CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume II, Number 7
April 8, 1983

This Week . . .

* * *

HOUSE COMMITTEE UNANIMOUSLY INCREASES NSF SOCIAL SCIENCE BUDGETS

The House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology marked up the authorization for the National Science Foundation (NSF) on Tuesday, April 5. Representative Doug Walgren (D-PA), Subcommittee chairman, proposed that the Subcommittee accept the overall budget level for the Foundation proposed by the administration for FY 1984 but that funds be reallocated within the budget to provide an additional $15 million for the social, behavioral, and information science programs. Of this amount, $2 million would be reserved for the Division of Information Science and the remaining $13 million be divided between the Division of Social and Economic Science and the behavioral science programs within the Division of Behavioral and Neural Sciences. Representative Judd Gregg (R-NH) ranking minority member of the Subcommittee, supported the Walgren recommendations, and they passed unanimously.

The next step for the NSF authorization for FY 1984 is the full Science and Technology Committee mark up which has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 12.

COSSA Washington Update is a biweekly publication of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, 202/234-5703; Dell H. Hymes, *President;* Roberta Balstad Miller, *Executive Director.* Member associations are the American Anthropological Association, American Economic Association, American Historical Association, American Political Science Association, American Psychological Association, American Sociological Association, American Statistical Association, Association of American Geographers, Association of American Law Schools, and Linguistic Society of America. A list of COSSA Affiliates and Contributors can be obtained from the Consortium.

April 8, 1983

THE STATUS OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN FRANCE

In the short period since the Mitterrand government has been in power in France, a number of far-reaching changes have been instituted. One of the areas that has been the focus of a great deal of study and policy redirection is science and technology, including government policy for the social sciences. Jean-Pierre Chevènement, Mitterrand's first Minister for Science, Technology, and Industry, held that "without a political strategy of research, there can be no political strategy of industry, society or culture," and organized a major symposium on scientific research and policy in January, 1982. Nearly 200 papers were prepared for the social sciences alone for the symposium.

As reported in an earlier issue of the COSSA Washington Update, funding for research in the social and behavioral sciences declined during the years that Giscard d'Estaing was president, with the heaviest decline occurring in 1980. The result of these cuts and of an overall science policy that tended to ignore social and behavioral science disciplines was that research resources such as library materials and data banks were in short supply. There were, moreover, few new positions in universities or in research institutes for social scientists, and job mobility among French social scientists came close to a standstill.

As has happened elsewhere, declining research support and employment opportunities had intellectual ramifications. In France in the late 1970's, there was a renewed emphasis on traditional disciplinary research at the expense of inter-disciplinary inquiry. In large part this was caused by the inadequacy of financial and other resources for interdisciplinary research. But it was also due to the fact that even in the best of times, interdisciplinary research lacks the institutional recognition accorded research that is solidly based in existing disciplines. In the worst of times, the situation is exacerbated even further.

Discussions at the symposium organized by Mr. Chevènement focused on both the substance and the organization of social science research in France. In terms of substance, there were a number of areas that were felt to be in need of greater emphasis. These ranged from policy-oriented studies of education and learning to deeper examinations of French social and political institutions and of adaptation to technological change. Several recommendations for structural changes in the management of research also grew out of symposium papers and discussions. These recommendations included the need to promote both mobility and job security for research scientists and to democratize the research enterprise by relaxing what had become rigid distinctions of rank and responsibilities and encouraging broader participation of administrative and technical staff in research training activities.

April 8, 1983

THE STATUS OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN FRANCE (cont.)

Mr. Chevènement then commissioned a leading French anthropologist, Maurice Godelier, to prepare a report on the status and problems of the social and behavioral science disciplines and to make further recommendations to the government about research policy in this area. The Godelier report, which called for increased and steady funding for social science research, was presented to the government in October, 1982.

At present, Mr. Godelier has been named director of the division of the social sciences of the Centre Nationale de Recherche Scientifique (CNRS). Chevènement, who is a social scientist by training, resigned from his position as minister for Science, Technology, and Industry during the recent post-election reshuffling of the Mitterrand cabinet. Although it is not known whether his successor will replace Godelier at CNRS, the involvement of the French government in the revitalization of the social sciences has proceeded so far already that it is unlikely that there will be a redirection of policy.

An article about Maurice Godelier from the London Times is included here as Attachment 1.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT

Over 100 national data bases are available for use in social science research. These data series comprise a major resource for research on social conditions and social change. Some are available from the federal government at nominal cost, while most of the others are available free of cost to faculty members of the 260 universities and colleges that belong to the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR).

"National Social Data Series: A Compendium of Brief Descriptions," a new publication of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) Center for Coordination of Research on Social Indicators, describes 101 major data bases, their content and availability. If you are interested in obtaining a copy, send $2.00 (to cover cost of postage and handling) to Dr. Richard C. Rockwell, SSRC Center for Coordination of Research on Social Indicators, 1755 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20036.

April 8, 1983

FIPSE: 10 YEARS OF SUCCESS AND A 50% BUDGET CUT

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), a program of the Department of Education, celebrated its tenth birthday last week. Created by the 1972 Education Amendments, FIPSE made its first awards in 1973, during the Nixon administration. The Fund's mandate, to improve post-secondary education opportunitites, has been interpreted very broadly and FIPSE is widely acknowledged to support many innovative and creative projects. The administration has proposed a rescission of over 50% for FIPSE in FY 1983 and a budget for FY 1984 at the same level.

FIPSE grants are made principally to universities and colleges, although projects that involve private organizations working in collaboration with institutes of higher education are also funded. When project proposals are submitted to FIPSE, it is first determined whether they would more properly fall under the jurisdiction of an agency with a more specific focus, such as the National Science Foundation or the National Endowment for the Humanities. Those projects that FIPSE elects to consider for funding must go through a two-stage grant submission procedure. This December over 2300 preliminary applications were received for consideration. Of these, 330 applicants were invited to submit more detailed proposals. Eventually 70 or 75 awards will be made.

Congress approved an $11.7 million budget for FIPSE for FY 1982. The administration has submitted to Congress a $6 million rescission to the FY 1983 budget. Congressional staff report, however, that it is highly unlikely Congress will assent to the rescission.

The administration has announced its intention to phase out FIPSE because it has been "extremely successful" and has proposed a FY 1984 budget of $6.0 million. This would only allow FIPSE to fund no more than grant continuations. Some of those who are familiar with FIPSE believe that the FIPSE budget is not being cut because of past successes, but because of past funding of labor unions, student organizations, and feminist groups that make it a prime target for those in the administration determined to "defund the left."

April 8, 1983

RESEARCH GROUP TO AID CONGRESSIONAL CHILDREN'S COMMITTEES

COSSA and the Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD) have organized an informal group of research organizations to provide assistance to two new congressional groups, the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families and the Senate Children's Caucus. Participating in the group, which will be called Research Resources for Children, Youth and Families (RRCYF), are societies representing sociology, law, psychology, anthropology, political science, history, public health, and women's studies, among others.

RRCYF and will make the latest research on children, youth and families available to Congress. Because of the multidisciplinary nature of its affiliated organizations, RRCYF will be able to draw upon the expertise of research scientists from a wide variety of disciplines. Its current plans are to provide members of the Select Committee, the Children's Caucus and their staff with written and oral briefings on policy issues, annotated bibliographies of current research, and names of researchers who can be called upon to provide testimony at congressional hearings.

RRCYF will function strictly as a clearinghouse for research on children. It will not lobby on behalf of particular programs, nor identify with partisan points of view. Members of RRCYF, furthermore, will be free to interact directly with congressional staff.

It is hoped that the monthly meetings of Research Resources for Children, Youth and Families will not only provide a forum for developing resources for the Congress, but will also promote the exchange of information and improve communication among researchers from different disciplines.

TURKISH SOCIAL SCIENTISTS FIRED

Over the past several months, over 30 academics have been fired from Turkish universities, allegedly because of their political views. Most of those dismissed from their posts are social scientists, although mathematicians and medical faculty have also been fired. The dismissed faculty members lost not only their jobs, but also their pensions and the right to future employment in any public institution or body. No reason has been given for the firings.

April 8, 1983

CONGRESSMAN CONCERNED ABOUT OSTP ADVISORY COUNCIL

When George A. Keyworth II, the White House Science Advisor and head of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) announced plans to establish an advisory Science Council, the news was received with both interest and approval in the science community. Many looked to the new body as a revival, albeit under a different guise, of the earlier President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC) with broad representation of the science community on the new body. The reality of the situation, however, was quite different. The OSTP Science Council was comprised almost entirely of physicists and engineers.

The question of the composition of the Science Council surfaced again recently at House hearings on the National Science Foundation (NSF) authorization for FY 1984. Representative Mervyn M. Dymally (D-CA) questioned NSF Director Edward A. Knapp about the composition of the Science Council, asking specifically about the representation of social and behavioral scientists on that body. Although Dr. Knapp pointed out that NSF was not involved in the selection of Science Council members nor in setting its agenda, Mr. Dymally persisted. He said that if the OSTP were involved in determining budget levels at NSF, he did not understand how they were able to make decisions about consistently funding the social and behavioral sciences at lower levels than the physical sciences when they had no scientific advice on the nature of research in those fields or the adequacy of available funding.

April 8, 1983

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (NSF)

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency rather than COSSA for more information.

Division of Behavioral and Neural Sciences

FY 1983 Budget: Funds available to the entire Division of Behavioral and Neural Sciences for FY 1983 amount to $33.8 million.

Program Areas: Seven programs comprise the Division -- Anthropology, Linguistics, Social and Developmental Psychology, Memory and Cognition, Psychobiology, Sensory Physiology and Perception, and Neurobiology. The Division's goals are "to advance understanding of the biological, environmental, and cultural factors that underly the behavior of human beings and animals, with explicit emphasis on nervous system structure and function."

Disciplines Supported: Anthropology, Psychology, Linguistics, Biology.

Funding Mechanisms: Grants only. Currently, grant applications may be submitted at any time during the year with the understanding that applicants leave 8 months lead-time. However, limited funding for NSF's review process will probably require the imposition of target dates for next year's applications.

Restriction on Awards: Awards may not exceed 5 years (modal award is 3 years) and may not ordinarily be granted to foreign institutions.

Review Processes Employed: Peer panel review.

Contact Persons:

Anthropology	Steven Brush	202/357-7804
Linguistics	Paul Chapin	202/357-7696
Memory & Cognition	Joseph Young	202/357-9898
Psychobiology	Fred Stollnitz	202/357-7949
Sensory Physiology & Perception	William Yost	202/357-7428
Social & Developmental Psychology	Jean Intermaggio	202/357-9485

Attachment 1

THE TIMES HIGHER EDUCATION SUPPLEMENT 18.2.83

Godelier brings a soupçon of French intellect to Cambridge

It was to have been a fairly private affair: a few Cambridge friends, a few old comrades, a handful of admirers, intellectual rivals and students. Maurice Godelier, French socialist and Marxist anthropologist, was to speak on the May 1981 election in France and the Marxist Socialist imagination and give some personal views on the Mitterrand government. His was the opening seminar of a series on "The French experiment" held at King's College, Cambridge.

By the time the meeting opened, rows of extra chairs had been put out and more than 100 were present. Such is the drawing power of Godelier, as both intellectual and director of the social sciences division of the Centre Nationale de Récherche Scientifique, the Paris-based equivalent of the five British research councils rolled into one.

He is not a member of the Socialist Party, but he has known Jean-Pierre Chevènement, minister for research and industry, for years. He now finds himself in the unusual position for a man of the left with very real power and considerable funds to hand out.

It is simply inconceivable that a man like Godelier might wield such power in Britain. The equivalent might be Ralph Miliband, former professor of politics at Leeds University, the chairman designate of the Social Science Research Council. But even a government headed by Michael Foot, the Labour leader, would baulk at selecting a man so anti-establishment.

In a characteristic and symbolic gesture he moved his chair off the podium to the same level as his audience before launching into a wide-ranging talk on the power intellectuals enjoy in France; the crisis of Marxist thought; the role of the Communist Party and the state; and the "really big change" in French society that occurred in 1981.

Godelier is an engaging man with identifiable French style. He is attentive to detail, modest of his own reputation and is gently and agreeably moving into middle age. But he is still eager and excited about the prospect of wrenching French social science research from the direction it has been stuck in for the past 20 years of Gaullist power and giving it more money at last. British social scientists can only glance enviously across the Channel.

Controversy over his appointment last year thrust him back into the limelight, when the director general and president both resigned. His report on the state of social science – suffering from political neglect, financial undernourishment, and an overall lack of democracy – has kept him in the public glare.

The report presented to Chevènement last October detailed the steady decline in support for the social sciences, a 26 per cent fall in state funding from 1976 to 1981. Why? The report says there was a determined effort to contain the "subversive" ideas of 1968. The *ancien regime* made a strong effort to "neutralize" social sciences, culminating in huge cuts in 1980, it adds.

The report was a massive effort, running to two volumes of 560 and 211 pages. It makes a fascinating document for study, containing detailed surveys of the different subject areas. It was based on widespread consultations with academics, civil servants, trade unionists and other community representatives. It involved 17 researchers sending 8,000 questionnaires, receiving 2,000 replies, holding two meetings a week for five months, and circulating all drafts for comment.

"We now have an idea of what is thought important in the French intellectual structure," Godelier said. The problem was that social science in particular had been ghettoized, and what he now planned was a "new dialogue" between science, government and society.

"The heart of the people was broken", he said, referring to the cuts. "You are pushed by the state into a ghetto from the outside, and you add to it yourself from the inside." Social scientists had been viewed as subversive and sociologists with beards seen as damaging the university tradition. "That is just not true. I want to turn the page of 1968," he said.

How will the new dialogue work? He gave as an example a new type of research contract between the CNRS and private companies, such as Renault, to study how society really worked. Godelier thought firms would cooperate because they wanted to improve quality and this was done by knowing about the culture and life of the people. Unions would cooperate because they wanted to know what motivated people beyond the world of private and personal interest. Fruitful discussions have already started with the French equivalent of the Confederation of British Industry.

Godelier did not want to be drawn on the differing prospects for social science on either side of the Channel. He would only say that the prospects in France were brighter. His report criticized the fallacy of seeing an opposition between fundamental and applied work, a debate so much in evidence in Britain during the past 18 months. "We do not want to tell people what to do. We will add new money and suggest new directions," he said. He particularly wants to encourage women's studies, which he feels is an area in which France has lagged behind both the United States and Britain.

He pinpointed a simple contradiction in the debate over whether social sciences were indeed "sciences". He agreed that social scientists were often accused of "loose" methodology. "You must reply you cannot put society into machines or study it in a laboratory," he said. But when social scientists set out to collect social data and run fieldwork exercises these same people would turn round and say it cost too much, and should not be done, he added.

Godelier built his reputation as a Marxist anthropologist by challenging the strict evolutionary model favoured by Soviet anthropologists. He was influential in the French group in the 1970s which worked round the structuralist ideas of Lévi-Strauss. He has made a number of trips to Papua New Guinea, studying social rituals of the inhabitants. Ironically on one trip he missed, the 1968 May Day demonstrations in Paris.

One idea Godelier discussed at the seminar was the current crisis faced by Marxism. Less and less accepted, it is always linked in popular thinking to Stalinism and the purges. He himself went to a Catholic school and became a Marxist at 18. At 48 he remains very much a Marxist. "I know I can read Marx without wasting my time. And I know tomorrow that I am not going to become an anti-Marxist, or transfer to Stalin."

Godelier wants to create a new environment. In his report he set himself talks in the social sciences. One element is his plan to launch a massive family survey of France comparable to the famous 1802 Napoleonic census. He wants to trace the genealogy of different groups in all the different regions in France back to the nineteenth century, highlighting socioeconomic relations, social mobility, relations between old and young, between men and women and so on.

Another element is his wish to promote links between French and British social scientists. He feels British academics are particularly good in anthropology, history, oriental studies, economics, education studies and archaeology. An exchange of studentships in already in force and a new Franco-British accord on collaborative research has just been finalized. This will involve teams in the two countries working on matching projects in areas such as poverty, defence studies, criminology, and mass communications.

Godelier is also keen to do something to promote British understanding and interest in French social science, and he has begun discussions on sponsoring a new social science library in London and perhaps a bookshop for French academic books. The seminars at King's have been backed by the French with a £1,500 grant to pay the travel costs of prominent academics. Michael Ignatieff, a fellow of King's and one of the organizers, explained at the start of the seminar that it was sometimes hard to persuade French academics to come to Britain to talk. They seemed to feel Britons had been left behind intellectually.

Godelier himself just published a new book on Papua New Guinea and he has another in the pipeline on the Marxist theory of transition from early society to capitalism. He is preparing another, but that is secret. "You see everyone knows then that I am not just some bureaucrat," he said.

Les Sciences de L'Homme et de la Societé en France, by Maurice Godelier, from La Documentation Francaise, Paris 1982.

Paul Flather