. . . All the same I remain pretty uncomfortable with those indicators "left of the OECD" as there certainly is nobody in the foreseeable future other than the "states" or MNC ompanies with the necessary capability for "planning". The endpoint for these is minimal political discontent and health of some segments of the workforce besides their own at the most economic price, and the selling of certain products.

Many sources of discontent are due to attitudes and behaviours of the HS that could be smoothened easily taking off pressure for certainly more expensive treatment options. The comprehensive friendly consultant may be well more successful than an arrogant but much more qualified technocrat opting for s £2,000 back operation which leaves the patient with some though less pain. There is a constant effort to explore these "enigmatic" behaviours, e.g. the "All back to work" approach of A. Nachemson and AB Volvo (or better assault on the "LBP-bastille" of the working classes). The upset caused to elderly patients coming into hospital by "untrained" staff another example. In brief: I think the important variable "patient-satisfaction" is a function of many low-cost variables which are worth investigating for the HS <u>to reduce cost</u> because not more satisfaction than necessary will ever be produced. Necessary by the above standards.

Now a sociological enquiry may well disclose a cheap way to improve a health service to the satisfaction and sometimes joy of the customers. Should this not be done then? I think it should, but only in a radical way, i.e. through the participation of the concerned and showing that for obvious reasons they are better "planners" than those paid to do so. If this trick is disclosed through anonymous questionnaires and a MANOVA in order to convince a HA-committee it becomes a catch 22, the benefit is more than offset by an increased power of the planning-state (i.e. its increased acceptance, its appropriation of originally antagonist intelligence

which was denied its power-expression, cost-reduction etc.). I.e. a radical proposition must intrinsically include more spending among other things.

There are of course "philosophical" arguments against indicators. In their current use they are hyper-positivistic. A world of correlations, a world upside down. Instead of testing the effect of causes, testing the effects of effects. But I think this is a more technically epistemiologic problem, and once there will be a different state-substituting power, solutions will come up rapidly. Who wants to work in this field today should do so privately unless he doesn't want to provide the state with better tools. Today planning for the mass appropriation of power is necessary and who on the radical side wants to plan otherwise should not be allowed to do so without intrinsic referral to this.

The post 1968 world managed e.g. by the Trilateral-linked power-elites has programmatically installed a "countercurrent"-system, putting severe "Limits to democracy" and public spending while coopting large parts of the academics to organise ubiquituous pseudo-basic democratic institutions and other monitoring devices destitute of any power in function of major social control from the top downwards along the money-line. The answer must be: there is no democracy without power. full stop.

The nazi-capitalist 'experiment' of the German trusts had statistics as a constitutional feature: on all levels, in all its aspects. No nazism without statistics. Interestingly, statistics with an omnipresent (though hidden because fully compatible) power-variable. Radical statistics indeed! (I will need a bit of time to review the present historic evidence for you).

The nazis copied much from the social-democratic social hygiene movement. But even more radical avantgardes have often been allowed to activate people since, whenever parts of the states where in a deadlock (e.g. the 60ies universities), and they have always been quite successful to "change everything in order that everything remains the same" (Lampedusa,

The Leopard) because - obviously, given the power-relations - they where or substituted or coopted after conclusion of the "experiment". The latter became the professionals of the critical acceptance, with few exceptions.

THE THEORIST