

relationship between the Center and the mother institutes has actually been very time-consuming. It is difficult to be inside and yet a little outside.

We do not deny that the more substantial conclusions of the 'Nightmare' article may come true on the long view, but on the short view and as members of COS, we experience different obligations.

The View on Research and Science

Basically, we find it a weakness of the article that it concludes exclusively on the basis of two alternative views on social science research. Social science research is either autonomic and critical or dependent and bureaucratic. The social science researcher either develops theories, but is often isolated in his or her ivory tower and dependent on the frames of one single paradigm, or he or she is one-sidedly oriented towards empiricism and practice and dependent on the elite groups of society. At COS, we believe in a third possibility: a social science research which combines the development of theory and practice, couples theoretical and empirical analyses, works across existing paradigms, and is developed in dialogue with research milieux and society, aiming at, among other things, contributing to the development of society in the 1990s. This model for social science research is not even considered in the 'Nightmare' article.

REFERENCES

- Clark, Burton R. 1986. *The Higher Education System. Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hansen, Hanne Foss 1988. *Organisering og styring af forskning – en introduktion til forskning om forskning* (Organization and Control of Research – An Introduction to Research on Research). Copenhagen: Nyt fra Samfundsvideenskaberne.
- Premfors, Rune 1986. *Svensk forskningspolitik* (Research Policy in Sweden). Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Kaarlo Tuori, Department of Public Law, Helsinki University

It seems that the criteria the writer has chosen for those four models he uses in analyzing the Nordic social science projects is not in harmony with Mills's criticism of large-scale projects in social science. Mills's criticism focuses mainly on the relationship between decision-makers and researchers whereas the models are based on the relationships between the projects

and 'the established research community'. If the aim of the study has been to use Mills's criticism as a kind of a hypothesis to be tested, the criteria for the model-building should have been in accordance with the focus of Mills's criticism.

My second comment is closely connected to the previous one. I am not quite certain whether the four projects chosen by the author are the most suitable ones for testing if Mills's criticism holds also for Nordic social science research. All these projects work mainly in the traditional academic milieu which still has, at least to a certain degree, its traditional autonomy in regard to political decision-makers and the bureaucracy. The trends that mostly resemble the development about which Mills was worried are not located in this milieu, but rather in the research going on within the bureaucracy itself. It certainly is true, at least as far as Finland is concerned, that such kinds of large-scale projects which the author has picked up for analysis are a new phenomenon in social science. However, the other relatively new phenomenon, and also more important, at least in the context of Millsian criticism, is represented by social science research organized in the bureaucracy itself. In the light of the criteria for model-building and of the types of projects chosen for analysis, the author's conclusion that his 'observations do not in all respects support C. Wright Mills's "American Nightmare" in its Nordic Context' is not very surprising.

In the context of independent research projects working mainly in the academic milieu, the models used in the article may be considered fruitful ideal types. Still, some doubts may be expressed about their ability to summarize significant differences between the very four projects analyzed. As the author himself concludes, in fact all of these projects seem to combine some features from all the models. The differences are perhaps not so great as the ideal-type labels given by the author suggest.

Thus, I think that the author has, in certain respects, exaggerated the distinctiveness of the Finnish project. Thus, for example, this project clearly has quite an emphasis on strategies which the author has connected to the Network and the Contract models. In my view, it is also somewhat misleading to say that this project is 'on the whole a part of the traditional academic research community both administratively and in terms of research'. The project works at the university, its 'headquarters' are located at the Faculty of Law of Helsinki University; but that does not mean an administratively interdependent relationship. The faculty provides the project with workrooms, technical facilities, and so on, but administratively, as far as, for example, decisions on the research work are concerned, the project is wholly independent from the university. This arrangement follows the general division of work between the Academy of Finland and the universities: the Academy provides the funding – on the basis of research plans – whereas the research work itself is done at the universities. The

project also has some multidisciplinary features; in fact, one of the central aims of the project has been to break the traditional isolation of legal science, to create contacts between legal and (other) social science. Also, the administrative independence of the project may be regarded as one of the prerequisites for the realization of this aim. At least in the context of legal science, the research strategy of the project might perhaps be more aptly deemed innovative rather than traditional!

Still, perhaps the main distinctive feature of the Finnish project may be connected to its relationship to the university, but not so much in regard to the research done as to the instruction given at the university. The project, or rather its leader, also has some responsibilities in postgraduate guidance. This is due to the background of the project. The project is organized as part of the research work of a research professor of The Academy of Finland. Research professors are appointed for a fixed-period, generally for five years; and one of the main criteria for the appointment is their research plan. Their main responsibility is research, but they are also supposed to be active in postgraduate guidance, although this does not take place within the official or fixed curriculum of the faculty. The idea is to combine these aspects, research and postgraduate guidance; and this has also been the strategy of the Finnish project in question. The other distinctive feature of the Finnish project is, of course, the size of its budget, which is quite modest in comparison with the other projects. On the other hand, the size of the annual budget mentioned in the article may be somewhat misleading because (1) the salaries paid by the Academy are not included, (2) the project also has some Network-model features, and (3) part of the research is done by postgraduate students.