

Book reviews

MULTILINGUAL DEMOGRAPHIC DICTIONARY (CZECH EDITION)*)

The second Czech edition of the **Multilingual Demographic Dictionary**, which was prepared by *Zdeněk Pavlík* and *Květa Kalibová*, came out in the spring of 2005, forty years after the first and more than twenty years after the second French and English editions of the volume¹⁾. This in no way detracts from its significance, as the dictionary is much more than a translator's aid and serves also as a resource for the codification of demographic terminology, respecting international comparability, and at the same time taking into account differences based on specific national circumstances. The sections of notes that accompany the terms explain these differences and usually also outline in more detail the meaning of particular terms in one language that do not have exact equivalents in every other language.

The dictionary was developed as part of a large-scale project that was launched at the fourth session of the *Population Commission of the United Nations*, which presented the *United Nations Secretariat* with a proposal to prepare a demographic dictionary. The UN Secretariat took advantage of an offer from the *International Union for the Scientific Study of Population* to cooperate on its preparation. The Multilingual Demographic Dictionary Committee, established at the fifth session of the UN Population Commission, prepared versions of the dictionary in French, English, and Spanish. During the preparation process and in the first draft of the first edition in 1954, prepared in French, it became evident that there was also a need to define the terms and explain the different concepts they refer to in different languages. The Committee took this need into consideration and instead of aiming to find equivalencies in different languages and to standardise terminology, that is, instead of synthesising definitions, they developed the project with the objective of understanding the meanings of the terms in different languages and explaining the different concepts behind the terms used in three Romance (especially French) and English languages (the French and English editions were published in 1958, the Spanish in 1959). The first Czech edition, which was prepared at the Institute of Economics of the former Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (edited by *Z. Pavlík*) and published in 1965 as the eighth language mutation of the dictionary, was also prepared in this spirit, that is, as the equivalent of an encyclopaedic dictionary rather than as a mere translation.

Based on the experiences of publishing the dictionary in other languages, a recommendation was made in the early 1970s at the fifteenth session of the UN Population Commission (1969) in Geneva and at a congress session of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population that work on the dictionary project continue. In 1972 the re-established Multilingual Demographic Dictionary Committee began working again, and under the direction of *P. Paillat* (of France) the Committee processed an enormous amount of material, which *Louis Henry* from the French *National Institute of Demographic Studies* used to prepare the second edition of the volume in French (1981). This served as a model for the second English edition of the dictionary, published in 1982, which was prepared by *Etienne van de Walle*; these were followed by the Spanish edition in 1985 (edited by *Guillermo A. Macció*) and the German edition in 1987 (edited by *Ch. Höhn*).

The Multilingual Demographic Dictionary is conceived as a kind of reference dictionary, published in various languages, wherein the individual terms are identified in each language version using the same numerical codes. The dictionary has two parts: a reference section with explanations of the terms, and an alphabetical index of terms. In addition to professional demographic terminology the dictionary also lists and includes terms from other spheres of human activity that are used in demography. In order to find the correct term when translating from one language to another, the user looks up the term in the index section of the source language, where the terms are listed and marked according to the same system of numerical coding in every dictionary, and follows the number to the corresponding place in the reference section of

*) This review was published in *Demografie* 2005, 47, p. 271–272. The contents of the journal are published on the Web site of the Czech Statistical Office at: <http://www.czso.cz/csu/redakce.nsf/i/demografie>

¹⁾ The second Czech edition of the *Multilingual Demographic Dictionary* (Mnohojazyčný demografický slovník) was published by the *Czech Demographic Society* as the 15th volume in the series *Acta demographica*. The technical editorship of the publication, with 184 pages, was successfully executed by *Ludmila Fialová*. The dictionary was published in Prague in 2005 with a print run of 1000 copies (ISBN 80-239-4864-4). The dictionary is distributed by the Czech Demographic Society (Česká demografická společnost), Albertov 6, 128 43 Prague 2 (e-mail: teskova@natur.cuni.cz, tel.: 221 951 418, fax: 224 920 657).

the target language edition that the number refers to, where there is an explanation of the term. When translating, for example, from Czech into another language, the user looks up the code number in the Czech version and from that locates the corresponding term in the target language edition.

There are two parts to the numerical code: the first part is a three-figure number, the second part, separated from the first by a dash, is a one- or two-figure number, sometimes followed by an asterisk. The very first number in the three-figure code refers to the number of the chapter in which the term is located (chapters 1–9) and the second two numbers indicate the paragraph in which it is located within the chapter. The numbers to the right of the dash directly identify the term, which is typed in bold (along with synonyms) in the relevant paragraph and chapter in the reference section, where the term is explained; if the term is located in other paragraphs in different contexts, it is typed in italics. All terms typed in bold in the main text have equivalents in other languages. Codes marked with an asterisk refer to other terms printed in bold and listed in the notes at the end of the paragraph, where an explanation is given of the relevant equivalent term. These are terms that do not have an adequate equivalent translation in other languages, but nonetheless do occur in some of them. In the index section these terms have the same code as the equivalent terms and are accompanied by an asterisk. These terms are typed in bold only once.

The reference section of the second edition maintains the same structure as the first edition of the dictionary. It is divided into nine chapters, beginning with explanations of the more basic and generally used terminology, proceeding to chapters on processing demographic statistics, the state of the population, mortality and morbidity, marriage and divorce rates, fertility, population growth and demographic reproduction, migration, and to a chapter explaining terms relating to the economic and social aspects of population development. There is no reason to analyse the correctness of the terms and the terminological accuracy; the professional qualifications and lengthy experience of the authors are adequate guarantee that this is a volume of high professional quality.

In the alphabetical index the authors made a successful effort to overcome as much as possible the one disadvantage of a printed index – that the entries are classified according to a single principle. In this dictionary the authors have addressed this problem by listing multi-word terms under each of the words in the term (except conjunctions).

Naturally, the twenty-year period that has elapsed since the second editions of the French and English versions were published raises the question of the currency of the demographic terminology, which has not remained unchanged over such a long period, and new terms have also entered the field that at the start of the 1980s were not regularly used or did not even exist (most often these are terms from areas of marginal interest to demographers, e.g. from the field of medicine or law). However, given that the second Czech version of the dictionary corresponds in content to the second editions of the other language mutations of the dictionary it was not possible to update the dictionary in this way. However, I believe that whatever slight “ageing” of the content may exist in no way reduces the quality of the second edition. Basic demographic terminology has proven to be relatively fixed and internationally comparable. Some periodical updating would certainly be useful, as interest in the field of demography is increasing in every country around the world. Although this is clearly a demanding project, it has only to be hoped that the dictionary will be updated internationally. It would be useful if the second volume of the dictionary were published as an updated supplement only with terms in the five main world languages (English, French, German, Russian, and Spanish).

Dagmar Bartoňová

DEMOGRAPHIC HANDBOOK 2004*

The **Demographic Handbook 2004** (Demografická příručka 2004) draws on a tradition of demographic handbooks published in Czechoslovakia and later the Czech Republic since 1958, when the **Demographic Handbook 1958** was published (written by *Dagmar Vysušilová*; at the time this publication was only for internal use), followed by the **Demographic Handbook 1959** (which was published by the *State Statistical Office* and written by *Dagmar Vysušilová* and *Milan Kučera*), the **Demographic Handbook 1966**, which was published by Svoboda publishers (written by *Vladimír Srb*), and the **Demographic Handbook 1982**, which was published by the *Federal Statistical Office* (written by a group of authors headed by *Vladimír Srb*).

The most recent edition, the *Demographic Handbook 2004*, retains the basic structure of the previous handbooks, but it has been enhanced by a number of features and especially by an appendix containing graphs¹⁾.

The group of authors was headed by *Jiřina Růžková*, and the publication's individual sections were prepared by: *Milan Aleš*, *Petra Brabcová*, *Štěpánka Morávková*, *Jarmila Molinová*, *Dana Pírníková*, *Magdaléna Poppová*, *Marie Radolfová*, *Eva Smrčková*, *Marcela Stoužilová*, *Josef Škrabal* and *Jana Štichauerová*, without any further specification of individual authorship of the sections and other work.

According to its foreword, the *Demographic Handbook 2004* was published on the occasion of the 85th anniversary of the introduction of Act No. 49/1919 Coll. and the foundation of the *State Statistical Office* of the Czechoslovak Republic. The handbook contains the oldest Czech demographic statistical data, dating from 1785, and some estimates for older (pre-statistical) periods. The time series of demographic data from the period of the Czechoslovak Republic start in the year 1919, at which time two other publication series were launched, the **Source Book on Population Migration** (*Pramenná díla o pohybu obyvatelstva*) and the **Source Book on the Census Results** (*Pramenná díla s výsledky sčítání lidu (domů a bytů)*), issued for the first time in connection with the census of 1921. The foreword notes that the majority of the data are available on the Web site of the *Czech Statistical Office* at: <http://www.czso.cz>.

The contents of the *Demographic Handbook 2004* are marvellously laid out on chalk paper and accompanied by colourful graphs. The book is divided into eleven sections, including an adequately large section on international statistics. The Appendix contains textual graphs (for individual sections) and three synthetic maps. An essential part of the handbook is the *Methodological Notes* (p. 15–20). There is even a kind of “crash course” in demographic statistics with regard to terminology and the meaning of the most commonly used indicators used in demography and demographic statistics.

This review will first look at the content of the publication.

Territory and population. Unlike older demographic handbooks, the most recent one is enhanced with the inclusion of a number of indicators that were not published in previous editions, which naturally adds to the publication's value by offering the use of other combined indicators, most of which must be calculated by the user. Given that the handbook limits its scope to the Czech Republic, in several places it is able to present overviews for the regions and districts. This is a big advantage, though I am aware that the frequent (and unnecessary) changes to administrative-territorial divisions detract from the value of the data almost immediately after their publication. The graphs for each section are labelled “Appendix – maps”, and despite reservations about the territorial-administrative changes, these are an immensely valuable addition to the content of each section and of the entire publication.

Houses and dwelling. It is apparent that the absence of data on houses and dwelling in the censuses conducted between 1921 and 1961 cannot be subsequently compensated with solid estimates, and in this regard we must still rely on the past Reports and Analyses of the *State Statistical Office*, etc., which contain detailed data on building and dwelling construction in the interwar years, but only for a very narrow sample of towns and municipalities.

Families and households. These data are drawn from analogical data in previous demographic handbooks, expanded with the inclusion of a structural indicator. Item “B” in Tables 3–5 and 3–6 is not the

* This review was published in *Demografie* 2005, 47, p. 121–123. The contents of the journal are published on the Web site of the *Czech Statistical Office* at: <http://www.czso.cz/csu/redakce.nsf/i/demografie>.

Vladimír Srb, a prominent Czechoslovak demographer, is no longer with us (he passed away in 2006). By including his last article we wanted to draw attention to Srb's enormous contribution to the development of demography and demographic statistics in Czechoslovakia. He was the author of many demographic studies, books, articles, and reviews. Older foreign colleagues may recall his review *Demosta* (published in English, French, Spanish, and Russian), which promoted Czechoslovak demography abroad.

¹⁾ *Demografická příručka 2004*. (Demographic Handbook 2004) Prague: Český statistický úřad, 2004, 373 pp., English translations of the text in the tables and graphs are provided.

fault of the Czech Statistical Office but of the Office of Personal Data Protection. These are data – married women according to the number of live births in the current marriage, based on the results of censuses in 1930–2001 – that the aforementioned not altogether qualifiedly blocked. The problem is now needlessly being addressed in court in a case that the Czech Statistical Office must win, as the verdict must confirm the obstinacy of the office involved.

Marriages. Although marriage and the marriage rate continues in the Czech Republic to be one of the determinants of the fertility rate, it cannot be the subject of any wider attention than it has been in previous years, given that the published data are enough for the assessment of the significance and weight of nuptiality for the reproduction of the population in the Czech Republic. The table is expanded to include educational levels of engaged partners, and this information is also provided in other sections, but unfortunately not in the section on deaths, where this information is missing but where it would have been especially useful. The traditional table on marriage balances is certainly very interesting and is perhaps the most vivid global indicator of the effects of socio-cultural and value changes in the Czech population.

Divorces. Statistics on divorce rates and the effects of divorce on natural population growth will be an increasingly frequent resource for demographic analyses of the development of society. As in the case of marriage, the statistics on divorce provide a sufficient amount of information about one possible fate of a marriage. Comparing the marriage and divorce rates by the education levels of couples, including an index of this type of separation, contributes especially to our knowledge of this social phenomenon for its analysis in natural population growth.

Births. The fifteen tables devoted to births and pregnancies reveal the natural focal point of the handbooks, which concentrates mainly on the reproduction of the population. The content in this section is typical in form, but the indicators in the individual tables – especially for recent years – are now coming to represent a kind of historical document on the most significant changes in population reproduction. Maps included directly in the section show the total fertility rates in 2001–2003 and the percentage of extra-marital births in 2001–2003. Thus, the indicators selected are ones which the authors correctly believe are the two synthetic indicators perhaps the most representative of the change in the natural reproduction of the population. The section also contains a passage in the table on total embryos born, which is an indicator little used in demographic summaries abroad owing to the absence of data necessary to create such a summary.

Abortions. I believe that previously Czechoslovak and today Czech and Slovak demographic statistics are among the few that can surpass in scope and relative accuracy similar statistics published abroad, which are usually substituted with clinical statistics or sample survey data. Consequently, the abortion rates recorded here sound worse than they are in a number of respects (volume, categorisation details, etc.). There is no graph section here that would allow me to compare these data with the data on total fertility. It will be up to analysts to explain the seemingly incomprehensible relationships between indicators in the 1980s.

Deaths. The mortality trend in the Czech Republic in recent years is among the more positive features in the country's population development. This finding is evident from all the indicators in this section. Nevertheless, analysts repeatedly note the continued existence of quite a significant gap in some indicators between the Czech Republic and other "advanced" countries, for example, the gap in life expectancy. From the data it is possible to see the biggest declines occurred in child mortality and old-age mortality, with some stagnation in productive old-age, and with more positive development in the mortality rate of men than of women, which is part of a process of compensating for previous developments, when male mortality stagnated while female mortality declined, and women's life expectancy rose to levels comparable to indicators abroad while men's did not. The addition of a new table on the percentage of the deceased at age over given a age limit seems like an unexpected return to "primitive percentage indicators of total mortality", but I do not regard the table as out of place among the more traditional tables. As stated above, what I do miss here is a breakdown of the deceased by education. Maps showing life expectancy by sex in 1996–2000 are a good addition to the numerical section.

Migration. I know no country that has such detailed statistics about the movement of the population as the information maintained by former Czechoslovakia and now the Czech Republic since 1949 or 1950. It is true that in recent years (since 2001) these statistics have been less reliable than before, specifically with regard to inter-state (external) migration, but this is not the fault of the Czech Statistical Office. The incomplete or illogical nature of the data on external migration is clear from a comparison of data from the Czech Statistical Office and the Slovak Statistical Office on Czech-Slovak migration. It is wonderful that Slovakia is interested in these comparisons, even though in terms of migration – compared to the Czech Republic – it continues to be an emigrant state. It is good that the data are not regarded as prestigious. However, it is unlikely that the user will seek *prima vista* statistics on the natural

increase by region and district in this particular chapter. Nevertheless, the question is where the table should be included in connection with net migration. This section also lacks an appendix with graphs, perhaps because the data for the past two years are not as reliable as we thought before, even with the awareness that migration is one of those changes that are difficult to assess anywhere in the world and tend to be inaccurate. In order to make data on inter-state migration more accurate it would be necessary to set up some kind of headquarters that would gather national data and attempt a “clearance calculation”, the results of which would be communicated to national governments or individual countries.

Regional summaries. This new section is a truly innovative addition to the demographic handbooks and must be welcomed with warm praise. Territorial summaries are becoming an increasingly more common part of demographic analyses. This corresponds with the decentralisation of public administration and the needs of local authorities at various administrative levels. The selection of tables in this section was naturally not easy to make, but I consider the result, and the inclusion of a map, to be good.

International summaries. This section is also a new addition and is appearing for the first time in this volume. The collection of so many relatively similar indicators, and especially for so many countries, was a laborious task even given the wealth of sources we are now accustomed to. The appended maps on total fertility in 2002 and on life expectancy of men and women at birth in 1999–2002 serve as a valuable conclusion to this section and to the publication as a whole.

Overall my evaluation of the Demographic Handbook 2004 is very positive and remains so despite the following few remarks:

The organisation of some tables in the publication is done wastefully.

The arrangement of some tables does not permit the extension of time series, e.g. to 2020, when the next edition is intended to come out; the empty pages at the end of the publication are not a suitable solution.

The classification of analytical data in the tables continues in the tradition of previous handbooks, but is also the result of decisions about other analysers. Let the analysts sweat a little!

Perhaps the handbook should also include some summary or some analytical data on demography in the Czech Republic, like in the handbook in 1982. These data must usually be sought with some effort from inaccessible sources.

In my opinion, which is by no means overly benevolent, the Demographic Handbook 2004 is a new and essential resource for demography in the Czech Republic.

Vladimír Srb

STATISTICAL LEXICON OF MUNICIPALITIES IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC 2005*)

One of the lasting traditions of the *Czech Statistical Office* is that it continues to publish the **Statistical Lexicon of Municipalities** following each national census¹⁾. The most recent edition is the sixth to be published since the end of the Second World War, and it is much richer in content than the previous edition, which came out in 1992 [and published sooner; the “delay” this time was not the fault of the Czech Statistical Office (CZSO)]. The Lexicon contains an overview of population numbers from censuses conducted between 1869 and 2001, broken down according to regions, districts, and towns with a population of ten thousand or more, a list of towns in the Czech Republic not arranged by district, lists of municipalities according to municipalities with extended competence and municipal authority, according to register and building offices based in another district, a summary of territorial changes and changes in geographical names in 1993–2004, a list of municipalities with extended competence, and summaries of the number of municipalities, parts of municipalities, and census local units by region and district along with basic census data. The main part of the Lexicon is made up of a list of municipalities, parts of municipalities, and census local units by region and district and a corresponding detailed alphabetical list of territorial units.

The Lexicon represents an invaluable guide to the complex hierarchical structure of the variously subdivided territorial settlement of the Czech Republic, without which it is impossible to imagine en-

*) This review was published in *Demografie* 2005, 47, p. 272. The journal’s contents are published on the Web site of the Czech Statistical Office at: <http://www.czso.cz/csu/redakce.nsf/i/demografie>

¹⁾ Prepared by the Czech Statistical Office in cooperation with the Ministry of the Interior CR, published by Ottovo nakladatelství s. r. o., Prague, 2005, 1358 pp.

gaging in any work on territorial issues. The list of municipalities contains the names and codes of the municipalities, the parts of the municipalities, their census local units, their classification characteristics, postal codes, and area measurements, and main census statistics. I think that a good selection of data has been made, as they provide a good indication of the size of the population and the number of homes and flats in a necessarily concise format.

However, in my opinion the Lexicon has several faults, and if they could be eliminated the Lexicon would be a better or more concise piece of work. The first problem is the ineffectively wide columns for information of limited volume (especially the names of a municipalities with extended competence), in the place of which other data could have been presented (e.g. the percentage of the population over the age of 65, or the number of single-member economic units, both of which are indicators of the ageing of the population in rural areas). The use of crosses instead of figures is comical.

I regard a second flaw to be the double-spacing of all numerical data in the case of municipality = census local units, which only adds unnecessarily to the number of pages, and a third to be the absence of row numbering at the right end of the left-hand pages and at the left starting end of the right-hand pages: using just the numbers of the municipality is not enough, especially in the case of municipalities that comprise a large number of parts and census local units, so the user is required to number them him/herself. The authors no doubt yielded to the pressure of programmers, whose work was made easier as a result (e.g. the Lexicon from 1982 does not have double-spacing!).

The formerly anonymous approach to citing the authorship of the Lexicon has correctly been replaced with a list of authors from the census group at CZSO. What is incredible is the price of the Lexicon, which at 999 Czk remains beyond the means of private users. However, this is balanced by the opportunity to purchase the Lexicon on CD for 500 Czk.

Milan Kučera

TWILIGHT OF THE WELFARE STATE – FAMILIES AND CHILDREN IN THE GLOBAL SOCIETY*)

In this book¹⁾, *Jan Keller*, a professor at the *University of Ostrava*, a lecturer at several universities abroad, and a very active sociologist, thinker, and author, focuses on a prominent current issue in advanced countries at the start of the 21st century – the weakening and decline of the welfare state. I am not qualified to evaluate the entire study, so I limit myself here only to the author's numerous warnings about the situation of families and children in a society that puts a strong priority on high productivity. The author has a good understanding of the problem of population reproduction (the decline in fertility, increased longevity, ageing, and the shifting proportions of the economically active and inactive in the population), and he also has a good grasp of the issues affecting families and children.

According to the views of critics in the 1980s, the welfare state resulted in the increased instability of the family when it took over some of its functions. It played an important role of an intermediary between the languages of economics, politics, the social sphere, and culture. To this end it needed to base itself on redistribution as a manifestation of solidarity between different groups of the population. To operate it required the cohesion of the family to support members if they encountered problems in the labour market. Today, however, the family is experiencing a process of "flexibilisation" and is becoming just one of a number of projects in individualised lifestyles and a field of experimentation in new forms of private life arrangement. There is increased reluctance to start a family when the flexibilisation of the family poses a greater risk to women than men. In the author's view, to now the strategy of the welfare state in relation to the family has involved the provision of social services to compensate for the gaps in functions formerly fulfilled by the family. The family is clearly and irrevocably evolving from the model of the single-breadwinner household to the two-income household and from there to the model of the single-parent family. The economic advantages of childlessness increase the pressure on young couples to choose to remain childless in order to improve their living standard and increase the changes of being in a better situation in old age (loosely cited from p. 29–31). An increasing number of people have realised that they will only just manage to work off the expense of supporting themselves, and that the only way to save for a decent future is by not having children (p. 33). A family that gives thought to its

*) The review was published in *Demografie* 2006, 48, p. 51. The contents of the journal are published on the Web site of the Czech Statistical Office at: <http://www.czso.cz/csu/redakce.nsf/i/demografie>

¹⁾ Keller, Jan. *Soumrak sociálního státu*. Prague: Slon, ediční řada Studie, 2005, 158 pp.

economic situation will simply not have a child. University-education people with children are on average materially worse off than childless couples with lower levels of education. As the welfare state recedes, the costs of caring for children are increasingly borne by the family. Families with children at the same time take over the responsibility of providing for the retirement of those people who have chosen not to have children. As more and more limits are put on redistribution, children and the education of children will increasingly be regarded as a matter for parents to take care of, disregarding the importance of children as future contributors to the system of old-age security and thus even to the security of childless people (regardless of what kind of system is involved). This results in the discrimination of families with children. They bear the costs of future retirement even for those who “economised” by remaining childless.

Declining solidarity leads to the disadvantaging of families with children. Children become an economic burden on the family alone, as the solidarity between people with children and people who have “cleverly” remained childless decreases or ceases to exist (the latter having renounced the risks stemming from caring for children, and not just in terms of living standards).

The author does not address the demographic issue of global society and just draws attention to some of its aspects. In place of the author, readers can make their own conclusions: amidst the competition between states over GDP growth and the competition between individuals (self-fulfilment, success in life, a career, wealth, etc.), children represent an “unnecessary” life risk for many young people.

Luckily young people do not just think in economic terms, and for many, children and caring for children are an enrichment of life and a source or expression of their own self-fulfilment, so they are able to face the increased risks. Mutual regard between parents, love for one’s children, and the children’s love for their parents, which later evolves into friendship, are not, like honour and morality, economic categories. The basic question for future reproduction levels in the Czech Republic continues to be the relationship between these two groups of people (the last two paragraphs represent the opinions of this reviewer; the author of the study did not go into such detail).

Keller’s study should be read by all demographers, especially those who “dream” of an increase in the total fertility rate in the Czech Republic to a level above 1.4.

Milan Kučera