

Universalism against particularism. Kjetil Bruun and the ideological background of the Total Consumption Model

PEKKA SULKUNEN & LEENA WARSELL

ABSTRACT

AIMS – This article discusses one of the dominant doctrines in the alcohol policy field today: the need to regulate the total consumption of alcohol in the population. This position is theoretically justifiable and based on a large body of evidence. However, in practice its consistent implementation is rare. This contradiction results partly from inefficiency of the instruments – price control and availability restrictions – but it has an ideological background that will be the focus of this article. **DESIGN AND DATA** – Our paper goes back to the sources of Kjetil Bruun's ideas that led to the publication of *Alcohol Control Policy in Public Health Perspective* in 1975. This book started the wave of research and policy debate on the Total Consumption Model that continues to date. We also base our argumentation on information received by Bruun's colleagues and peers. **RESULTS** – Many of Bruun's ideas originated from studies of areas other than alcohol. Three elements in his previous research experience were particularly important: (a) studies on power, (b) research on international drug policy, and (c) criminology and social control in general. **CONCLUSIONS** – Economic power often contradicts the public interest. Drug policy demonstrates how such power leads to selective approaches in social control, and research on social control warns of the danger of discrimination against vulnerable populations. Against this, Bruun's approach to social policy stressed transparency, the priority of the public good against particular privileges and the importance of universalism in social policy to avoid particularistic biases. These elements motivated Bruun's interest in the total consumption approach.

KEY WORDS – alcohol, total consumption, background, ideology, Bruun.

Submitted 16.05.2011

Final version accepted 13.02.2012

Introduction

The Total Consumption Model (TCM), also called the availability theory, is a doctrine widely accepted by alcohol policy experts but very unevenly implemented in practice. It holds the view that the total consumption of alcohol determines the amount of alcohol-related problems in any population. Consequently, the consumption level should be a key target of preventive alcohol policy and its measures – the quantity of pure alcohol ingested by the

population or by the adult population in the form of alcoholic beverages – should be a key indicator of policy success. (Edwards et al. 1994; Babor et al. 2003)

The reason why many governments are reluctant to implement policies along the lines of this expert theory is not disbelief in the theory itself – there is plenty of evidence to support it. Two other factors are probably more important. First, measures such as price or tax increases, legislation

to limit advertising or number of outlets, drinking age or selling hours, aimed to reduce or to stop the growth of alcohol use, interfere with market freedoms and the freedom of consumers to choose. Such measures make them unpopular and a target for business lobbying. Secondly, such measures may be deemed inefficient in current contexts where alcoholic beverages are so widely available that the policy outcomes would be marginal at best and create black and grey markets at worst.

There are, however, also ideological obstacles that are more fundamental and rooted in the presuppositions of the TCM itself. These are often ignored by policy advocates but should be recognised to place recommendations on a firm ground. This paper will analyse those presuppositions in the case of Kettil Bruun, one of the early formulators and proponents of the approach and the first author of the book *Alcohol Control Policy in Public Health Perspective* (Bruun et al. 1975a) that became and still is a standard reference to the approach. These presuppositions are also relevant to keep in mind when considering the applications of the approach in other policy areas that are associated with such consumer behaviour as problem gambling or smoking.

The biographic approach of this article is not meant to overstress Bruun's personal role in the development and history of the TCM. Other members of the Purple Book team, and many scholars before and since, have contributed to it significantly, each from their specific backgrounds and contexts. Bruun's role as a member of his intellectual generation, and not only as an alcohol policy specialist, brings forth the ideological baggage carried by the TCM in

its early Nordic context. Its view on alcohol policy should be seen in the light of wider intellectual concerns of the time to clear some misunderstandings of the TCM and the ideological positions in which it was embedded.

The total consumption approach is often seen either as a technical theory limited to alcohol-related harm, or even as a normative anti-alcohol approach that takes a negative stand on drinking as such. Critics often deem it to be in conflict with policies that aim to reduce harm, not consumption. It is often seen as an authoritarian approach to limit individual freedom. In this paper we show that the project stemmed from a much richer, liberal rather than authoritarian sociological background than is often thought, at least as far as Kettil Bruun's role was concerned. Bruun's interest was based not only on the Finnish alcohol policy context at the end of the 1960s, when consumption doubled rapidly in the wake of new liberal legislation that came to force in 1969, and then continued to rise even further. It was also consistent with and a continuation of his other research interests in power, international drug control and social control in general. This study is based on Bruun's own writings, media reporting and on sixteen interviews of 1.5–2.0 hrs each with his colleagues and collaborators that have been collected by the second author in 2009–2011. These consist of about 100 pages plus field notes.

Our article first lays down the ideological conflict between modern radical intellectuals and traditionalism in the Nordic context of the late 1960s and early 1970s. The focal concept of this critique was power. We then present Bruun's and his colleagues' application of this critical ap-

proach to the study of international drug control, and move on to look at the sociological critique of social control. The next section shows how all of these debates had a direct bearing on the ways in which the TCM was originally formulated and used in the controversy over Finnish alcohol policy. The article ends with a discussion of the differences and similarities in the reception of the TCM in different contexts, and explains why its sociological ambitions may be too demanding to be acceptable in today's world.

Power

Kettil Bruun became known in the 1960s as one of the radical intellectuals and reformers of Finnish (and Nordic) society. The reformers represented the first generation educated in modern social science and its positivistic, anti-traditionalist hubris in the 1960s. They were critical of all traditional institutions, structures of power, conventional moral standards and limitations of intellectual freedoms. They turned against any authority, legal, moral or political, that could not be justified rationally with empirical evidence. This generation gained visibility in the growing electronic media – radio and especially television – that staged the conflict between modern rationalism and traditional authoritarianism for everybody to see. (Mäkelä 1972; Sulkunen 2000) The radical intellectuals published books called "pamphlets", collectively written or edited on subjects that were controversial and related to breaking down conventional moralities and practices of power.

Marxism was not yet known in the Nordic countries as other than highly politicised versions of "historical materialism",

often understood beyond the political context simply as criticism of religion and clerical moralism. The critical concept concerning social structure was not "capitalism", as among the next generation of intellectuals, but power. One of the most important pamphlets was *Economic power in Finland* (1969), edited by Bruun and a fresh professor of social psychology, Antti Eskola. Bruun's opening words in the introduction are prodigious: "My starting point is that power must be controlled and regulated... Power is a possibility to influence people's circumstances and happiness, a potential to force them to behave according to the will of the executor of power. There is a need to assure that those in power do not crush primary human rights, a need to prevent exploitation and oppression. If there are no rules to delimit power, there are no criteria to distinguish use from abuse of power." (Bruun & Eskola 1969, 13/our translation).

One of our informants recalls: "The book aroused alarm among some directors of the alcohol monopoly, which covered all the costs of the Social Research Institute and the Finnish Foundation of Alcohol Studies. One of them had raised the question, 'Should we really pay for work such as *that* book?'"

But the researchers had the support of Pekka Kuusi, the Director General of the monopoly. (Informant 7: Heikki Koski, the DG of the Finnish alcohol monopoly after Pekka Kuusi).

The main conclusion from the dozen studies included in the volume was that economic power is invisible, even in a small country like Finland, where banks and financing companies have tight control of the industry. It is not known to the

public, or even to experts, who owns what, what other dependencies exist between business companies, and who actually decides on major investment or development plans. When the editors of the book sent a number of questions to heads of the major banks, the banks refused to answer. Economic power operates behind the scenes, and this may pose a threat to political democracy, which fortunately, according to the editors, is more transparent and public. Their analysis is a stunning foresight in view of today's globalisation critiques: "Concentration of power and its transnationalisation are new arguments to study power. Managers can manipulate one of their incorporated firms to act as a profit-maker and others to operate at loss. Corporations can exercise enormous power over national governments by moving firms from one country to another." (Bruun 1970, 107)

The point of the editors' critique was that corporate power does not meet the ideal of democratic control we expect of political institutions, because it is exercised behind closed doors. Bruun commented their experience in the Finnish journal of sociology: "We made inquiries to the major banks. Communication was pleasant, but the information we received was lean." (Bruun 1970, 106)

From today's perspective the editors', and even more so the authors', view of power appear simplistic or even naïve. Power, even in the economic sphere, is more than ownership and decisions (or non-decisions), and sociological study of power involves more than indentifying individuals who exercise it. Agenda setting through informal networks, and invisible discursive power with hardly any identi-

fiable subjects at all, must be accounted for, as Steven Lukes (2005[1974]; see also Sulkunen 2010), inspired by Michel Foucault's work, has pointed out more recently. Among the authors, J.P. Roos came closest to a systemic analysis, but even his reference was the idea of corporate power in the then famous book *Monopoly Capital* by Baran and Sweezy (1966), not a systemic critique of capitalism as in Marxist research a few years later.

Nevertheless, in the context of welfare state building and democratisation of society, focus on decisions rather than systemic or "discursive power" was well adapted to political needs. Banks and their managers had direct impact on social change through ownership and financing. Financial decisions directly influenced where and in what conditions people were to live, what kind of work they were employed to do, what educational needs arose, how they could be satisfied, and many other fundamental issues of public concern. The radical claim was that priorities should be set openly, options should be clarified and conflicting interests should be solved in view of the common good. In this, the editors were very close to the idea of planned capitalism that had been the essence of welfare state theorists from Lord Beveridge (1942; 1944) to Pekka Kuusi (1961), the DG of the Finnish alcohol monopoly and a social democratic defender of the welfare state.

A few years later, in 1975, Bruun was involved in another Finnish pamphlet, *Science Policy and Researchers' Responsibility*. Here a very similar agenda was applied to power in research policy, in keeping with the international front of critical scientists who claimed the right to know

what their work was planned to be used for, and to refuse if the intentions were not morally acceptable (cf. the nuclear bomb, the Camelot project, many examples from the medical industry, etc.). Again, the authors claimed that priorities should be openly set also in research policy, decisions should be accountable and morally justifiable, and public interest should be privileged over private, notably economic ones. Academic, discipline-based research does not meet these criteria, because the interests of chair holders cannot be exposed to public debate, and consequently their preferences may not optimally serve society as a whole. As if anticipating the famous dichotomy between Mode 1 and Mode 2 Science by Gibbons et al. (1997), the authors argued that research should best be made in the context of application and its priorities should be set in open public debate (Mode 2). Disciplinary academic scholarship, where only peers are qualified to evaluate achievements and plans (Mode 1), is not open to public debate and therefore not accountable to society. The idea of democratic planning was applied to science, as it was applied to economic policy in the earlier pamphlet. Another informant comments: "Kettil's broad view with which he operated in the area of science ethics and science policy was exceptional. He saw the whole scientific community in much wider perspective than others at the time. He was a visionary..." (Informant 8, Senior Civil Servant, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Kettil Bruun's long-term collaborator).

At this point, Bruun was President of the Finnish Social Science Research Council. In this position he was able to establish a research programme on power and democ-

racy in Finland, after the Swedish model of power analysis that he and his co-editor and authors had demanded in their 1969 pamphlet but that had not so far been accepted in Finland. He even managed to appoint his colleague at the Social Research Institute of Alcohol Studies, Juha Partanen, as one of the two leaders of the research programme. Partanen's team aroused enormous controversy throughout its work and especially when their summary report was published in 1978, because many of the researchers had a Marxist orientation and their activities were therefore labelled as a Communist conspiracy.

The first author of *Alcohol Control Policy in Public Health Perspective* was a political liberal, even radical in the turbulence of the time. The cold war was coming to its close and political confrontations between socialist left, especially the Soviet-minded left, and the more conservative nationalist right were at their height. Bruun was never in any way committed to the political left, but as we can see, his distance from the right was even greater. "Kettil was one of those very rare Finnish-Swedish bourgeois liberals, who really believed in democracy [...]. Originally he was a historian, not a sociologist [...] As a historian he had an interest in the society he studied. Therefore his attitude to theories was quite different from that of sociologists, for example Erik Allardt [chair of sociology at the University of Helsinki] who liked to give new names to things. Kettil's research focused on Finnish society, not on sociology". (Informant 1: Klaus Mäkelä, one of Kettil's nearest colleagues and his successor as leader of the Alcohol Research Institute).

The same could be said of Bruun's atti-

tude towards social problems: he saw them not *only* as policy issues and objects of reform, but as part of the web of social relations. He explained the first research policy programme of the Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies in 1956 in this way: "Differences in drinking habits cannot be explained by focusing on variables that describe drinking practices alone. Regularities of differences in drinking habits can only be discovered when we account for the structure of societies and communities, the social fields of individuals, and personality". (Bruun 1956, 199–202)

As we shall show in the section on Finnish alcohol policy context, Bruun's conception of legitimate power as open negotiation over policy objectives between the public good and underlying interests led him to stress that targets must be based on evidence and interests underlying interests should be made public. Success or failure of a policy must be evaluated by its outcomes, not by the principles that once gave rise to it. Objectives must be made public and measured objectively. Private preferences cannot be objectively valued, and the interests of the industry are not public; therefore it is the role of research to study them. This comes very close to the second line of Bruun's scholarly activity that is relevant for understanding the public health orientation in his alcohol policy advocacy.

Drugs and pharmaceuticals

In the early 1970s Bruun was engaged, together with Lynn Pan and Ingemar Rexed, in a study of the international drug control system, commissioned by UN Narcotics Commissions of several countries. The result, *The Gentlemen's Club – International*

Control of Drugs and Alcohol (Bruun et al. 1975c), was a fit example of research in the context of application. Like many other publications in which Bruun participated, it ends with a series of recommendations, both organisational and of wider bearing. Still it was not only an evaluation of a policy-making structure but a sociological analysis of the international system and the way it covers itself with mysteries, secrets, self-commending rhetoric and even lies.

The book examined the history of drug control from the Shanghai Convention of 1909 to the 1972 Protocol, which amended the 1961 Single Convention. It analysed the structure and operation of the different international bodies engaged in drug control, again identifying key actors and the interests they represent. The Shanghai Convention was the first international attempt to stop opium trade from India to China, and at the same time a diplomatic recognition of China as an independent state. The Single Convention was a charter that merged all existing international agreements on drugs and psycho-pharmaceuticals into one and established the UN structure of drug control. The 1972 protocol strengthened the provisions to deal more effectively with illicit trade in opium.

Two aspects of the study were relevant for the formation of the public health perspective in alcohol policy: drug control was from the beginning international and it was geared to control supply rather than demand. The authors argue that drug control had three successes in the three first quarters of the twentieth century. First, recognition of the principle that a country can export narcotics to other countries

only with their permission has prevented the recurrence of the kind of situation exemplified by the Anglo-Indian opium trade to China. Second, limitation to a small number of countries of legal opium production for export has been an obstacle for new countries starting legal opium production. Consequently the use of opiate preparations for medical purposes has been reduced. And third, diversion of narcotic drugs from pharmaceutical houses to illicit markets has also been reduced during the study period. None of these achievements would have been possible without the influence of the international community and its drug control system. There has been little sign of voluntary self-control within the drug industry, and national controls, on the evidence of debates in the control bodies, would have been even more tardy. (Bruun et al. 1975c, 272–273)

The other common denominator of the successful achievements was that none of the interventions was directly aimed at affecting the individual drug-taker at the behavioural level. They were attained by influencing production and trade or by regulating medical practices that successfully influenced norms and customs of the professions and private enterprises. These are more susceptible to regulation than individual behaviour.

Besides the bureaucratic inertia characteristic of all complex and massive organisations, the failures ensue from attempts at eliminating all proscribed individual drug use or supplies catering to that demand, and from approaching drug-taking as though it were an isolated phenomenon. A more realistic and sociologically sensitive approach than prohibition is to set the re-

ducing of harm as the goal and to account for that drug-taking and supply involves many things, including the overall welfare of potential users, consumer protection, especially in the case of industrial drugs, as well as agricultural economic planning and possibilities of drug substitution.

The authors explicitly juxtaposed alcohol policy with drug control. In fact, international alcohol control was one of their "cases", together with control of cannabis and illicit traffic, and programmes for crop substitution. The conclusion is that since the 1920s, when the League of Nations raised concern about alcohol exports to Africa, international activity on the alcohol problem had been modest, except for the period of E.M. Jellinek's consultancy at the WHO 1950–1955. The authors consider this inconsistent with that alcohol is widely recognised to have "dependence liability", especially considering that alcohol gives rise to more problems than any other drug in the world and that its production and trade are increasingly occurring at an international scale. (Bruun et al. 1975c, 286)

Two points in the analysis are particularly interesting in view of the Purple Book to come. First, arguing in favour of harm reduction in drug control, the authors refer to de Lint and Schmidt (1971) and to Mäkelä (1972), whose work suggests that "the rate of alcoholism in a given population is related to the general level of consumption in that population, so that measures aimed at lowering the general consumption will also diminish the harmful effects." (Bruun et al. 1975c, 288). In Bruun's mind, harm reduction and availability policy were compatible from the very beginning. Second, the authors stress

in several contexts that international drug control rests largely on statistical monitoring of production, international trade and consumption of drugs. This is not just a technical means of control but must be accorded a higher value as the information base, which must underlie any control machinery. No such recording system was available for alcohol, and the data they were able to gather was really not very useful. The Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies then undertook the task of setting up a database drawing on FAO statistics and other sources and attempting to analyse as carefully as possible the reliability of the figures (Sulkunen & Lumio 1977). The symbolic importance of statistics is highlighted by the persistent, decades-long reluctance of the WHO to set up a system of alcohol statistics, despite repeated appeals by researchers and policy makers.

Social control

Bruun had another slant on the concept of power in his studies of social control, related to his analysis of powerful institutions. Control is always selective, but the criteria of selection should be transparent, justifiable and fair. In one of the most celebrated pamphlets, edited by the legal scholar Lars D. Eriksson (1967) and titled *Helpers by Force* (Pakkoauttajat), Bruun (1967) presented statistical figures to show that asylums had had 35,590 involuntary admissions in 1964, and at the end of the year these institutions had 20,830 inmates and patients. The reason why this number is greater in the course of a year than at any given day is that many of these incarcerations are short, especially so when the reason is crime. The difference is smaller

for those who are in institutions because of mental illness. Convicts and mental health patients were the largest groups in the institutions, both with over 16,000 admissions. In two cases incarcerations at a given day outnumber annual admissions, because the "sentences" are long: conscientious objection and school absenteeism. Only 38 new conscientious objectors were admitted in 1964, but the total number of prisoners for this cause was 81. For school absenteeism, 90 new admissions took place, but 155 children were kept in correctional institutions.

For a small country such numbers were high, much above those for Norway or Sweden. The reason is that while the number of prisoners had declined somewhat from the late 1930s, new legislation allowed the dispossessing of individuals' freedom on therapeutic grounds: mentally ill persons and alcoholics were the largest and growing groups. But there were also incarcerations that were diversions of other measures. The largest number of incarcerations was due to a crime – with 15,800 cases per year – but in 6,500 cases the original penalty was a fine, not a prison sentence. As many as 5,000 cases were in prison because of unpaid fines for public drunkenness. In conclusion: incarceration was the main way of "treating" alcoholism in Finland. A few years later Bruun used these same figures in his seminal paper "Finland: The non-medical approach" (1971b). Bruun was also actively involved in the process of de-criminalising public drunkenness and setting up the "A-clinics", open-ward treatment units throughout the country, as well as low threshold sobering-up stations.

The control system was not only harsh

but also strongly selective. The poor, the homeless, even the working class at large, were the object of control measures that would have hardly passed the criteria of international agreements on human rights, had they been taken to court. According to Bruun, one reason why people with alcohol problems were treated in such a cruel way was the prohibition history, still rather near. The other possible reason was that in the tumultuous post-war years, maintaining public order was a primary concern of the powers that be. Class conflict was visible in Finland as it was throughout Western Europe, and the control system was certainly not neutral when confronting it.

Liberal societies are founded on the principle of agency of its members. To be an agent involves autonomy, the right to exercise self-control and free will. But it also involves the right to be different at one's own discretion, even if it implies high risks or even life on the margins of society. These rights must be universally respected on the basis of public criteria, otherwise someone must have arbitrary power to decide who is and who is not a full citizen. The struggle of Bruun and his generation of intellectuals made evident how incompletely this fundamental idea of a modern society was implemented in Finland and how autonomy, the right to live in society as a free citizen, was massively violated. A comparison between radicalism in Norway, Sweden and Finland showed that while Norway and Sweden adopted elements from romantic youth movements typical of the western world, the Finnish version was a relatively sober affair, focused not on liberating the inner self but still preoccupied with estab-

lishing basic civil rights and the ideal of a *Rechtstaat*. (Sulkunen 2000)

In this situation it was a logical consequence to look for more universalistic solutions "to the alcohol question", which accentuated towards the end of the 1960s with mounting forces working for liberalising the system, especially putting country and town on equal footing in alcohol availability, and lifting the monopoly on beer following the Swedish example in 1965.

The alcohol policy context

The Finnish alcohol legislation was liberalised as of 1969 to allow sales of medium beer in grocery stores, with the consequent rise of per adult alcohol consumption over a longer period from 2.7 litres in 1960 to 8.4 litres in 1974, most of which over just one year after the beer reform. This was a double chock for alcohol researchers. First, they were not expecting it, and second, they had believed that the abuse of non-potable alcohol ("drops") would be replaced by legal spirits. This idea had been tested in the rural alcohol experiment more than a decade earlier but had actually been refuted in Kuusi's dissertation (1957). Quite the contrary was found to be the case: old habits were not replaced but reinforced by wider availability of legal alcohol. The effect was not only additive but cumulative. Easy access to milder beverages was not only added to the old drinking practices but stimulated them further (Sulkunen 1976).

This was a totally new view of how consumer behaviour reacts to modernisation: it is not the case that consumption simply satisfies some needs in society. There are two levels of cultural definitions of consumption, normative that regulate what is

permissible, and meaningful, which define what it is that is normatively regulated. In Finland we could observe that the norm changed whereas the meaning stayed the same. A bottle of wine at lunch table easily became a symbol of the norm: we *can* do this, but the meaning of what we did was still the same as before: that we get intoxicated.

A similar trend towards higher levels of consumption was observed in many countries, especially those with low starting points earlier in the century, often but not always related to temperance history. Bruun's take on this was *not a negative stand on alcohol use as such*. On the contrary, he believed that those who would focus alcohol control on alcoholism rather than population consumption rates often disguise their moral judgement against drinking itself – by some other people, not by themselves – in the apparently good-willing attempts to reform the fallen. "We are dependent on very many things: sexual contacts, coffee or tobacco, but the occurrence of these states does not as such inform us about their effects. Often, alcoholism is used to label people who are wanted under control and who are suspected of using alcohol unconventionally. Therefore alcoholism becomes a concept with a variable content and that reflects the environment's reactions against drinking itself rather than its consequences." (Bruun 1971a, 102/our translation)

It is not surprising that to arrive at Bruun's new position took some wrestling with himself. Together with Kuusi and others, he had advocated the anti-prohibitionist civilising alcohol policy line until the late 1960s, believing that wine and beer consumption could replace binge drinking

of vodka and of non-beverage alcohol. It was a full turn to accept that this was not happening with more liberal availability of milder beverages. Even for outsiders such a turn was difficult to understand. It took the temperance movement almost ten years to recognise this change in Bruun's views (Nelker 1982), and Bruun admitted to Martti Voipio (1982), the veteran Finnish temperance leader, that the change had been difficult.

In Bruun's case the TCM was therefore not issued from an anti-alcohol sentiment, nor was the temperance movement of any help in making his new view accepted. The temperance movement itself was actually part of the problem. Bruun was well aware that the alcohol policy position he advocated in the mid-1970s could easily be associated with the conservative temperance tradition, but nothing could have been more alien to his view of power and society. The other part of the problem was the supply side, business interests and in alliance with them, the monopoly, his employer and the funding source of his research team. A report of a working group that led to the Purple Book project stated that "those who have been trying to give alcohol studies a scientific basis have of course been much concerned to shake off the contentious moral overtones which have traditionally surrounded the subject of drinking, and to suggest that 'the trade' should now be an object of study, may seem to carry the danger of re-awakening all sorts of confusions and the accusation that the research worker has surrendered his impartiality" (World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe 1974, quoted by Room 1984). The problem was to find a morally

neutral position between the two antagonists.

As Bruun recognised that business interests were likely to interfere with a policy aimed at regulating total consumption, his priorities were clear: the public interest comes first. The monopoly leadership had advocated the off-sale liberalisation of medium beer and on-sale trade as a whole since the early 1960s for very different types of reasons. On the one hand, they believed, and this was very strongly Kuusi's conviction, that consuming milder beverages would civilise drinking practices and lead to less harm. On the other hand, selling massive quantities of beer through monopoly shops, with precincts on breweries to supply only for their local area, was uneconomic for the monopoly itself and obstructive for the rationalisation of the brewing industry (Sulkunen 2000). Introducing the TCM at this point as the guiding alcohol policy principle inevitably led into a conflict between Bruun and the monopoly management, and put him and his steady supporter Pekka Kuusi, on different sides of the trench for a while.

Bruun's sociological insight about alcohol as a societal issue helped him to get his views accepted and implemented. Our informants (1, 4, 6: who are long term colleagues and worked with him in many common research projects) stressed his skill in getting support for his policy ideas first outside the country, especially in the Nordic countries, and only then introducing them at home. This was the tactic he applied when he collected the Purple Book team and gained the collaboration of WHO Euro.

The other insight was to be careful about his concepts. Between the lacklustre tem-

perance discourse and the sanguine modernism of the liberals, something neutral was needed to evade moralities about alcohol itself and to replace the antagonism with the opposition between the common good and private values or interests. The new public health movement, which no longer focused on contagious diseases (as public health professionals had done for over a century) but on health promotion, was only in its beginnings. The Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion was adopted only in 1986, but public health in the sense of promoting health of a population fitted very well Bruun's conception of power as open negotiation over policy targets. Rates of alcohol-related problems and rates of consumption in a population are measurable indicators, allowing public assessment of policy success or failure. The health of populations can be quantified and compared in time and space, whereas the causes of individual ill-feeling are difficult to detect. Above all, when targets are set at the population level, their interaction with the environment can be manipulated.

In this point, Bruun's view of alcoholism was closer to that of the Swedish nineteenth-century physician Magnus Huss than to the dominant American tradition that sees alcoholism as a "disease of the will". While the latter located the problem in individuals' capacity to control their desires, and thus laid the foundations of the AA movement (Levine 1978; Valverde 1998) and later the "alcoholism movement" (Room 1978), Huss founded his thinking on clinical experience with heavy drinkers in several European hospitals. For him, alcohol itself was a toxic substance that causes many kinds of ail-

ments in the human body. Only in very few exceptional cases does drinking turn into an almost irresistible craving, "super-drift", that obstructs any rational conduct (Ruuska 2009). Abuse results from the use of alcohol, not from mental disorders or weakness of the person. Therefore environmental factors – availability and customs – are accorded a much more important role than the individual in Hussian alcohol policy thinking.

Bruun's Hussian view of alcoholism was well adapted to his universalistic approach to social control. The alcohol control system in the Nordic countries in the three post-war decades was openly selective and geared to protecting public order, not public health. Monopolies in Sweden, Norway and Finland alike felt that their task was to educate the poor and uncivilised to adopt less harmful "Continental" drinking practices. On this ground, they were biased in favour of male middle-class drinking styles and environments such as restaurants, against working class and rural patterns. Women's drinking was also ill thought of, especially in public places (Järvinen 1991). Alcohol was in fact a symbol of class and gender discrimination far beyond its significance as a policy issue. In Finland, a socialist literary magazine edited by the accomplished poet Pentti Saarikoski published several special issues on alcohol policy. Another socialist review edited by Pentti Holappa, a poet and future Minister of Culture, carried regular articles to claim access to alcohol by women, rural people, working class and ethnic minorities (gypsies and Lapps) to equal "bourgeois" men (Sulkunen 2000). We agree with Christoffer Tigerstedt (1999) that

Bruun's alcohol policy view was liberal, even when he turned to support limitations of availability and high taxation. The important point was that restrictions are universally applied in the same way for all. Bruun was a herald of universalism against particularism.

Conclusion and discussion

In Finland, the window of opportunity for the TCM was open only momentarily. With the increasingly conflict-ridden political climate, the alcohol issue became politicised. Any efforts to set controls on the free market were interpreted as "socialism" (Sulkunen 2000; Anttila & Sulkunen 2001). The temperance movement lost what remained of its political influence almost before it realised that the TCM potentially was a powerful and suitable instrument for its goals, and there was no professional support for restrictive alcohol policy except within the alcohol monopoly itself (Warpenius & Sutton 2000). Before any serious efforts to implement policies recommended by the TCM, the ideological welfare state universalism gave way to neoliberal values of the free market and consumer individualism.

In contrast, the temperance movement in Norway and Sweden remained more evenly dispersed across the political spectrum, and was quicker to realise the potential of the TCM for their cause (Anttila & Sulkunen 2001). As Caroline Sutton (1998) has pointed out in her dissertation, the main reason why the TCM had, and still retains, a strong position in Swedish alcohol policy is that the medical community has a closer historical connection to the new public health movement and its concern about the alcohol issue than in

any other Western country, except perhaps in France.

In countries outside Finland and Scandinavia, the TCM landed in political and ideological contexts that still need to be analysed in detail. To assess its potential policy relevance today, the following points about its origin should be kept in mind.

Kettil Bruun's alcohol policy views were not based on a negative attitude towards alcohol use itself. In this respect he was neutral and thought that regulation of availability and prices should aim at reducing harm to society. It was not a value in itself. In this respect, alcohol policy could in fact serve as a model for drug policy. Limiting everybody's access to alcohol increases its cost in time and money but leaves the choice to individual consumers. As a radical liberal (but not socialist), Bruun argued that alcohol policy must seek a solution that reduces harm, avoids temperance morality, respects individual freedom and representative democracy, and is universalistic. To meet these requirements, any social control policy must pass the test of evidence that it actually serves the public good.

This may seem like a technocratic attitude, but it is nested in a wider ideological position. One of its assumptions is still valid beyond any doubt today. Alcohol use, and lifestyle factors more widely, are among the major preventable risks in the present world. In contrast, we consider three other presuppositions of Bruun's thinking to be critical in view of its application in contemporary systems of governance.

The first concerns the measurable outcomes themselves. Bruun's intellectual

generation struggled to modernise social control to respect citizens' agency – everybody's right to personal autonomy and individuals' right to be different. These ideals were only dreams even in advanced liberal countries in the third quarter of the twentieth century. It took a long series of legislative and institutional changes to make them real. Today, we take these rights for granted but face another problem. One person's difference bears on another's autonomy. If someone wishes to live a shorter life as an alcoholic, this taxes other peoples' autonomy in the cost of health care, social services, looking after his or her dependents and other inconveniences that regular heavy drinking causes to others. It may be that it is more difficult today to weigh the public good against individual interest than half a century ago. Even the holy trinity of public goods – health, security and welfare – now present in almost any good-willing policy programme may turn out problematic in a multicultural world where claims for autonomy and claims for the right to be different are equally valid and acceptable. (Sulkunen 2009, 140–158)

The second presupposition concerns the role of science. Welfare state building in Western Europe was fundamentally based on the idea of a plan. A plan requires information of the present state of society and of the available means, a target that is formulated in an observable way, and a theory that connects the means to the ends. This was apparent in Bruun's emphasis on evidence and in his belief that research can provide these instruments for policy-makers, whose task it is to set priorities, to make choices and to assure that their decisions are implemented. Sci-

entists should never surrender their position of impartiality to any other passions than the passion for scientific rationality, but on the other hand they are entitled to be heard *before* decisions are made. Today the idea of science in the context of application has acquired another appearance. Social scientists, especially in the area of lifestyle regulation, are no longer asked to work on a plan but to evaluate, assess, or audit policies *after* they have been adopted and often already being implemented. Very often scientists are *a priori* committed to the policy they are evaluating, and whether it is our own choice or not, we are always suspected for carrying forward an agenda that is not only our own.

Third, the democratic state is a presupposition that needs critical examination. Bruun's writings often ended with recommendations – they were addressed to someone. Still, they were seldom policy papers commissioned by a ministry or a governmental department but were rather addressed to experts in the field and to lay persons with an interest in taking a stand – politicians. The fundamental principle of Bruun's view of power was that it should be public and its exercise should be submitted to debate between informed parties. Values come from society, information comes from research and other experts, and political institutions should combine

the two into a general will to promote the public good. It may be that even advanced liberal states no longer meet these expectations. Electoral participation is down, international bureaucracies and corporations influence policy-making more than public debate, and the representative political apparatus is too weak to formulate a general will that reflects majority values in society in a credible way.

The presuppositions concerning the public good, the role of science and the democratic state are indispensable for implementing the Total Consumption Model. If the TCM today is unevenly applied, it may be useful to seek the explanation not only in the validity of the model itself, or in the efficiency of the instruments that are necessary for its application, but also in the ideological and institutional landscape in which the model is nested.

Declaration of Interest None.

Pekka Sulkunen, researcher
Centre for Research on Addiction,
Control and Governance (CEACG)
University of Helsinki
E-mail: pekka.sulkunen@helsinki.fi

Leena Warsell, researcher
Secretary General of NordAN
E-mail: leena.warsell@gmail.com

INFORMANTS

Informant 1: Klaus Mäkelä, one of Kettil's nearest colleagues and his follower leading Alcohol Research Institute

Informant 4: longterm colleague

Informant 6: longterm colleague

Informant 7: Heikki Koski, the Director General of the Finnish alcohol monopoly

Informant 8: Senior Civil Servant, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health

REFERENCES

- Anttila, A.-H. & Sulkunen, P. (2001): The inflammable alcohol issue: alcohol policy argumentation in the programs of political parties in Finland, Norway and Sweden from the 1960s to the 1990s. *Contemporary Drug Problems* 28:49–86
- Babor, T. & Caetano, R. & Casswell, S. & Edwards, G. & Giesbrecht, N. & Graham, K. & Grube, J. & Gruenewald, P. & Hill, L. & Holder, H. & Homel, R. & Österberg, E. & Rehm, J. & Room, R. & Rossow, I. (2003): *Alcohol: No Ordinary Commodity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Baran, P. A. & Sweezy, P. (1966): *Monopoly Capital. An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York: Monthly Review Press
- Beveridge, W. (1942): *Social Insurance and Allied Services*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office
- Beveridge, W. (1944): *Full Employment in a Free Society*. London: George Allen & Unwin
- Bruun, K. (1956): Säätiön tutkimusohjelma. Säätiön apurahojen jakotilaisuudessa pidetty esitelmä (Research programme of the Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies). *Alkoholipolitiikka* 5: 199–202
- Bruun, K. (1967): Yhteiskunnan valvojat ja vapauden riistot (Controllers of society and involuntary incarcerations). In: Eriksson, L.D. (ed.): *Pakkoauttajat*. Helsinki: Tammi
- Bruun, K. (1970): Taloudellisesta vallasta (On economic power). *Sosiologia* 7: 104–108
- Bruun, K. (1971a): Alkoholit käyttö, vaikutukset, kontrolli (Alcohol: use, effects, control). Helsinki: Tammi
- Bruun, K. (1971b): Finland: The non-medical approach. In: Kiloh, L.G. & Bell, D.S. (eds.): *Proceedings of the 29th International Congress on Alcoholism & Drug Dependence*. Butterworths: Chatswood
- Bruun, K. & Edwards, G. & Lumio, M. & Mäkelä, K. & Pan, L. & Popham, R.E. & Room, R. & Schmidt, W. & Skog, O.-J. & Sulkunen, P. & Österberg, E. (1975a): Alcohol control policies in public health perspective. Helsinki, The Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies 25
- Bruun, K. & Eskola, A. (eds.) (1969): *Taloudellinen valta Suomessa (Economic power in Finland)*. Helsinki: Tammi
- Bruun, K. & Eskola, K. & Viikari, M. (eds.) (1975b): *Tiedepolitiikka ja tutkijan vastuu (Science Policy and Researchers' Responsibility)*. Helsinki: Tammi
- Bruun, K. & Pan, L. & Rexed, I. (1975c): *The Gentlemen's Club. International Control of Drugs and Alcohol*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press
- Edwards, G. & Anderson, P. & Babor, T.F. & Casswell, S. & Ferrence, R. & Giesbrecht, N. & Godfrey, C. & Holder, H.D. & Lemmens, P. & Mäkelä, K. & Midanik, L.T. & Norström, T. & Österberg, E. & Romelsjö, A. & Room, R. & Simpura, J. & Skog, O.-J. (1994): *Alcohol Policy and the Public Good*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Eriksson, L.D. (ed.) (1967): *Pakkoauttajat (Helpers by Force)*. Helsinki: Tammi
- Gibbons, M. & Limoges, C. & Nowotny, H. & Schwartzman, S. & Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1997): *The New Production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage
- Järvinen, M. (1991): *Kontrollerade kontrollörer – kvinnor, män och alkohol (Controlled controllers – women, men and alcohol)*. *Nordisk alkoholtidskrift* 8 (3): 143–152
- Kuusi, P. (1957): *Alcohol Sales Experiment in Rural Finland*. Helsinki: The Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies
- Kuusi, P. (1961): *60-luvun sosiaalipolitiikka (Social policy for the 1960s)*. Helsinki: WSOY
- Levine, H. G. (1978): The discovery of addiction. Changing conceptions of habitual drunkenness in America. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 39(1):143-174
- De Lint, J. & Schmidt, W. (1971): *Consumption Averages and Alcoholism Prevalence: A Brief Review of Epidemiological Investigations*. *British Journal of Addiction* 66: 97–107
- Lukes, S. (2005 [1974]): *Power – A Radical View. Second Edition. The Original Text with Two Major New Chapters*. Houndmills: Palgrave

- Mäkelä, K. (1972): Consumption Level and Cultural Drinking Patterns as Determinants of Alcohol Problems. Paper delivered at the International Congress on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence. Amsterdam, 4– 9 September
- Nelker, G. (1982): Kettil Bruun osoitti alkoholin kulutuksen ja haittojen välisen yhteyden (Kettil Bruun proved the correlation of alcohol consumption and alcohol-related harm). *Raatiussanomat*, No 8, 8 May
- Room, R. (1978): Governing Images of Alcohol and Drug Problems: The Structure, Sources and Sequels of Conceptualizations of Intractable Problems, Social Research Group, School of Public Health. Berkeley: University of California
- Room, R. (1984): The World Health Organization and Alcohol Control. *British Journal of Addiction* 79: 85–92
- Ruuska, A. (2009): From symptoms to society: On Thomas Trotter, Magnus Huss, and the historiography of early 19th century medical thought on alcohol. Paper presented at the 35th Annual Alcohol Epidemiology Symposium of the Kettil Bruun Society, Copenhagen, June 2009
- Sulkunen, P. (1976): Production, consumption and recent changes of consumption of alcoholic beverages. Part II: changes in the consumption of alcoholic beverages in the 1960's, *British Journal of Addictions* 71(2):115–122
- Sulkunen, P. (2000): The Liberal Arguments. In: Sulkunen, P. & Sutton, C. & Tigerstedt, C. & Warpenius, K. (eds.): *Broken Spirits. Power and Ideas in Nordic Alcohol Control*, 2000, NAD Publication No. 39, Helsinki
- Sulkunen, P. (2009): *The Saturated Society. Regulating Risk and Lifestyle in Consumer Culture*. London: Sage
- Sulkunen, P. (2010): Agency and Power. The Contractual Illusion. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 13: 495–510
- Sulkunen, P. & Lumio, M. (1977): *International Statistics on Alcoholic Beverages. Production, Trade and Consumption 1950-1972*. Helsinki: The Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies and The World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe
- Sutton, C. (1998): *Swedish Alcohol Discourse: Construction of a Social Problem*. Uppsala, Sweden: S. Academiae Ubsaliensis
- Tigerstedt, C. (1999): Alcohol policy, public health and Kettil Bruun. *Contemporary Drug Problems* 26(2): 209–235
- Valverde, M. (1998): *Diseases of the Will: Alcohol and the Dilemmas of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Voipio, M. (1982): *Kommentti* (comment). *Raatiussanomat* No. 8, 8 May
- Warpenius, K. & Sutton, C. (2000): The Ideal of the Alcohol-free Society. In: Sulkunen, P. & Sutton, C. & Tigerstedt, C. & Warpenius, K. (eds.): *Broken Spirits. Power and Ideas in Nordic Alcohol Control*. NAD Publication No. 39. Helsinki.
- World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe (1974): *Alcohol Control Policy and Public Health: Report on a Working Group*. WHO-EURO, Copenhagen, Publication WHO-EURO 5455 IV. Reprinted in *The Drinking and Drug Practices Surveyor* 9 (1): 32–39.

