
CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume IV, Number 2
January 25, 1985

This Week . . .

Reagan to Name Economist to High NSF Post
OMB Reduces Number of NIH Grants to be Awarded in FY 1985
Peace and Security Studies: The Private Sector Forges Ahead
Director of NEH Named Secretary of Education
Sources of Research Support: Department of Health and Human Services

* * *

REAGAN TO NAME ECONOMIST TO HIGH NSF POST

The President intends to nominate John H. Moore, an economist, to the position of Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation. Moore is a Senior Fellow and has recently been Acting Deputy Director of the Hoover Institution. He is a comparative economist, has written on the workings of the market economic system and the Soviet and Yugoslav systems.

Moore currently serves on the National Science Board (NSB), the governing body of the Foundation, in a six-year appointment that runs until 1988. The deputy directorship and the NSB appointments are all subject to Senate consent.

News of Moore's impending appointment, as first published in The Chronicle of Higher Education of January 23, 1985, has caused some grumbling among physical and biological scientists who represent the academic community in Washington. Erich Bloch, the Director of the Foundation, is an electrical engineer by background; neither he nor Moore comes immediately out of an academic (i.e., departmental) milieu. However, as an IBM Vice President, Mr. Bloch was responsible for IBM's relations with the science and engineering community, including the university world; and Hoover is, of course, an archival and scholarly center closely tied to Stanford University.

COSSA Washington Update is published 20-24 times per year, normally biweekly, by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1200 Seventeenth Street, NW, Suite 520, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202/887-6166). Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$25.00; institutional subscriptions, \$90.00; overseas airmail, \$40.00. ISSN 0749-4394 COSSA Members, Affiliates, and Contributors are listed on the back.

Risa I. Palm, *President*

David Jenness, *Executive Director*

The natural scientists' concern reflects also the fact that the top managers of the NSF preside over a large 'hard science' basic research funding system, far larger than that devoted by the NSF to the social and economic sciences. The reasoning is that a natural scientist should hold one of the top positions. But another social-behavioral scientist, Richard C. Atkinson, an experimental psychologist with a specialty in mathematical learning theory, served as Deputy Director of the Foundation in 1976-1977. He then moved up, serving with distinction as Director from 1977 to 1980.

Some social scientists have reacted to the news with caution, pleased by an economist's being named to a policy-setting position in the Foundation but expressing some anxiety over what the Chronicle calls the apparent 'Hooverization' of the NSF. A recent appointee to the NSB, Annelise Anderson, is also from Hoover (see Update, October 26, 1984). A recent book published by Hoover, To Promote Prosperity: U. S. Domestic Policy in the Mid-1980s, edited by Moore, is a programmatic volume that generally (though not exclusively) presents conservative economic viewpoints.

Essentially, the Deputy Director of NSF is a policy and administrative officer, without direct supervision of any of the Foundation's specific scientific areas. The Assistant Directors who head the various scientific directorates (and are also Presidential appointees) are typically working scientists from the basic research community.

OMB REDUCES NUMBER OF NIH GRANTS TO BE AWARDED IN FY 1985

As the administration prepares to send its Fiscal Year 1986 budget to Congress, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has notified the various National Institutes of Health (NIH) that Congress' FY85 appropriations to the NIH will be honored -- but not in the way NIH agency officials had expected.

When the FY85 budget was completed by Congress in October 1984, the Institutes received substantially more funds than the President had requested. For example, two Institutes that are important sources of grants to social and behavioral scientists -- the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the National Institute on Aging -- received increases for research (or research and research training) of 18% and 28%, respectively, over actual FY84 levels, and 16% and 23% over the President's initial FY85 proposal. That has been the pattern in all years since 1981, and the White House has been unhappy about it.

Now the OMB has instructed the NIH agencies as a group to commit the FY85 amount, but to 'forward fund' a substantial number of grants for up to three years, thus spreading much of the research money into future years. The working instructions are for the NIH in toto to reduce the number of extramural grants from about 6500 to 5000 by this means. Thus there will

be substantially fewer 'new starts' among competitive grant applications. Even more troublesome, from the point of view of agency managers, is the possibility that a stretch-out will become a scale-down: with millions of dollars of grant funds allocated into FY87 and FY88, the administration may propose nominally level funding for the agencies in those years -- but then release only the sum that was not 'forward-funded.'

Agency officials are concerned that there will be a long-range depressing influence on young researchers or first-time grant recipients. In recent years, faced with major research fund cuts in the NIH, the National Science Foundation, and elsewhere, university-based researchers have overreacted to the bad news, and submitted fewer solid proposals than could in fact have been funded. A decline in good proposals is what program administrators fear most, since it suggests to top agency officials and the OMB that a scientific field is quiescent, and not in need of grants.

A decline in proposals and new starts also tends to justify a reduction in agency personnel in the extramural grants programs. This has an exacerbating effect: agency officials can no longer respond to inquiries, help shape pre-proposals to meet or reflect agency priorities, and organize new scientific initiatives and calls for proposals. At the National Institute on Aging (NIA), for example, the Behavioral Sciences Research Program had been promised funds to hire a biopsychologist to survey new biobehavioral research opportunities and help shape the program's emphases. That position has now been de-funded. About 15 full-time-equivalent jobs in NIA will be lost in FY85; in NIH as a whole, about 400.

Ironically, multi-year commitment of research funds has long been attractive to university scientists, since it would allow more orderly prediction of personnel and funding patterns; encourage individual scientists to aim at solid or comprehensive, rather than dramatic short-term, results in their research; and somewhat reduce the burden of year-by-year progress reports and continuation-proposal writing. The problem, in principle, has been that such a procedure tends to hold back young researchers from winning support on their own, and interferes with the ability of program officers and advisory councils to cancel or delay continuation grants if the promised research is not proceeding on schedule and with good quality.

NIH agency program officials have told Update that proposals funded in the latter part of this (FY85) year will have to receive significantly better 'priority scores' (as established by peer review groups) than those funded already in the first grant cycles of the year. This does not mean that proposals already funded were undeserving, but it makes the review process inequitable. It is still essential that proposals be submitted, and that the research community make known its disappointment with the OMB directives. The administration's move appears to be legal, in that appropriated FY85 funds will indeed be committed in FY85. Congress, however, may take a dim view of the action, which is presumably a violation of congressional intent: OMB's

procedures are a logical way of moving toward a deficit-reducing 'freeze,' but at the administration's preferred level. This move may affect the FY86 budget process; Congress could start specifying the number of grants to be paid, the number of 'new starts,' and other parameters. The Update will follow this story in future months and communicate in concrete terms the costs to research of OMB's directive.

PEACE AND SECURITY STUDIES: THE PRIVATE SECTOR FORGES AHEAD

The President has notified Congress of his intention to defer spending start-up funds for the new U.S. Institute of Peace -- \$4 million appropriated by Congress for FY 1985. The announcement was contained in the Federal Register of January 10, 1985. Under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 the President may ask for postponements on spending appropriated funds. A deferral can be overridden if either the House or the Senate passes a resolution disapproving such an action.

Under the law passed by Congress in the last session, the President was required to nominate a Board of Directors, including academics and public figures, by April 20, 1985, but there has been some doubt whether the administration would proceed on schedule. (See Update, December 21, 1984.)

According to those active in the National Peace Academy campaign, which lobbied Congress for creation of the Institute, the White House continues to have concerns about political posturing by and security problems with Board members. Administration spokespersons have recently said that if 'technical redrafting' can be accomplished in Congress to deal with these and other concerns, the Institute for Peace could still get under way. At the least, there will be a considerable delay.

Meanwhile -- and coincidentally -- the field of peace studies and international security is receiving a very significant boost from major private foundations in the U.S. On January 25, the Chicago-based John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the second-largest U.S. foundation, announced a \$25 million commitment over an initial three-year period to grants to universities and other independent nongovernmental institutions in the U.S. and abroad. According to Jerome B. Wiesner, former MIT president and science advisor to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, "We must transform the field of international security so that it adequately reflects the impact of competing world economies, historical interactions, the dynamics of larger organizations, collective politics and individual psychology of strategic rivalry, and the uncharted consequences of unbalanced social development."

Ruth Adams, former editor of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, will serve as program officer for the new foundation initiative. She told Update that one of the intentions of the

new program is to help legitimate interdisciplinary and innovative work in universities, and to help synthesize and integrate all aspects of the international environment as they bear on nuclear arms control, conflict avoidance, and security systems.

Most of MacArthur's initial \$25 million has been committed to strengthening existing programs or encouraging institutional development at universities and research organizations with productive scholars and teachers already in place; to organizations that will be active in public education and policy debate; and to a competitive program of doctoral and postdoctoral fellowships to be administered by the Social Science Research Council (New York). Some \$6 million is currently uncommitted, allowing the Foundation to consider worthy projects not yet identified. Presumably these funds, together with opportunities for fellowships, will provide the chance for individuals from diverse backgrounds to propose new ideas and projects, as distinct from proposals for institutional development. According to Adams, MacArthur plans to make additional grants if the first set of commitments works out well.

It may take some time for social and behavioral scientists to focus their research on manageable aspects of peace, security, and conflict. As with most scholarly areas that are intrinsically interdisciplinary and that also have been associated with political controversy, social science research in this field has been scattered in recent years. Kenneth Prewitt, President of the SSRC, comments: "Since the advent of nuclear weapons, international peace and security studies have been shaped by foreign policy experts, physicists, engineers, and international relations specialists. Social science disciplines have made only marginal contributions." (Emphasis added.)

Fortunately, private support in this area promises to be long-term as well as large in size. The Carnegie Corporation of New York has been making major grants focused on avoiding nuclear war since mid-1983; that support is now running about \$5.5 million a year. Major investments have been made by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and philanthropist and ex-Ambassador Averell W. Harriman -- the last three of these focused primarily on the revival of Soviet studies in the U.S. A new program from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund is in the works, and the Ford Foundation continues to make grants in this field amounting to several million dollars a year. In recent years there has been close cooperation among foundations in organizing the field; in fact, most of the recent programs are built on directions and capacities developed in the 1970s by the Ford Foundation, under McGeorge Bundy. Bundy and David Hamburg, President of Carnegie, are among those who advised MacArthur on its new program.

Thus, funds for research from the U.S. Institute of Peace may not be crucial to the vitality of academic research in these fields. They may still, however, be uniquely valuable for their symbolic meaning, precisely because the Institute is a federally-funded enterprise.

DIRECTOR OF NEH NAMED SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

William J. Bennett, currently the Director of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), has been nominated by President Reagan to be the new Secretary of Education (ED). Bennett will replace Terrell H. Bell, who resigned following the election.

Bennett, who has a doctorate in philosophy as well as a law degree, has aroused controversy during his tenure at NEH as he moved to change the priorities of the Endowment. He has been critical of past NEH funding of what he considers "faddish" research, like ethnic and women's studies and other viewpoints that flirt with cultural relativism. Instead, Bennett has argued for a return to emphasizing the classics of Western civilization. In a report, "To Reclaim A Legacy," released by NEH last November, Bennett criticized the teaching of the humanities in our nation's colleges and universities and called for the development of a "core of common studies" for college graduates -- an idea that creates deep divisions among scholars of all disciplines.

Bennett will take over a Department the President still talks of abolishing. In announcing Bennett's appointment, the White House also directed him to conduct a thorough study of the Department and its responsibilities. A similar study three years ago led to the recommendation that the Department be downgraded from the Cabinet to an independent agency similar in structure and function to the National Science Foundation. That recommendation was never seriously considered by the Congress. A Department Task Force is already at work on the future of the federal role in educational research. Among the issues facing the Task Force is the future of the National Institute of Education.

Some in the research community are quite pleased with Bennett's selection, as they feel his background and commitment to scholarship will make him favorable towards research interests. Others claim that Bennett has not challenged Reagan administration policy during his tenure at NEH, particularly on Endowment budget levels and on a number of appointments to the NEH Advisory Council considered by some to be highly unqualified. Thus, there is some question as to whether Bennett can carve out the independent niche at ED that Secretary Bell seemed to have done following the release of the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, "A Nation at Risk." During the period of speculation on Bell's successor, Bennett submitted to a screening interview with the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank that has considered the creation of the Department an "abominable mistake." It is not known what promises, if any, Heritage received from Bennett, but it is widely rumored that current Undersecretary of Education Gary L. Jones, whom the conservatives considered not vigorous enough in carrying out their agenda in education policy, will be replaced.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

The National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI) are currently seeking research proposals in the area of smoking behavior. Because the deadline for the receipt of proposals is imminent, and because both agencies have indicated that the number of applications received to date is low, brief descriptions of both programs are provided below. Please contact the agency rather than COSSA for more information.

National Cancer Institute

The Smoking, Tobacco, and Cancer Program of the National Cancer Institute is interested in supporting studies in two areas: the long-term effect of interventions designed to prevent the onset and/or reduce the prevalence of cigarette smoking among women, and the effectiveness of interventions to prevent the onset and reduce the prevalence of smokeless tobacco use. Women and smoking intervention studies should include strategies for responding to social, cultural, psychological, and economic factors that differentially impinge upon women's lives and are likely to influence their smoking behavior. Smokeless tobacco studies should focus on the long-term effectiveness of interventions and provide information on the demographics of users and those at risk for use, patterns of use, influencing factors, and the relationship to use of other forms of tobacco.

Deadline: Prospective applicants should submit a one-page letter of intent by February 15. Formal applications are due March 15.

Contact: Dr. Gayle M. Boyd, Smoking, Tobacco and Cancer Program, National Cancer Institute, Blair Building, Room 425, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, MD 20205; 301/427-8620.

National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute

The NHLBI has approximately \$8 million available to fund behavioral science research through three programs: smoking cessation in patients with cardiovascular disease; exercise, stress and atherosclerosis; and behavioral stress, neuroactive peptides, and cardiovascular disease.

Deadline: February 15

Contact: Dr. Steve Weiss, Chief of Behavioral Medicine, National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, 7550 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda, MD 20814; 301/496-9380.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

MEMBERS

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
 Linguistic Society of America

AFFILIATES

American Association for Public Opinion
 Research
 American Educational Research
 Association
 American Society of Criminology
 Association for Asian Studies
 Eastern Sociological Society
 Economic History Association
 Evaluation Network
 Evaluation Research Society
 History of Science Society
 International Studies Association
 Law and Society Association
 Midwest Sociological Society
 National Council on Family Relations
 National Council for the Social Studies

North Central Sociological Association
 Northeastern Anthropological Association
 Population Association of America
 Regional Science Association
 Rural Sociological Society
 Social Science History Association
 Society for American Archaeology
 Society for the History of Technology
 Society for Research in Child
 Development
 Society for the Scientific Study
 of Religion
 Society for Social Studies of Science
 Southwestern Social Science Association
 Speech Communication Association

CONTRIBUTORS

University of California, Berkeley
 University of California, Los Angeles
 University of California, Santa Barbara
 Carnegie-Mellon University
 Center for Advanced Study in the
 Behavioral Sciences
 Center for International Studies,
 Duke University
 University of Chicago
 University of Colorado
 Columbia University
 Cornell Institute for Social and
 Economic Research
 Cornell University
 Florida State University

Harvard University
 University of Illinois
 Indiana University
 Institute for Social Research,
 University of Michigan
 University of Iowa
 The Johns Hopkins University
 University of Michigan
 University of Missouri
 University of Nebraska
 New York University
 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
 Ohio State University
 University of Oregon
 University of Pennsylvania
 Pennsylvania State University
 University of Pittsburgh
 Princeton University
 Rutgers University
 Social Science Research Council
 University of Southern California
 Stanford University
 State University of New York at
 Stony Brook
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 Texas A & M University
 Tulane University
 University of Washington
 University of Wisconsin, Madison
 University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

1200 SEVENTEENTH STREET, N.W., SUITE 520, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036