JUSTIZ ASKED TO LEAVE: NIE'S FUTURE?

William Bennett, the new Secretary of Education (ED), has asked for the resignations of Manuel Justiz, the Director of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and Donald Senese, the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). These actions have further fueled speculation that the Administration is planning to abolish NIE and establish a centralized Office of Education Research and Statistics under a new Assistant Secretary. (Dr. Chester Finn of Vanderbilt University, a friend of Bennett's and former aide to Sen. Daniel Moynihan (D-NY), is rumored to be the choice for this post.)

Under the Department of Education's organization act the Secretary has the authority to abolish NIE without going to the Congress. The Institute has been criticized over the years by conservatives for research which supports liberal educational reforms and by liberals for recent attempts to use NIE for promoting a conservative educational agenda. Thus, its friends, particularly on Capitol Hill, are few. NIE's authorization expires this year (although it may be extended for one year without congressional action), and the House Select Education
Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Pat Williams (D-MT), has scheduled hearings on NIE for the end of March. The Senate Education Subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Robert Stafford (R-VT), has indicated that it has no plans to reauthorize NIE this year.

Justiz, whose two years as Director have been praised in some circles for bringing the Institute back from the disastrous tenure of Ed Curran (see below), also suffered from controversy over his overruling of a peer review panel in awarding a technology center to Harvard, and was reprimanded by former Secretary Bell for using airline mileage bonuses for private use. Some of his friends from New Mexico had pushed Justiz as a candidate to replace Bell.

As expected, Undersecretary Gary Jones has also resigned, thus allowing Bennett a chance to bring in his own team at ED to support him in his efforts to promote the President's education agenda.

FORMER NIE DIRECTOR LEADING CANDIDATE TO HEAD NEH

Edward A. Curran, former Director of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and currently Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, has become the leading candidate to become Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). The position became vacant when William Bennett resigned to become Secretary of Education. The Endowment funds a number of programs of interest to social scientists, particularly in history, political science, linguistics, and cultural anthropology.

Curran was fired as NIE Director by then Education Secretary Terrell Bell for writing a letter to the President, without informing Bell, that called for the abolition of NIE. Curran's NIE tenure was stormy as he tried to implement a conservative education research agenda over the objections of many in the education research community.

When Curran was appointed Director of NIE questions were raised about his qualifications to direct a research agency. Those same questions are being raised now. Before coming to NIE, Curran had been Headmaster of the Cathedral School for Girls, a private school in Washington, D.C. He has a B.A. from Yale and a Master's in teaching from Duke University. He would be the first Chairman of the NEH not to hold the Ph.D. Curran was also head of Professionals for Reagan-Bush in 1980.

Negative reaction in the humanities community to the rumored appointment, including the suggestion that Curran had "no background or understanding of research," has been sufficient to cause the White House to have second thoughts about the nomination. Apparently, President Reagan signed off on the appointment at the same time he signed off on Bennett's appointment to be Secretary of ED. However, White House Counsel Fred Fielding has not moved the appointment off his desk and
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sent it to the Senate where Curran would face confirmation hearings and a vote. A Senate staffer told Update that although Curran was "not very qualified" for the position, it would be difficult to block his appointment if it comes to a vote since Senators will generally defer to the President on nominations such as this one.

Other candidates suggested to be in the running, should Curran not make it, are Charles Ritcheson, university librarian at the University of Southern California and a historian, and Gertrude Himmelfarb, a professor of history at the Graduate School of the City University of New York.

NSF BUDGET SCRUTINIZED BY HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEES

The two subcommittees in the House responsible for the authorization and appropriation for the National Science Foundation (NSF) held hearings in late February on the FY 1986 NSF budget. That budget provides a 4.5% increase over FY 1985 levels in total funding for the Foundation, including a 19% increase for social and economic science research and a 6% increase for behavioral science research.

The Science, Research and Technology Subcommittee (Rep. Doug Walgren (D-PA), Chairman) authorizes spending amounts for the Foundation. At authorization hearings conducted on February 20 and 21, members of the Subcommittee were told by outside witnesses that this was a "good budget" and basically should be left alone. Members of the Subcommittee were concerned with the deferral of spending for science and engineering education (SE&E), the demise of the Ethics and Values in Science and Technology (EVIST) program (see p. 4) and the reduction for Policy Research and Analysis programs. NSF Director Erich Bloch strongly defended the budget decisions as necessary for an institution interested in preserving excellence in research during tight budgetary times. The Subcommittee intends to markup -- the process of actually approving the numbers and legislative language -- on March 26.

The HUD/Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Ed Boland (D-MA), sets the actual spending levels for the Foundation. This Subcommittee was very concerned with NSF's "foot dragging" on science and engineering education. It appears that NSF asked for $116 million for SE&E in its original FY 1986 budget submission to the Office of Management and Budget. The budget that was released scaled down that request to $51 million in new money and $31 million in carryover money from FY 1985. Chairman Boland made clear that the Subcommittee expects to increase the funding for SE&E in FY 1986. Since he has also indicated that the 4.5% increase in total funding for NSF in FY 1986 may not be justified in the face of massive cuts in social programs, it seems clear that if the SE&E budget is increased by the Subcommittee the money will be taken from other programs in the NSF budget. In the past
this Subcommittee has shifted funds from research to SE&E. COSSA suspects it may do so again this year.

Rep. Boland asked several questions concerning the large increase for social and economic science research, specifically in the economics and history and philosophy of science programs. He appeared satisfied with the justifications made by Dr. David Kingsbury, Director of the Biological, Behavioral and Social Science Directorate at NSF.

**LATE-BREAKING NEWS:** Developments in the Senate Budget Committee may impact on the NSF appropriations for FY 1986. The Committee, chaired by Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM), voted on March 5 to 'freeze' defense spending with only a 3.5% increase for inflation. On March 6 the Committee voted to 'freeze' the NSF budget at the FY 1985 level, with no growth for inflation. The Budget Committees prepare the budget resolution which usually serves as a binding guideline for both the authorizing and appropriating committees.

**CONTINUED COMMENT ON ETHICS AND VALUES RESEARCH**

The February 22, 1985 issue of Update contained a brief analysis of the implications of the proposed elimination in FY 1986 of the National Science Foundation's Program on Ethics and Values in Science and Technology (EVIST). Update commented that researchers in this field should be alert to the implication that such studies were 'not in the mainstream' of science, but that NSF's stated intention was to fund some studies in the area through other research programs.

Gerald Holton, a professor of physics at Harvard and a well-known historian and philosopher of science, has responded as follows.

"The EVIST program is relatively small ($1 million a year) and young (about 10 years old), but already it has triggered a long string of successful research results that have contributed to successful policy formation by industrial managers, legislators, and academic researchers. Such studies range from secrecy in science to privacy in the electronic age, from the question of the start of 'personhood' to the problem of heroic prolongation of life, from measures of the 'quality' of science to the role of technical expert witnesses before courts, Congress, and regulatory agencies. These are not concerns that will go away.

"Thanks to EVIST there has grown up a whole cadre of well-informed and interdisciplinarily competent researchers. This cadre will diminish quickly if industry and universities see the sudden discontinuation of research support from an agency with the prestige of NSF.

"This may also occur if the larger scientific-political world only perceives a downgrading of the status of the research.
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That happens inevitably when a program is dismantled: at best, the implication is that such research has found sufficient funding in the private sector. But apart from the fact that this is not demanded of, say, chemistry or history, the field of research on ethics and values in science is not yet sufficiently institutionalized in universities and elsewhere. There is clearly a growing community of researchers and citizens who want to see this field developed further. It indicates the ecumenical nature of the field that among authors who have been published in the leading quarterly, Science, Technology, and Human Values, are scientists, philosophers, industrialists, clergymen, and such legislators as Orrin Hatch and Doug Walgren.

"Thanks to EVIST support, there now exists a visible commitment to the development of a field that is concerned with the ethical and moral impacts of the nation's scientific and technical advances. The intellectual grounds are unassailable. The practical costs of inattention -- misuse and misunderstanding of science, 'clean-up' costs of technological misapplication -- are enormous. The sudden discontinuation of the NSF program may send out a signal that scientists or Congress are unconcerned about such matters. In my opinion, this is far from the truth."

OUTLOOK FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE IN GREAT BRITAIN, CANADA

The Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) of Great Britain, which received a 30% cut in real terms in its budget since 1979, is expecting basically level funding over the next few years. ESRC is scheduled to receive approximately £23 million ($24.5 million) in 1985-86.

Despite the recent cuts, the ESRC has been able to fund new centers in health economics and addiction, has begun a long-term program on the competitiveness of British industry, and will initiate a major study of crime and the criminal justice system this year. High priority will be given to the contribution of the social sciences to information technology, involving research in cognitive science and the use of information technology in education.

"Change in Contemporary Britain: Context, Adjustment and Management" is the theme on which the ESRC will focus its research program over the next five years. Sir Douglas Hague, Chairman of the ESRC, explained the focus:

The change theme is concerned with understanding what is wrong, what needs to be done and in what order and then facilitating adaptation in a country where traditions and instincts are settled to the point of inertia. For 20 years, a major problem of the social sciences in Britain has been the separation of academic disciplines. Many have doubted whether fusion is possible, over such a disparate range. Council believes it has found a theme which not only binds the social sciences together, but also links them directly to the most intractable problems facing the nation. (ESRC Newsletter, November, 1984)
The Council hopes to encourage research that will deal not only with internal factors influencing change, but also those pressures from outside Britain that are leading to change. Changing economic and social structures have had an impact on a variety of issues, ranging from unemployment to urban crime rates to marital and family patterns to the character of social stratification. Because the rate of change in the past few decades has been rapid, it has been difficult to assess the effects of earlier changes before new ones are imposed. Therefore, adaptation to change is a significant component of the ESRC program. Priority is already being given to the relations between social, economic and technical change, and also to changing urban and rural systems.

In line with a recent recommendation to the various British research councils, the ESRC has agreed to convert its Research Units into Designated Research Centers. The Centers are usually in universities and are supported by ESRC for up to eight years, by which time they are integrated into the universities. This will allow the ESRC to redeploy research funds after the eight-year period, as well as facilitating closer integration of the Research Institutes with the research activities of the universities.

* * *

The research funding situation in Canada is somewhat similar to that in the U.S. Although direct support of social science research has not been the target of budget cuts this year, programs in some agencies have been reduced or eliminated. Among these cuts are the elimination of the dairy research program; a reduction of $5.9 million (U.S.) in discretionary programs for the promotion of health, social security, and social welfare; and cancellation of the 1986 mid-decade Census, for a $71.5 million (U.S.) saving. Canadian social scientists are concerned that these cuts are only the first step in a detailed examination of government expenditures aimed at reducing the deficit. Cuts in social science funding over the past five years have left little "fat" in the enterprise. The cancellation of the 1986 Census will have a serious impact on social science research, creating a gap in data for many social scientists.

NIMH DIRECTOR MEETS WITH COSSA EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Dr. Shervert H. Frazier, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) since December, 1984, was the guest at a luncheon on March 4 which was attended by members of the COSSA Executive Committee and COSSA staff. Lee Dixon, Deputy Director of NIMH's Office of Policy Development, Planning and Evaluation, and Joyce Lazar, Chief of that Office's Bureau of Research Planning and Evaluation, accompanied Dr. Frazier. The discussion focused on the management and funding of social and behavioral research at NIMH.
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SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

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

Division of International Programs

The Division of International Programs (INT) in the Directorate for Scientific, Technological and International Affairs coordinates and supports U.S. scientific participation in international programs and activities that promise significant benefit to the U.S. science effort. Three types of activities may receive support: (1) cooperative research projects designed and conducted jointly by principal investigators from the U.S. and a foreign country; (2) research-oriented seminars or workshops to exchange information, review the current status of a specific field of science or engineering, and plan cooperative research; and (3) scientific visits for planning cooperative activities or for research. Bilateral cooperative science activities focus on countries generally categorized as industrial countries of Western Europe, East Asia, and Oceania; China and countries of Eastern Europe; and countries that are not well developed industrially.

FY 1985 Budget: $12.5 million

Funding Mechanisms: Grants

Review Process: Peer review

Disciplines Supported: In general any area of science or engineering supported by NSF can be supported by INT. In several programs NSF and its counterpart agency in the foreign country have agreed on program priorities that restrict which fields may be supported.

Restrictions on Awards: No restrictions

Deadlines: Proposals may be submitted at any time for projects in a number of countries, allowing six to nine months for processing. Programs involving other countries have varying deadlines.

Contact: Program Manager, (Specific Country of Interest)
Division of International Programs
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20550
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

CONTRIBUTORS
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

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