



COSSA Washington Update

Consortium of Social
Science Associations

February 27, 2005

Volume 24, Issue 3

BUSH ADMINISTRATION RELEASES AUSTERE BUDGET

In order to meet his goal of continuing “pro-growth economic policies and enforce even greater spending restraint across the Federal government,” President Bush has proposed an FY 2006 Federal budget that is “lean” and “austere,” particularly with respect to non-security related discretionary spending.

The \$2.6 trillion budget does not include further funding for the American military contribution to building democracy in Iraq and Afghanistan, expected to cost at least \$80 billion more in FY 2005. The Administration estimates that the Federal deficit will remain \$427 billion in the 2005 fiscal year. The Administration suggests that its budget proposals will reduce the deficit to \$390 billion in FY 2006 with continuing reductions in the following years, so that by FY 2010, it will decline to \$227 billion, only 1.3 percent of the Gross Domestic Product.

To accomplish this, the FY 2006 budget reduces non-security discretionary spending by about one percent and holds the growth in overall discretionary spending, including defense and homeland security to below the rate of inflation (an estimated 2.5 percent). The budget, according to the President, also proposes to meet the “fiscal challenges...created by the long-term unfunded promises of our entitlement programs.” The Administration proposes net reductions in mandatory spending, with Medicaid and farm subsidies taking big hits.

(Continued on Next Page)

DAVID LIGHTFOOT TO LEAD SBE AT NSF

Arden Bement, director of the National Science Foundation (NSF), has announced that David Lightfoot will become the next Assistant Director (AD) for the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate (SBE). Lightfoot is currently the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and Professor of Linguistics at Georgetown University.

He replaces Norman Bradburn, who left NSF in March 2004 to return to the National Opinion Research Center. Wanda Ward has served as Acting AD for SBE since then.

(Continued on Page 3)

Inside UPDATE...

- **DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE DISCUSSED AT LAW SCHOOLS MEETING**
- **UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND NAMED NEWEST HOMELAND SECURITY CENTER OF EXCELLENCE**
- **MORE RESEARCH NECESSARY ON LINKS BETWEEN PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT**



BUDGET (Continued from Page 1)

What follows are preliminary looks at the proposed FY 2006 budget. COSSA will analyze it in more detail and produce its annual budget issue of the COSSA Washington UPDATE, which will be published on March 7.

National Science Foundation (NSF)

The proposed NSF budget is \$5.6 billion, an increase of \$132 million or 2.4 percent over FY 2005. Director Arden Bement noted that “this modest increase allows us to assume some new responsibilities, meet our ongoing commitments, and employ more staff – with little room for growth in research and education programs.” One of the new commitments involves a transfer of \$48 million from the Coast Guard for icebreakers to help with NSF’s South Pole investment.

The Foundation is concerned with its decreasing success rate, once 30-33 percent and now averaging about 20 percent. How to increase this in a constrained budget environment is a challenge, Bement noted, especially while still maintaining the increased size and duration of awards.

The Research and Related Activities account would receive \$4.33 billion from this budget proposal, up from \$4.22 billion in FY 2005. The \$112 million, or close to three percent boost, includes the funds from the Coast Guard for the Office of Polar Programs. Without these funds, the increase is reduced to \$64 million.

The budget proposes \$198.8 million for the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) Directorate. After a significant \$12.6 million increase between FY 2004 and FY 2005, the proposed increase for next year is only one percent. One possible strategy for SBE is to leverage funds from other directorates, and there is hope that the shared cyber-infrastructure program will allow SBE to provide grants to improve research tools in the SBE sciences.

The Human and Social Dynamics (HSD) priority remains intact and will see its funding increased from \$30 million in FY 2004 to \$38.3 million in FY 2005, with \$39.5 million proposed in FY 2006. With almost 40 percent of HSD proposals in the FY 2004 competition coming from non-SBE directorates such as Biology, Engineering, and Computer

Sciences, the SBE share of these funds is \$21.6 million in FY 2004, \$30.9 million in FY 2005, and a proposed \$31.4 million in FY 2006.

NSF proposes to reduce funding for the Education and Human Resources Directorate from \$841 million to \$747 million. The Administration is trying to shift responsibility from NSF to the Department of Education, especially for K-12 programs. One consequence is that NSF will reduce its commitment to the Interagency Education Research Initiative.

National Institutes of Health

With only one week on the job, newly appointed Secretary Mike Leavitt explained that the Department of Health and Human Services “made some tough choices” and “focused money on the most urgent priorities that will make the biggest difference in the health and well-being of Americans” in its budget. For the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the Administration requests \$28.8 billion, a \$196 million or 0.7 percent increase over the FY 2005 funding level. The bulk of the increase, \$56 million, is for NIH biodefense efforts. With only small gains for NIH in this year’s budget proposal, it is clear that the era of doubling NIH’s funding is over.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

For the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the FY 2006 budget requests a total program level of \$7.5 billion, a net decrease of \$491 million from the FY 2005 level. CDC’s total funding also includes \$1.6 billion in Vaccines for Children (VFC) funding and \$265 million in Public Health Service evaluation transfers. The budget request provides programmatic increases of \$339 million, which consists of expanded funding for influenza vaccines, global disease detection efforts, the Strategic National Stockpile, and improvements in childhood immunizations. These increases are offset by completed facility construction projects, one-time projects, reductions on overlapping programs within the CDC, internal management efficiencies, and one-time costs in the VFC program.

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

The FY 2006 request provides \$319 million for the Agency for Healthcare Quality and Research (AHRQ), the same as FY 2005. Continued efforts to improve patient safety through the implementation of information technologies and new comparative effectiveness research anticipated by the Medicare

Prescription Drug Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003, comprise the agency's priority activities for FY 2006. As a result, AHRQ will invest \$162 million of the total funding level in research and dissemination activities in prevention, and pharmaceutical outcomes, informatics, and other areas to support the quality and cost effectiveness of health care.

Agriculture

The FY 2006 budget proposes a reallocation of research formula funds that have previously been made available to eligible institutions under the Hatch Act as part of a proposed two-year phase out of these programs. Hatch Act funds would be reduced from \$179 million to \$80 million. Instead, the Administration wants to use some of the saved funds to support competitive funding through the National Research Initiative (NRI) and a newly created \$75 million regional, State, and local competitive grants program conducted through the State Agricultural Experiment Stations. NRI will increase from \$180 million in FY 2004 to a proposed \$250 million in FY 2006. Furthermore, the Administration proposes to remove the congressionally-imposed cap on indirect costs. How this will play in a Congress accustomed to protecting local agricultural interests, including its Land-Grant universities, should be interesting.

The Economic Research Service would go from \$74 million in FY 2005 to \$81 million next year. The National Agricultural Statistical Service increases from \$128 million to a proposed \$145 million, with \$7 million of the increase set aside for Census of Agriculture costs.

Education

Once again, the Administration is trying to eliminate a number of the small grant programs that the Department of Education has supported for many years. During previous attempts, Congressional sponsors of these programs have succeeded in thwarting such Executive Branch initiatives.

The Institute for Education Sciences will have steady budgets from FY 2005 to FY 2006 (\$164 million for research, evaluation and dissemination; \$90 million for statistics) with the exception of its assessment programs. The Administration is proposing to extend the National Assessment of Educational Progress testing to 12th graders 2007, as part of making high schools more accountable under No Child Left Behind.

The Administration proposes to continue level funding for the International education and foreign language programs (\$106.8 million) as well as the Javits Fellowship program (\$9.8 million) in FY 2006.

Justice

The Administration proposes approximately \$77 million for research, development and evaluation at the National Institute of Justice, which includes transfers from other accounts, and \$63 million for the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), up from \$34 million in FY 2005. Both of these accounts now include funds for management and administrative costs previously found elsewhere in the budget. Part of the BJS increase stems from the proposed resurrection of the Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring program (ADAM), formerly in the National Institute of Justice, now called the Felony Arrest Drug Abuse Reporting Program.

Census

The proposed budget provides \$897 million to the Census Bureau for FY 2006, \$132 million more than in FY 2005. Of this, \$657 million would go for periodic censuses and programs, with \$467 million slated for further preparation for the 2010 decennial census. Within this number, funds are included for continuation of the American Community Survey and for revisions of the Master Address File/Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (MAF-TIGER) system. In addition, the budget provides \$240 million for the Salaries and Expenses account.

Congress will now scrutinize the President's proposals. Once again, the Administration seeks to restrain legislators from earmarking or deviating from the President's priorities. Such an austere budget will exacerbate partisan wrangling over certain programs, and may even make some in the President's party think twice about reductions or eliminations. Congress always puts its stamp on any budget and this year the President has laid down a difficult challenge for legislative reaction. Stay tuned!

LIGHTFOOT (Continued from Page 1)

Prior to his post at Georgetown, Lightfoot served as Chair of the Department of Linguistics at the University of Maryland, College Park. He has also taught at the University of Michigan, McGill University, and the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands.

He has published eight books, including: *The Language Organ: Linguistics as Cognitive Physiology* (with Stephen Anderson); *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change* (edited); *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change and Evolution*; and *The Language Lottery: Toward a Biology of Grammars*. Lightfoot has been asked by Cambridge University Press to edit the four-volume Cambridge Survey of Linguistics. In addition, he is the author of more than 60 articles and book chapters.

Early in 2004 at the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Annual Meeting in Seattle, Lightfoot presented his latest research, conducted with his Georgetown colleague Raffaella Zanuttini, on how many languages there are.

Lightfoot has held a Fulbright Scholarship, fellowships from the Ford Foundation and the American Council of Learned Societies, and received a number of NSF research grants.

He earned his B.A. from the University of London, King's College, and his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Michigan. He is expected to begin his NSF tenure in June.

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE DISCUSSED AT LAW SCHOOLS MEETING

In early January, on the day following Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger's State of the State message in which he told the legislature that if they didn't pass his agenda, he would take his case directly to the people through California's initiative and referendum processes, a workshop on *Democratic Governance* took place at the Association of American Law Schools annual meeting in San Francisco. Other experiences from the recent election were also fresh on people's minds.

The sessions focused on the structure of representation, the tools and theories of popular democracy, and building democratic systems abroad.

Representation

One major complaint in recent congressional elections has been the lack of competitive districts. The blame is placed squarely on the practice of gerrymandering district boundaries for partisan advantage. One of Governor Schwarzenegger's

reform proposals called for a new redistricting of the California legislature by a panel of retired judges.

Bruce Cain, Director of the Institute for Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, addressed the gerrymandering problem. He explained that views of this practice have changed over time. The *Baker v. Carr* Supreme Court decision in 1962 eliminated the gerrymandering that occurred because of disparities in district populations. "One man, one vote," became the law of the land. Later, the Voting Rights Act used racial gerrymandering to create majority-minority districts to increase the numbers of African Americans and Hispanics in Congress. Following the 2000 Census, the most egregious cases of gerrymandering involved the bipartisan protection of incumbents. Cain took a skeptical view of the proposal that commissions of judges or computer-drawn boundaries would make a great deal of difference. The tendency to maintain a "community of interests" in drawing legislative boundaries will continue to lead to less competitive districts, he argued.

In 2007, the Voting Rights Act, which has transformed American politics, will be up for reauthorization. Richard Pildes of New York University argued that policymakers must recognize that "things have changed," and that the Administration and Congress should carefully examine whether an extension of the Act is necessary. According to Pildes, a robust two-party competition in the South, a substantial contingent of Southern Black office holders, and the willingness of white voters to vote for Black congressional candidates are all part of these altered circumstances. He also referred to the Supreme Court decision in *Georgia v. Ashcroft*, which upheld Georgia's recent redistricting that moved away from creating safe seats for minorities.

Carol Swain of Vanderbilt University picked up the theme of ending group representation. She declared that African Americans and Hispanics need to embrace coalitional, rather than identity politics. These coalitions should go beyond race and beyond the Democratic party to embrace new allies for promoting agendas that would help minorities. One reason for this, she argued, is because African Americans have reached their limit of majority-minority districts.

Daniel Ortiz of the University of Virginia noted that there is a "paradox of mass democracy." Normative theory during the infancy of the United States posited that there would be a high degree of participation in the democratic process and that people would think deeply about their political decisions. However, the founding

fathers felt the need to erect constitutional safeguards to protect against the “natural thoughtlessness of people.” Today, Ortiz argued, we have moved to a place where mass democracy is a “consumption activity,” where various agents are producers and voters are consumers. Elections, he asserted, have become like baseball arbitration, where “the last best offer” is voted upon.

Popular Democracy

Elizabeth Garrett of the University of Southern California discussed the recall as an instrument of popular democracy, particularly its recent use to unseat Gray Davis and elect Schwarzenegger in California. She called this recall “historic,” although recalls have been a significant factor in local politics for years. A number of elements came together in 2004, notably Davis’s unpopularity and inefficacy, the substantial infusion of money for the collection of recall signatures, and the peculiarities of California’s system – low number of signatures required (12 percent of voters in the last gubernatorial election), the process of voting for a replacement at the same time as the recall, and the no-runoff provision. Garrett suggested these last three should be changed, but she asserted that what she called “hybrid democracy” (some representative democracy elements and some popular democracy elements), worked well.

Peter Schrag, a journalist with the Sacramento Bee, discussed how the initiative process, where it existed, had now become an integral part of a politician’s governing apparatus. California had been one of the earliest states to adopt it as part of the Progressive Movement in the early 20th Century. He noted that the most notorious recent use of the initiative process, Proposition 13 limiting property taxes in California, had engendered significant restrictions on representative democracy at the local level. After Proposition 13, there came a cycle of ballot measures from both liberals and conservatives that have made governing California extremely difficult, particularly those that earmarked large portions of the state’s budget.

Can judges thwart the popular will of the people by invalidating initiatives? Jane Schacter of the University of Wisconsin reported that lawsuits invalidate almost 50 percent of some part of initiatives. Critics of initiatives point to the guarantee of a “republican form of government” in the Constitution, not a popular democracy. Although the initiatives are sometimes portrayed as unfettered

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND NAMED NEWEST HOMELAND SECURITY CENTER OF EXCELLENCE

This month, the Department of Homeland Security named the University of Maryland its newest Homeland Security Center of Excellence for Behavioral and Social Research on Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism. The Department announced that it anticipates giving UMD and its partner institutions over \$12 million in the next three years to address topics such as: the psychological impact of terrorism on society, public preparedness, public response and resilience to threats, the motivation and intent of terrorists, and effective tools and strategies for counteracting terrorists. As Under Secretary for Science and Technology Charles McQueary stated, “This Center’s analysis of behavioral and social aspects of terrorism and counter-terrorism reflects a long-term commitment to a stronger and safer America.” Professor Gary LaFree of Maryland’s Criminology and Criminal Justice Department will head up the Center.

majoritarianism, Schacter suggested those who condemn the process are unwilling to accept that representatives and voters may not be all that different.

In reflecting upon the issue of popular democracy, Philip Chase Bobbitt of the University of Texas brought up the notion that Madisonian democracy in the U.S. has gone through three phases. First, there was the “state-nation” phase, in which constitutional order was paramount and safeguarding the state from the mob was an imperative. This gave way to the “nation-state” phase, in which the representative reflected the people’s judgment and participatory democracy was important. Now, according to Bobbitt, we have moved on to a new constitutional order he calls the “market-state.” Here, everyone maximizes opportunity, private priorities take precedence over the public good, and we have a “consumerist” approach to politics. There is a great reluctance to delegate decision-making authority, he concluded.

Building Democratic Systems Abroad

With the upcoming elections in Iraq as backdrop, a number of scholars looked at how democratic systems take hold in previously undemocratic countries. Noah

Feldman of New York University addressed the situations in Afghanistan and Iraq directly. He noted the ubiquity of democratic system export over the years, and suggested that sometimes, producing democracy involves undemocratic means. In Afghanistan, there was little expectation of democracy, which Feldman attributed to the lack of satellite TV. There was very little opposition to the imposed constitutional presidency of Hamid Karzai. The contrast with the situation in Iraq is stark, according to Feldman. There, you have a quandary between imposition of democracy and self-determination. The willingness of Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani to embrace the elections is useful, but Feldman wonders how the Shia Islamic democrats can guarantee non-exploitation of minorities. Feldman believes the best solution lies in a rational compromise at the elite level.

Heinz Klug of the University of Wisconsin, who was an adviser to the African National Congress during the transition to democracy in South Africa, reminded the audience that although we now think that this transition occurred smoothly, it did not. A number of stages – negotiations, an interim constitution, elections, a constituent assembly, and then a permanent constitution – were necessary. Even then the transition was a violent period, a “bloody birth” according to Klug. The key, he argued, was that the parties to the conflict could “imagine a future together.”

Finally, Michael Doyle of Columbia University examined international enforcement through the years. He noted three models: imperialism, occupation, and peacekeeping. The occupation model can lead to complete defeat or can achieve success. The latter is more likely if there is a progressive strategy, an assured departure date, and good preparation such as the styles of occupation that the U.S. used as early as 1943 for occupying Germany and Japan. However, Doyle suggested that this is not happening in Iraq. For international peacekeeping to succeed, it needs the consent of the parties and is best done in humanitarian rescue emergencies. It has not worked so well in the 119 civil wars in recent history, Doyle concluded.

MORE RESEARCH NECESSARY ON LINKS BETWEEN PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

One day prior to the federal government’s release of its new dietary guidelines for Americans to promote health and reduce risk of chronic diseases through nutrition and increased physical activity, a National

Academies report called for additional research to explore the links between physical activity and the built environment. The report, *Does the Built Environment Influence Physical Activity? Examining the Evidence*, explained that research increasingly shows a link between physical activity and the “built” environment – buildings, roads, parks, and other structures that physically define a community.

Conducted by the Transportation Research Board and the Institute of Medicine, the study was requested by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to examine the role of the built environment as an important potential contributor in reducing levels of physical activity in Americans. Led by Susan Hanson, the Landry University Professor of Geography at Clark University as well as a former COSSA board member, and Bobbie Berkowitz, Professor of Psychosocial and Community Health at the University of Washington, the committee’s charge was: to review what is known about these relationships, including the strength and magnitude of any causal connections; draw implications for policy; and recommend priorities for future research.

For the purpose of the study, physical activity is categorized into four types – leisure time or recreational, transportation, household, and occupational. The committee noted that its interest was in “the effect of the built environment on overall physical activity because total daily physical activity levels are what matter from a public health perspective.”

The committee’s findings included:

- Physical activity levels have declined sharply over the last half-century due to the reduced physical demands of work, household management, travel, as well as increased sedentary uses of free time.
- The built environment can facilitate or constrain physical activity.
- The relationship between the built environment and physical activity is complex and operates through many mediating factors, such as sociodemographic characteristics, personal and cultural variables, safety and security, and time allocation. Individual behavior is also influenced by the social and physical environment. For example, the social disorder and deteriorated physical condition of poor inner-city neighborhoods deter physical activity for many residents.
- The available empirical evidence shows an association between the built environment and physical activity. However, few studies capable of demonstrating a causal relationship have been conducted, and evidence supporting such a relationship is currently sparse. In addition, the

characteristics of the built environment most closely associated with physical activity remain to be determined.

- Weaknesses of the current literature include the lack of a sound theoretical framework, inadequate research designs, and incomplete data.
- The built environment in place today has been shaped by longstanding policies and the practices of many decision-makers (e.g., policymakers, elected officials planners, developers, traffic engineers).

Recommendations

The committee emphasized that “research on the relationship between the built environment and physical activity is at a pivotal stage.” It also noted that: the number of investigators and studies is growing rapidly; interdisciplinary approaches are being encouraged; and technologies such as geographic information and global positioning systems, pedometers, and accelerometers are now available to provide and link more objective and detailed measures of both the built environment and physical activity. The committee further recognized that policy prescriptions require a better understanding of causal connections than currently exists, as well as a better grasp on the strength of these connections and their impact on population subgroups. Accordingly, the committee made several recommendations:

1. A continuing and well-supported research effort in this area, which Congress should support in its authorization of research funding for health, physical activity, transportation, planning, and other related areas. Priorities for research include:
 - Interdisciplinary approaches and international collaboration, bringing together the expertise of the public health, physical activity, urban planning, and transportation research communities.
 - More complete conceptual models that provide the basis for formulating testable hypotheses, suggesting variables and relationships for analysis, and helping interpreting results.
 - Better research designs, particularly longitudinal studies that can begin to address causality issues, as well as designs that control more adequately for self-selection bias.
 - More detailed examination and matching of specific characteristics of the built environment with different types of physical activity to assess the strength of the relationship and the proportion of affected population subgroups.
2. Expanding national public health and travel surveys to provide more detailed information about the location of physical activity and travel.
3. Developing interdisciplinary training and education programs to prepare practitioners with appropriate skills at the intersection of physical activity, public health, transportation, and urban planning.
4. Facilitating access to, enhancing the attractiveness of, and ensuring the safety and security of places where people can be physically active.

The committee commissioned seven papers to explore various aspects of the relationships among land use, transportation, and physical activity.

Copies of the report and the papers will be available in the early spring from the TRB Business office; (202) 334-3213 or at <http://gulliver.trb.org/news>.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS (COSSA)

Executive Director: Howard J. Silver
Dep. Dir. Health Policy: Angela L. Sharpe
Public Affairs: Tracey S. Lesetar
Gov't Relations: Julie A. Egermayer
President: Myron Gutmann

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), an advocacy organization for Federal support for the social and behavioral sciences, was founded in 1981 and stands alone in Washington in representing the full range of social and behavioral sciences.

Update is published 22 times per year. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$80; institutional subscriptions - \$160; overseas mail - \$160. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA:

1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 842-3525
Fax: (202) 842-2788

www.cossa.org