

The absence of any chapter or even as unit of analysis on the interrelationship of such social factors as ethnic, and migratory (whereas gender and social-educational background criteria are used, and rightly so) with higher education and unemployment which tends to affect them most seriously is characteristic of the lack of perspective. In a period when mass youth unemployment is linked with movements of populism, racism and antisemitism (as Lepenism in France, and Neo-Nazism in Germany and other middle-european countries) the aims of education, in all levels, curricula and content, should tend, without overlooking the vocational aspect, to strengthen those critical faculties that would widen the horizons in the direction of the understanding of the "other" of his or her civilization, religion and specific culture. In this critical period instead of observing an intensification of all the relevant subject fields as a prerequisite, not least for professional and technical departments, it is exactly the humanities, history and the social sciences that are losing grounds under the command of market capitalism. Minimizing populist, chauvinist and sometimes nationalistic mentalities and policies could have much more important practical economic results than mechanistic, functional, in the narrow sense, adaptations. Furthermore, education in general, H.E. in particular, should be a source of deep enjoyment, excitement and self-fulfillment *per se* and not for some ulterior utilitarianly defined objective. This is a precondition for the formation of that state of the mind that would permit later on one's full realization in work, in employment without thinking in terms of career trajectories and pecuniary meta-ends. This path would only guarantee that in the very end of one's life voyage there will always be *angst*-provoking jobs, unmaterialized further profits and side benefits, unsatisfied additional prestige and influence. But it would come too late. In the not so long run we are all dead, and what is most precious in life, to end up with a normative statement, $\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \zeta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\upsilon$, would have been lost for good in the quest of quantifiable indicators of educational and work success.

Finally, and unfortunately, in addition to a rather long and tedious to present series of editorial problems (transliteration rules, grammatical and syntactical problems, conceptual and terminological asymmetries and sheer type-set errors), which the reviewer could make available to the editors if they so wish the figure on "Job-orientation type altruistic orientation by field of study" (3.3, p. 62) is an obvious error. It is incongruent with the text. The latter emphasizes nursing, pharmacy, psychology and the humanities as the strongest within the so called "altruistic" typology. Yet the figure projects instead, production engineering, business studies, accountancy, law estate management and hotel administration as the zenith of "altruistic" orientation and contradistinction to humanities. English literature and fine arts which are categorized as the nadir of egocentric careerism. At a second reading it seems that figure 3.3 is the duplication of figure 3.1 the "careerist" type of orientation. The reader has lost for good the opportunity to read the detailed research findings. At least in the uni-disciplinary past this would have been considered as unpardonable, a reject copy. And for a book on University Education stressing strict criteria of evaluation, it is a case, I am afraid, to be pulled out from circulation and replaced by a decent edition!

STEFANOS PESMAZOGLU

*Department of Political Science
Panteios University
Athens
Greece*

Strategies for the National Support of Basic Research: An International Comparison, edited by Irvin Asher, Alex Keynan and Meir Zadok. The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Jerusalem, 1995.

The impressive title of the book covers an attempt to transform the proceedings of an international conference, held at the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities in October 1994 to prepare the next steps in the evolution of science funding and priority setting in Israel, into a more general diagnosis of the situation of (basic) science in contemporary societies. The contributions to the conference certainly deserve to be made accessible to a wider audience. Their often informal nature, and the edited transcripts of discussions, enable the reader to listen in to "the deliberations of the world science leaders" (p. 323). This has advantages of directness, but also disadvantages of fragmentation and inconclusiveness. For example, the comparison, promised in the title, is absent except for remarks of participants in the discussion, and the recurrent question whether experiences abroad apply to the situation in Israel.

The occasion for the conference to be held was the specific situation of Israel. Strong applied scientific research, actively sponsored by government ministries; a gap between this applied research and the autonomous universities locked into teaching obligations; massive foreign support of Israeli science and extensive travel of Israeli scientists abroad. Only recently, a grant awarding body had been set up, the Israel National Science Foundation, thanks to the catalytic role of the U.S.A. Charles H. Revson Foundation providing seed money. The question how to proceed from there shaped the conference, sponsored again by the Charles H. Revson Foundation. Thus, questions of funding and assessment of (basic) research and the relation with social priorities, were high on the agenda.

The “world science leaders” invited to contribute to the conference were leaders of universities, academies, presidents or former presidents of science organisations and committees, and some analysts of science policy like Jean-Jacques Salomon, Yaron Ezrahi, and Michael Gibbons. So they were leaders as seen from within the world of science, and this coloured their contributions and the discussion. Changes in the world “outside” science were evaluated as to whether they were threatening science or not. Naturally, defense against such changes was uppermost in the mind of the world science leaders. A shared starting point was: “As research resources tighten, science will have to define and fight for its priorities” (p. 19), and the issue of assessment of science was taken up because: “if we do not measure ourselves, somebody else will—“upper management”, the government, funding agencies, whoever—and they will probably do an even worse job of it” (p. 217).

The analysts introduced some hard-nosed questions, and raised discussion without, however, being able to get the conference out of this locked-in mode of approaching the issues. David Robinson, executive director of the Carnegie Commission for Science, Technology and Government which had prepared a series of influential reports, emphasized the importance of getting, as they had done, non-scientists involved if science wants to be heard in the wider world (p. 138). Indeed, while examples were given of productive interactions, e.g. in interdisciplinary centres as in the Technion in Israel, the general attitude was reflected in summary phrases about the autonomy of the scientist: “For most scientists, having to prove their “worth” to nonscientists is intrinsically distasteful. Nor is the unpredictable creative process readily amenable to time schedules and other managerial constraints” (p. 163).

This attitude stands in curious contrast with real world of science as presented in the informative reports to the conference about organisation of science, funding patterns, international collaborations, new assessment schemes, in various countries. Together, they offer a useful overview, and often with some added insights because the speakers had been directly involved in these matters. But the diagnosis continues to be one of the “current crisis in research and research funding” (p. 225 and *passim*) related to the “collapse of public and political confidence in the importance of science” (p. 13). When the editors note that discussion for and against assessment in each of its many guises spilled over into private conversations in halls, bus rides and wherever else participants met, they continue to say that this indicates that “assessment is, perhaps, the most specific proposal on the table for meeting the current crisis and restoring public confidence” (p. 163).

Universities were sometimes taken as a given, and the discussion revolved on whether governments should trust the universities (as in the Netherlands) or not (as in present-day U.K.). The respective reports showed clearly how different the funding and assessment systems are in the two countries. In Sweden, it appeared, the universities are stimulated to make the necessary improvements themselves (p. 189), and in the U.S.A., “Reinventing the Research University” (the title of a meeting in June 1994) has become an issue (p. 46). The Israeli participants thought the constraints from within their universities too strong to effect the necessary changes.

There is much to learn from this book: assorted items of information, anecdotes, country reports, a convincing analysis of science policy, past and present, in the opening chapter by Jean-Jacques Salomon. And one can experience the spectacle of the world science leaders interacting among themselves, and be amazed at the curious mixture of experience and ability to get things done, scientifically and organizationally, and a certain naivete about the own situation.

ARIE RIP

University of Twente
Enschede
The Netherlands