

Ainsi donc, de nombreux universitaires pouvant jouir d'un congé sabbatique tous les six ans, plus de 4 500 d'entre eux pourraient chaque année participer à un tel programme. M. Patton estime d'ailleurs que leur recyclage requerra une action d'envergure nationale plutôt qu'individuelle, c'est-à-dire au niveau de chaque université.

Un autre type de programme de recyclage en cours de carrière consisterait à encourager les universitaires à oeuvrer périodiquement à l'extérieur du milieu universitaire, soit dans la fonction publique ou le secteur privé, à l'occasion de congés spéciaux. Un programme de cette nature pourrait ainsi encourager leur mobilité, laquelle a été immensément réduite compte tenu des conditions actuelles du marché du travail. Cette absence de mobilité peut non seulement être lourde de conséquences pour la personne, mais également pour la vitalité de la communauté universitaire.

Toutefois, de telles hypothèses ne résolvent pas la question des possibilités d'emploi des diplômés récents au niveau du doctorat et de ceux qui les suivront au cours des prochaines années. Ainsi, ils ont traditionnellement cherché à être employés en milieu universitaire, alors que la situation de l'emploi y était généralement perçue comme décourageante. Cependant, on ne s'attarde ici qu'à l'ampleur du problème. Il est toutefois surprenant de constater que le but principal de la majorité des diplômés au niveau du doctorat est toujours d'enseigner à l'université.

*Academia in Transition* est une initiative de la *National Science Foundation* réalisée en 1977 et a été publié sous forme différente par le *National Technical Information Service* du département américain du Commerce, ce qui rend compte de la nature technique de certains chapitres. *Apt Books* a publié l'ouvrage en 1979.

Cette étude est essentiellement la synthèse d'expériences américaines et l'on y fait nulle part mention d'analyses internationales. Bien que chaque chapitre soit annoté séparément, une bibliographie aurait été utile. Mais ce ne sont là que des détails secondaires.

*Academia in Transition* est un ouvrage opportun et édifiant qui nous donne la perspective nécessaire pour nous attaquer aux questions importantes qui troublent les universités canadiennes.

Max von Zur-Muehlen  
Statistics Canada\*

\* *Les opinions exprimées dans ce document sent celles de l'auteur et n'engage en aucune façon Statistique Canada.*

K. Mazurek, ed. *Educational Futures: anticipations by the next generation of Canadian scholars*. Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1979.

*Educational Futures* is a rather unusual book. It is written not by mature scholars but by graduate students; it is organized not around a single coherent subject but around 6 separate topics explored in 16 essays; and it is concerned not with the present state of education but with its future possibilities. For these reasons, the book both fails and succeeds, offering to the reader either a composite insight into the function of education as a social barometer or a confused collection of random and often imperfect thoughts.

The authors in *Educational Futures* entertain similar assumptions, such as the belief that Canadian society will continue to change, and perhaps for the worse, unless certain aspects of our means of dealing with it are ameliorated. Also, it is implicit in these essays that the necessary re-evaluation of education in the 1980's can provide increased possibilities for realising our human potential. Indeed, a significant proportion of the collection promotes the sanguine belief that education provides the key to a more rational entry into the next, troubled decade.

However, the unifying factors contained in these ideas are not exploited because of the lack of a good, comprehensive introduction or conclusion. The introduction (interestingly, the only essay by a faculty member) is curiously weak in this regard. For example, there is no analysis of the recurring theme of the dangers implied by the educational conservatism of the "Back to Basics" movement, although it is discussed in at least five of the papers (Mazurek, Tinglin and Young, Henley, Warters and Patterson). Similarly, the intimate connection between politics and education is mentioned by Bhattacharya in his introduction in only the most abstract sense, rather than linking concretely the ideas on this issue expressed by almost all of the contributors, who represent a wide spectrum of ideological points of view. Consequently, the collection has a haphazard, unfinished quality, despite the fact that the essays contained in it clearly have the potential to be fashioned into a book.

This unfinished character is unfortunately also evident within the various essays themselves. The divergence in point of view, disciplinary background and subject of these papers could have provided for an exciting vision of how our past aspirations, achievements and failures in education might inform our educational futures. Instead, because of weak editing, organisation and argument, the reader is left with a number of bright lights burning through a murky vision, a problem exacerbated too often by unsophisticated argument, infelicitous prose and unfamiliar or uncongenial concepts.

For example, Coulter's essay on "Teachers and Political Action" is less an analysis of an important subject than an exercise in ideological wish fulfilment; Jagodzinski's discussion of *designo* (sic!) in "Aesthetics and Education" reveals a lack of knowledge of the subject. Also, too many of the authors overuse italics and inverted commas, indicating a weak style, while others sacrifice clarity for rhetoric.

Nevertheless, there are excellent papers as well. Wood's "Decompartmentalization of Education" is a positive, innovative and useful contribution to her subject, despite stylistic lapses; Warters' essay on "Competency in Writing" contains a well argued plea for a redirected approach to composition teaching; and Tinglin and Young have provided a lucid and searching analysis of a critical question: the relationship between "Education and Ethnicity".

In short, *Educational Futures* would have greatly benefitted from a ruthless editor, and a synthetic introductory essay. Still, it must be remembered that this book was written by graduate students and the reader must consequently look to their potential for the future, just as they have done in their investigation of education; and, without a doubt, the educational futures of these students are bright indeed.

Kenneth R. Bartlett  
University of Toronto