

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

1755 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 300, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • [202] 234-5703

TO: COSSA Members, Affiliates, Contributors and Friends

FROM: Roberta Balstad Miller, Executive Director

COSSA LEGISLATIVE REPORT

November 12, 1982

This Week . . .

The 1982 Elections: How Do They Affect Social Science?
France: Government Report Says Social Science Neglected
House Maintains NIE and NCES Budgets at FY 1982 Levels
Fate of Senate Appropriation for NIMH Unclear
Changing of the Guard at NSF
Humanities Update
Federal Investment in Research
Sources of Research Support

* * *

THE 1982 ELECTIONS: HOW DO THEY AFFECT SOCIAL SCIENCE?

The results of the 1982 elections were, for the most part known on November 3, the day after the election. When the rhetorical smoke of the network enthusiasts had cleared, the Democrats were found to have maintained control of the House and to have increased their nominal majority by 26 seats. At the same time, the Republicans retained their majority in the Senate. That these changes occurred is clear. What effects they will have on social and behavioral science research issues in Congress is not at all apparent.

Social Science Research has lost some good friends as a result of the election. Harold ("Cap") Hollenbeck (R-NJ), Jim Dunn (R-MI), and Margaret Heckler (R-MA), all of whom served on the House Committee on Science and Technology and were outspoken in their support of social science research, were not re-elected. It is not yet known who will be appointed to replace them on the Science and Technology Committee. A fourth strong friend of the social sciences who was defeated in his attempt at re-election was Larry DeNardis (R-CT). The defeat of these particular Republican Members of Congress will make it somewhat more difficult to obtain bipartisan majorities for increases in social and behavioral

THE 1982 ELECTIONS: HOW DO THEY AFFECT SOCIAL SCIENCE? (cont.)

science budgets. COSSA now plans to identify other Republicans who will support social science issues in committee and on the floor of the House.

In the Senate, the defeat of Harrison Schmitt (R-NM) may well resolve the jurisdictional dispute between Schmitt's Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources headed by Orrin Hatch (R-UT). Senator Schmitt has been trying to have the responsibility for the NSF authorization transferred from the Labor and Human Resources Committee to the Commerce Committee, where responsibility for other scientific research authorizations lies. Senator Schmitt is also chairman of the Appropriation Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. It is not certain how his defeat will affect the mark up and eventual passage of that appropriation.

Congress will return to Washington on November 29 for a brief lame-duck session that will emphasize appropriations actions. The 98th Congress will convene on January 3 for swearing-in ceremonies and return at the end of January to begin work. According to the Democratic Steering Committee, committee assignments for the 98th Congress will be made in December or January.

FRANCE: GOVERNMENT REPORT SAYS SOCIAL SCIENCES NEGLECTED

A recently released report on the social sciences in France revealed that Giscard d'Estaing cut spending for social science research in half from 1976 to 1981. Funds for research in the humanities were cut by almost one-fourth during the same period. The Mitterand government is attempting to reverse the trend established by Giscard and has increased social science research support by 17 percent this year. The report, which was prepared by Maurice Godelier, an anthropologist who is Director of Studies at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes et Sciences Sociales in Paris, was presented last month to the French Minister for Research and Industry, Jean-Pierre Chevenement. Further details are available in Attachment 1 from Nature.

HOUSE MAINTAINS NIE AND NCES BUDGETS AT FY 1982 LEVELS

The House version of the appropriations bill for the Department of Education maintains funding for the National Institute of Education (NIE) at \$53.4 million, the FY 1982 level. Similarly, funds for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) were maintained at the FY 1982 level of \$8.6 million. The appropriation for the Department of Education is part of a larger bill that also covers the Department of Labor and the Department of Health and Human Services. It is not known whether the Senate will mark up this appropriation bill during the lame-duck session of Congress. (See "Fate of Senate Appropriation for NIMH Unclear.")

HOUSE MAINTAINS NIE AND NCES BUDGETS AT FY 1982 LEVELS (cont.)

Controversy continues at NIE. A complaint filed with the Merit Systems Protection Board charges that officials at NIE have been using personnel decisions to advance political agendas at the Institute. Officials at NIE have denied the accusation. No action on the complaint has as yet been taken. For further information, see Attachment 2.

FATE OF SENATE APPROPRIATION FOR NIMH UNCLEAR

The recent defeat of Sen. Harrison Schmitt (R-NM), Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, has made it uncertain whether the budget of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) will be marked up during the lame-duck session of Congress. The office of the Subcommittee maintains that the appropriation bill will be marked up at the end of the month. But COSSA has learned from Senate staffers that, in fact, no one knows what Sen. Schmitt or his successor, who might be named as early as December 2, plans to do. (See COSSA Legislative Report, October 8, 1982, for details of the House appropriation for NIMH.)

In other news from NIMH: the establishment of a new Center for Studies of Prevention is imminent. The new Center will become official as soon as Richard Schweiker, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, gives final approval to NIMH's reorganization plan. (See Attachment 3 from the APA Monitor for further details on the Center.)

CHANGING OF THE GUARD AT NSF

John B. Slaughter, who announced his resignation as Director of the National Science Foundation in May, left the Foundation as of November 1 to assume his new responsibilities as Chancellor of the University of Maryland at College Park. He has been replaced by Dr. Edward Knapp, who was sworn in as Director on November 5.

Dr. Slaughter became Director of the Foundation in late 1980, only weeks before the newly elected Reagan administration decided on severe and disproportionate cuts for the NSF social and behavioral science research budgets. Through much of his tenure at NSF, Dr. Slaughter was forced to detail, if not explain, the administration's decisions in this area. He was, at the same time, outspoken in his defense of the high quality of NSF-supported research in the social and behavioral sciences.

By the end of Dr. Slaughter's first year at the Foundation, Administration budget cuts had left the NSF budget for FY 1982 lower than the original Carter request by several hundred million dollars. At the same time, the Congress had expressed strong concern about the severe reductions in the social and behavioral

CHANGING OF THE GUARD AT NSF (cont.)

science research programs at NSF and had added funds to the administration's budget for NSF, designating them in part for these programs. Rather than waiting to increase the social and behavioral science budgets in the next fiscal year (FY 1983) as the administration had planned, Dr. Slaughter increased the budgets of these programs by \$11 million, or approximately 50% over administration levels in FY 1982.

As a consequence, however, the initial FY 1983 budget request for the NSF programs in the social and behavioral sciences included only small increases over FY 1982 levels. There has as yet been no public comment on the final shape of the FY 1983 budget but indications are that Dr. Slaughter restored additional funds to the social and behavioral science programs before he left the Foundation. It is possible, moreover, that other funds might become available at a later time to increase these budgets further.

Dr. Slaughter deserves our appreciation for his strong public statements on behalf of the social and behavioral sciences at a time when such support was urgently needed and for his significant restoration of funds in the FY 1982 budgets for social and behavioral science research.

The new Director of the Foundation is Dr. Edward Knapp, former Assistant Director of the Directorate for Mathematical and Physical Sciences. Prior to coming to NSF, Dr. Knapp was at Los Alamos laboratory as head of the accelerator technology division. Additional information on Dr. Knapp is provided in Attachment 4 from The Chronicle of Higher Education.

HUMANITIES UPDATE

The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, chaired by Rep. Sidney R. Yates (R-IL), may begin mark-up of their 1983 appropriations bill before the lame-duck session of Congress begins on November 29. The appropriation for the Department of the Interior includes funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). It is expected that funding for NEH will be maintained at its FY 1982 level of \$130.6 million.

The Congressional Arts Caucus, which has been providing Members of Congress with information about the arts, is in the process of expanding and improving its coverage of federal funding for the humanities and NEH. The Caucus has already been in touch with the National Humanities Alliance and the National Federation of State Humanities Councils, and is actively soliciting suggestions on how it can be more effective in gathering and disseminating information about the humanities.

A congressional caucus is an informal coalition of Members of Congress organized around an interest of mutual concern. Members are required to pay modest dues to the caucus and, in turn,

HUMANITIES UPDATE (cont.)

receive regular and current information about the subject around which the caucus is organized. Other Congressional caucuses include the Congressional Black Caucus, the Northeast-Midwest Coalition and the Congressional Rural Caucus.

Interested COSSA members should encourage their Representatives to join the Congressional Arts Caucus and urge them to expand their interest in funding for the humanities. For more information about the Caucus, call Helen Rauch at 202/234-5703.

FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN RESEARCH

Federal spending on research and development has increased substantially during the last decade. The Department of Defense still outspends by far any other agency of the federal government and has doubled its research and development (R&D) outlays since 1972. Whereas support for R&D in the National Science Foundation (NSF) and in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has more than doubled, similar support from the Department of Education (ED) has declined. Although R&D support in the Department of Labor (DOL) has doubled since 1972, DOL research support is lowest among the listed agencies and 1982 levels are less than half of what they were in 1981.

Federal Research and Development Outlays

1972-1982

(In billions of dollars)

	<u>1982</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1972</u>
Defense (DOD)	19.88	15.84	8.30
Nat'l Aeronautics & Space Adm. (NASA)	5.90	5.27	3.42
Energy (DOE)	5.81	6.10	1.55
Health & Human Services (HHS)	3.95	3.72	1.45
National Science Foundation (NSF)	0.92	0.91	0.44
Agriculture (USDA)	0.88	0.80	0.36
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	0.33	0.34	0.13
Education (ED)	0.10	0.13	0.11
House & Urban Development (HUD)	0.05	0.06	0.05
Labor (DOL)	0.04	0.11	0.02

Source: National Science Foundation

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT

From time to time, the COSSA Legislative Report will carry information on sources of research support in agencies of the federal government. COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the federal agency rather than COSSA for further information.

Department of Labor. The Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) will emphasize evaluation research in the coming year. Most research support will be allocated through competitive contracts awarded on the basis of responses to RFP's (Requests for Proposals) prepared in ETA. The ETA research budget for FY 1982 was approximately \$13 million.

To receive the RFP's as they are issued, write ETA and ask to be placed on the bidder's list. Requests should be addressed to: Janet Sten, Contracting Officer, ETA, 601 D Street, NW, Room 5118, Washington, D.C. 20213.

Department of Justice. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP) are separate agencies within the Department of Justice that fund social and behavioral science research. The FY 1982 research budget for NIJJDP was approximately \$5.5 million and that for NIJ was close to \$16.5 million.

NIJJDP will be publishing a research solicitation in the Federal Register before the end of November on "Community Studies of Serious Juvenile Crime." For information on this and other solicitations, contact the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (800/638-8736) and ask to be placed on their SNI (Selective Notification of Information) list. The Acting Director of NIJJDP is James C. Howell (202/724-6705).

NIJ awards grants that range from \$50,000 to \$200,000 on the basis of competitive solicitations that it places in the Federal Register. Grants are awarded to scientists in a wide range of social and behavioral science disciplines. The Acting Director of NIJ is James "Chips" Stewart. Nominated by President Reagan in August, his appointment, which is non-controversial, awaits Senate approval. For more information regarding the research program at NIJ call the Office of the Director (202/724-2942.)

Nature Vol. 299 28 October 1982

Social sciences in France

Few friends on the right

The unsympathetic manner in which Britain's Sir Keith Joseph regards the social sciences has precedents across the Channel, according to a long-awaited report on the social sciences in France. Figures collected by M. Maurice Godelier, a respected left-wing anthropologist and friend of the Mitterrand government, show that Giscard d'Estaing, the previous President of France, slashed social science spending by more than half between 1976 and 1981, and the humanities by nearly a quarter. Now is the time for reconstruction, and the government seems likely to follow M. Godelier's recommendations, although science and industry minister Jean-Pierre Chevènement said on introducing the report that full implementation would be too costly.

According to Godelier, there is much work to do. Giscard caused such a collapse in the human sciences "that the general public would hardly believe it". Libraries and documentation centres were particularly badly hit. The result was that subjects not protected by this or that "mandarin" were smothered. In the scramble for funds, academic standards went by the board.

Economics fared best, but only mainstream neoclassical economics. Sociology, tainted with being "leftist", was worse hit.

Godelier is thus starting almost from scratch. He recommends recreating infrastructures destroyed by Giscard (contract research supported by government departments had almost disappeared). He wants buildings repaired, libraries re-equipped, more funds for field studies and for publications, improved international contacts and more staff.

Nobody is likely to disagree with any of that — except for the size of the bill. But eyebrows have been raised in some quarters by his statement that the "new dynamic" should be founded not only on an increase in funding but also on a different cutting of the cake, in response to "a new evaluation of needs". These, it seems, would in part be turned towards the realities of modern French life, involving the study, for example, of both business and administration — the elite.

Moreover, Godelier has recommended the setting up of many more interdisciplinary studies, and cross-border funding committees — which might

threaten the very "mandarins" who survived Giscard. Godelier is thus seen as a personal and political threat in some quarters; and when this is combined with his forthright manner, he finds himself facing considerable opposition.

Thus when Chevènement attempted to make Godelier director of social sciences at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) last year, key figures in CNRS resigned over this alleged interference with "academic freedom". But others have pointed out that the man Godelier was to replace (and who did indeed resign, leaving a vacancy still unfilled) was himself a political appointee, a friend of Giscard's prime minister, Raymond Barre. Chevènement's logic was not faulty.

The political problem now is to fill the hot seat at CNRS, from which the Godelier reforms will be implemented, without creating too much uproar. Some kind of compromise, which might perhaps involve Godelier getting half the job but not the full responsibility, seems to be in the offing.

Robert Walgate

Spending low on France's books

A library, to a researcher in the humanities or social sciences, writes Hervé Le Bras, director of research at the Institut National des Etudes Démographiques, is like a telescope to an astronomer. But, claims Le Bras in an appendix to the Godelier report (see adjacent story), French libraries (though never good) are now "catastrophic".

The present state of affairs is illustrated by a comparison between the British Library (based in part at the British Museum) and the French equivalent, the

Bibliothèque Nationale. The table shows, in particular, a lack of French funds, posts and lending.

Some other figures: the Bibliothèque Nationale buys only 3.6 per cent of European titles in languages other than French, and only 2 per cent of North American titles. "The shadow which covers our own history [through lack of texts and documents] also extends to the rest of the world" says Le Bras. French social sciences "must not become provincial" he says.

	British Library (1979-80)	Bibliothèque Nationale (1981-82)
Total budget (FF)*	381,205,000	61,740,766
Conservation budget	24,200,000	11,611,508
Acquisitions of titles	2,100,000	750,000
Accredited readers	18,800	15,600
Staff	1,125	802
Requests for borrowing	2,375,000	24,700
Lending for borrowing	2,375,000	24,700
Lending budget (FF)	22,792,000	250,000
Lending staff	730	54

* (FF 12 = £1)

THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

November 3, 1982

Top NIE Officials Accused of Politicizing Agency

WASHINGTON

A group of employees of the National Institute of Education have charged that top officials have injected politics into the research agency's personnel decisions and programs.

In a complaint filed with the government's Merit Systems Protection Board, the employees contended that the officials violated a federal law governing the agency's employment practices when they allegedly tried to "implement a political agenda and place control of decision making into the hands of politically acceptable employees."

The group charged that Robert W. Sweet, acting director of the institute, Edward A. Curran, who gave up the post of N.I.E. director in June, and other agency officials revised es-

tablished hiring procedures for the professional research staff to put in key positions "politically and philosophically compatible employees" who were allegedly unqualified for the jobs.

The complaint charges that N.I.E. officials pursued "arbitrary and capricious" personnel practices, including firing professional staff members they wanted to replace, and checking employees' political affiliation.

Warren G. Kaufman, associate director of the N.I.E. for administration and one of the officials named in the complaint, said Mr. Sweet and Mr. Curran had acted "in compliance with law and fully within their authority."

"I am totally unaware of any politi-

cal criteria" for hiring decisions, Mr. Kaufman said. The personnel shifts, he said, represented an effort to bring "new blood" into the agency because some researchers with what were intended to be short-term appointments had worked with the agency for as long as nine years.

The complaint also contended that N.I.E. staff members had been excluded from decisions about research priorities and about the selection of peer reviewers.

Thomas R. Ascik, assistant director for planning and program development at N.I.E., called the complaint "preposterous."

"It is a false accusation that there hasn't been the most detailed discussion" with institute staff members, Mr. Ascik said.

Prevention center at NIMH takes new look at old goal

By Carol Turkington
Staff Writer

As science begins to uncover the etiology of mental disease, prevention becomes one of the most important tools with which to fight it.

In the wake of this national recognition of the importance of prevention, the National Institute of Mental Health is forming a Center for Studies of Prevention within the Division of Special Mental Health Programs.

"Prevention always was the ultimate goal of the NIMH," explained staff psychologist Jon Rolf. "And the methodology is now available to attempt research." Rolf believes that with the institution of block grants and the threat of the immediate demise of clinical research training, the emphasis on prevention research has been enhanced. "With behavioral medicine and health behavioral psychology, prevention is a growing area of interest," he said. "Administratively, the director of NIMH had the foresight to create a unit to develop a coordinated program."

And although the Mental Health Systems Act was eliminated, the section requiring NIMH to have an Office of Prevention still remains, according to Deputy Acting Director Eleanor Friedenberg, deputy acting director of the special programs division. The prevention office oversees prevention in a NIMH-wide sense, while the center will coordinate specific research projects.

The new prevention center will not become official until the approval of the NIMH reorganization package by Health and Human Services Secretary Richard Schweiker. At that time, the Center for Studies of Work and Mental Health will merge with the prevention branch and become known as the Center for Prevention, one of six such centers within the Division of Special Mental Health Projects.

As its first task, the new prevention branch announced two research opportunities for prevention scientists: preventive intervention research centers (PIRC) and investigator-initiated projects.

About \$800,000 will be available in FY83 to provide core support for up to four PIRCs where models of early mental health interventions can be developed and tested. These grants are available to public, private, profit or non-profit institutions (including community mental health centers) and federal, state or local governments. Although the deadline for PIRC applications was Nov. 1, all four grants may not be awarded at this time. Subsequent application deadlines are March 1 for funding by Dec. 1, and July 1 for an April 1 funding deadline. Awards provide seed money for up to five years of funding.

Appropriate areas

Prevention center staff indicate that "early preventive intervention" should be done while it is still possible to anticipate or reverse an early pathological process and that these interventions should occur before the need for treatment. Both severe disorders of low incidence and less debilitating but more common disorders will be appropriate problem areas for research.

Investigator-initiated projects support research activities by individuals. The amount of money available for these projects is still undetermined; the supplemental budget for FY 1982 that Congress passed over President Reagan's veto this summer contained \$6.5 million to NIMH, but how much the prevention branch might obtain is unknown. Applications are subject to the same peer review system process as other NIMH grant applications.

Priorities for these individual projects include development, field testing and replication of effective intervention strategies; preventive intervention for specific risk groups; methodological advancements; intervention for pathogenically stressful life events; and incorporating developmental perspectives into preventive intervention research.

Prevention branch staff has received about 20 letters of intent, with

300-400 more inquiries. If a researcher has a viable project but it is not workable as a center, staffers encourage the scientist to apply for an individual project instead. "We have had responses from persons well-known in health promotion research," Rolf said.

"A person might call and say, 'This is what I'm thinking about.' What they need is a network. We tell them who else is into prevention in their university or area. If there is already a tightknit group applying together, but they lack, maybe, an epidemiologist, we'll advise them to go get one before they apply to us as a center.

"All three of the institutes of ADAMHA (Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health) are studying the family; all three are studying areas of interest to each of them," Rolf said. "It's causing a formation of networks that weren't there before, since a PIRC application can't be done as a one-person, one-project study. There might be three or four independent investigators working together."

But despite the interesting, exciting changes the new grants are producing in the research community, there are many problems to overcome. Prevention research has much to prove, according to Rolf.

If too much money is given to prevention, the risks exceed the power of the intervention, staffers warn. Overreaching at this point could have grave consequences.

"Some say it's not possible, based on what is known about causes and intervention, to do prevention research," Rolf admitted honestly. Staffers say prevention can be a risky career, and warn of the lengthy turnaround time between research and its conclusions.

"We need to prove that good, solid legitimate research can be done, not expensively, and that it produces valuable data," Rolf said. "We must demonstrate that preventive intervention can work for groups. The future is one of hard work and, if carefully managed, good work." ■

Knapp to Head Science Foundation

WASHINGTON
President Reagan last week appointed Edward A. Knapp, a physicist and former administrator at the University of California's Los Alamos National Laboratory, to be the next director of the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Knapp will succeed John B. Slaughter, who left the agency last week to become chancellor of the University of Maryland at College Park. A Congressional aide said Mr. Knapp could be confirmed by the Senate as early as the end of this month, when Congress returns from its recess. Since President Reagan has the authority to make what is known as a "recess appointment," Mr. Knapp will serve as director of the agency even before he is confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. Knapp has been the foundation's assistant director for mathematical and physical sciences since September. Previously, he was head of the accelerator-technology division at the Los Alamos laboratory, which he joined in 1958. His research contributed to early knowledge about

controlled thermonuclear processes, and he helped plan the laboratory's half-mile-long linear proton accelerator.

Science lobbyists and Congressional aides interviewed by *The Chronicle* said they knew little about Mr. Knapp except that he had been associated professionally with George A. Keyworth, II, President Reagan's science adviser.

Mr. Keyworth worked at the Los Alamos laboratory from 1968 until he received his White House appointment in May, 1981.

According to one Congressional aide, "the most significant point" about Mr. Knapp "is that he's not a university person. That's a break from tradition."

Six of the past seven directors of the National Science Foundation came directly from universities. Leland J. Haworth, the director of the foundation from 1963 to 1969, had been director of the Brookhaven National Laboratory and commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission before his appointment.

John C. Crowley, director of

federal relations for scientific research at the Association of American Universities, said it was "not altogether unreasonable to suspect" that Mr. Knapp's lack of university ties could signify that the Administration wants a change in the way the science foundation is run. "But I am unable to read anything more into that. I don't know him."

William D. Carey, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said Mr. Knapp's background didn't necessarily mean that there would be changes in direction at the foundation.

Perhaps the most important question for scientists to consider, said a Congressional aide, is whether Mr. Knapp will prove to be "dynamic" enough to provide clear leadership at N.S.F.

He added that William A. Nierenberg, director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, had been regarded as someone who could provide such leadership, but that he had turned down the job when it was offered to him by President Reagan. —K. McD.