emphasis is on