WALGREN SUPPORTS SOCIAL SCIENCE AT NSF AUTHORIZATION HEARINGS

Representative Doug Walgren (D-PA), Chairman, House Science, Research and Technology Subcommittee, supported research in the social and behavioral sciences during three days of hearings held by the Subcommittee in late February. The Subcommittee is responsible for writing a House authorization bill for the National Science Foundation (NSF).

On the first day of the hearings, NSF Director Erich Bloch and Roland Schmitt, Chairman of the National Science Board, the policy making body for NSF, delivered 26 pages of testimony without once mentioning the social and behavioral sciences. Rep. Walgren stated that he believed the Foundation should focus on the vitality that these disciplines contribute to the scientific enterprise and noted that their funding increases were not significant. Bloch suggested that the social and behavioral sciences had received significant increases, about $10 million, during the past five years, and that they had recovered from the "bad history" of 1981-82 when they were reduced substantially. What he neglected to mention was that almost all other disciplines supported by NSF have grown by much larger margins during this period.
Bloch noted, in response to a question prepared for the Subcommittee by COSSA, that the social and behavioral sciences will share some of the special emphasis funds for FY 1987, particularly the computational initiative. He also suggested that the kind of social and behavioral science research supported by NSF had changed dramatically in recent years toward the "right" content areas. One of the major efforts at NSF in these disciplines, according to Bloch, is to enhance the more efficient use of the major data bases -- National Election Study, Panel Study on Income Dynamics, and the General Social Survey -- whose collection NSF supports. Rep. Walgren also expressed interest in the participation of social scientists in the Engineering Research Centers (ERCs) established last year. Bloch noted that economists, human factors engineers, and artificial intelligence researchers are involved with the ERCs.

Representative Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY), the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee, asked Bloch about the impact of FY 1986 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings imposed reductions and the potential impact of large cuts in FY 1987. Bloch noted that the FY 1986 reduction of 4.3% did not lead to the elimination of any programs. However, large reductions in FY 1987 could mean the Foundation would need to "shed certain disciplines."

On day two, Robert Rosenzweig, President of the Association of American Universities, testified. As part of his testimony he said that he was "pleased to see that the social and behavioral science programs have reclaimed their appropriate place in the NSF research budget. The sharp reductions imposed just a few years ago are restored. This reflects an appropriate recognition of the potential contribution of research in these fields to our productivity and security." Rep. Walgren seemed disturbed that "restoring" the social and behavioral sciences to their 1980 levels was the best that can be said for them. He suggested the need to encourage added strength for these disciplines.

This view was strongly echoed in the testimony of Dr. David Hamburg, President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. He expressed concern "about the marginal attention given to the behavioral and social sciences" by NSF. He reiterated part of the message he had delivered at the COSSA Annual Meeting in December, calling for increased support for research in three areas -- the economy, conflict resolution, and health-behavior links.

On day three, Neil Smelser, Professor of Sociology at the University of California-Berkeley, testified. Smelser is also co-chair of the National Research Council's Committee on Basic Research in the Behavioral and Social Sciences, which is preparing a ten-year outlook on research opportunities and priorities in these disciplines. Smelser was concerned with the roller coaster budgets the social and behavioral sciences have
faced in the past seven years. The discontinuities and general
leaness of funding create what Thomas Juster called in 1983, "a
jolting downturn in the overall productiveness of the
enterprise." Commenting on the proposed FY 1987 budget, Smelser
pointed out the lack of financial leverage for new initiatives
in the social and behavioral sciences. He mentioned four
examples of what he had in mind: individual decision-making,
language, demographic change, and the history of science.

All outside (non-NSF) witnesses before the Subcommittee
chided NSF for the slight ($2 million) increase in funds for
science education in the FY 1987 budget. Some witnesses noted
with approval the continuation of NSF support for research in
ethics and values in science and technology -- an issue which
Bloch noted was "inscribed on my back" after his attempt to
abolish funding in last year's budget proposal.

In the first two weeks of March the appropriations
committees will hear Mr. Bloch justify the FY 1987 NSF budget
request. The next issue of the Update will report on those
hearings.

ANNUAL BUDGET PROCESS BEGINS: GRH SWORD HANGS OVER

The Congress has begun its annual process of reviewing the
budgets of agencies. A full slate of hearings -- budget,
authorization and appropriations committees -- has kept the
COSSA staff busy. The deficit reduction targets of Gramm-
Rudman-Hollings (GRH) are still uppermost in congressional
thinking, although any consensus on how to reach those targets
has not yet developed.

The Budget Committees are beginning to write the budget
resolutions that set the parameters for the later work of the
authorization and appropriations committees. The numbers they
establish for the Science Function (#250), the Health Function
(#550) and the Education Function (#500) will affect the funding
for the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of
Health, and the Department of Education. The Science Function
is especially vulnerable to a reduction from the President's
proposed budget since it is slated for close to a $600 million
increase. According to the congressional schedule set by GRH,
the budget resolutions must pass the Congress by April 15. The
Committees hope to finish their actions by the middle of March.

The authorization and appropriations committees continue to
play their accustomed roles. Authorization committee members
promise to continue their support for the programs under their
jurisdiction, with some members publicly voicing support for tax
increases to keep funding levels from being cut. Appropriations
committee members talk about "doing their best in tough times,"
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a line not recently produced by GRH, but in the repertoire of committee members for years. So far not much has changed, people are still adopting a wait -- for the Supreme Court decision on GRH (now due in early July), for the President and Congress to negotiate "the grand compromise" -- and see attitude. Stay tuned!

PEACE INSTITUTE BOARD HOLDS FIRST MEETING

Seventeen months after it was established, the United States Institute of Peace may finally get off the ground. The Institute's Board of Directors held its first meeting on February 25-26, 1986. The Institute was created in 1984 to conduct studies, training, and symposia, and to develop programs that examine the causes of war and international conflicts and methods of resolving those conflicts peacefully. Congress appropriated $4 million for the Institute as part of the FY 1985 supplemental appropriations act.

The two-day meeting focused on organizing the Institute -- six committees were appointed, papers suggesting directions for the Institute were assigned, a president was named, a search for space was initiated, and a schedule of almost monthly meetings was decided. In addition, Board Chairman John Norton Moore, Professor of Law at the University of Virginia, expressed the hope that the Peace Institute would develop into an independent organization similar to the Smithsonian Institution. Board Member Richard Perle, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy, argued for the Institute's independence with a representative from the Office of Management and Budget, who claimed the Institute should be responsive to directions from the Executive branch.

On matters of substance, members of the Board stressed the need for a synthesis of previous efforts in the field. When the Peace Institute was created in October 1984 it was authorized for two years. This means that sometime this year Congress will have to reauthorize it. Board members were "moderately optimistic" that they will continue to function beyond 1986.

NEW AFFILIATE WELCOMED BY COSSA

COSSA welcomes its most recent Affiliate, the Association for the Social Sciences in Health. ASSH was established a decade ago by social and behavioral scientists from a number of disciplines, including sociology, economics, anthropology, political science, psychology, and demography, to provide an interdisciplinary national forum focused on major questions in health. ASSH is affiliated with the American Public Health Association and holds annual conferences in conjunction with APHA.
SPECTER AND REGNERY DISPUTE FUTURE OF OJJDP

Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA) is Chairman of the Juvenile Justice Subcommittee and a former District Attorney. Alfred Regnery is the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and a staunch supporter of the President whose budget calls for the elimination of the agency Regnery directs. For the past three years these two have been jousting with each other over grants that have been awarded by OJJDP, with Specter fervently committed to saving the agency and Regnery equally committed to abolishing it.

In December 1985 OJJDP announced that in line with the administration's intention to rescind FY 1986 funds for the agency it was freezing all grants as of January 7. On December 19, Senator Specter introduced and received unanimous support for a sense of the Senate resolution (a non-binding measure) disapproving the freeze. The agency has ignored the Senate and continues to withhold funds. Specter told Regnery that he was using illegal tactics to "cripple a program" that the Senate clearly wants continued.

Regnery claimed he was acting within the provisions of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974, stating that pending congressional resolution of a rescission request, the funds in question can be frozen. (Rescission requests must be approved by both Houses of Congress within 45 legislative days.) Specter asked Regnery if he thought there "was one chance in a million that the rescission would be approved?" Regnery said he did not know, since anything can happen in the Congress. Specter, visibly angry with this response, dismissed Regnery from the hearing.

Earlier in the hearing Marvin Wolfgang, Professor of Criminology at the University of Pennsylvania, testified on the impact of the freeze on research in juvenile justice and delinquency prevention.

In what appears to be another attempt to get the Congress angry enough to achieve the intended aim of abolishing his agency, Regnery awarded another grant that has stirred controversy. Despite the announced freeze, OJJDP awarded $186,000 to the Center for Judicial Studies to write a course on the Constitution for high school students. James McClellan, the director of the Center, is a conservative activist and former aide to Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC). The Legal Services Corporation recently withheld part of another grant to McClellan because of questions over the work done. Senator Paul Simon (D-IL) questioned whether writing a course on the Constitution was the kind of grant that should be supported by an agency whose mission is to improve juvenile justice and prevent juvenile delinquency.
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AAAS ASSESSES GLOBAL INITIATIVES

The National Science Foundation's Division of International Programs has requested the American Association for the Advancement of Science and its Consortium of Affiliates for International Programs (CAIP) to assist in the development of a list of potential topics for consideration as new global initiatives of the Foundation. As a result of a meeting of a steering group, which included CAIP representatives, a solicitation of potential topics is being made to a wide variety of groups within the mainstream scientific and engineering community. Topics should meet three criteria: 1) be an important global problem; 2) have high potential scientific, technological, or intellectual content; and 3) involve the broadest possible range of disciplines.

The steering group seeks suggestions for potential global initiatives from individual scientists and engineers and from appropriate groups. Suggestions should include a title, a short description, and a statement of the potential of the program to meet the established criteria, and should be not more than one page in length. Recommendations should be sent by April 1, 1986 to: Sandra M. Burns, Office of International Science, American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

FEDERAL SUPPORT DECLINES FOR RESEARCH ON WOMEN

The Labor Department's Employment and Training Administration reduced funding for projects focused on women's employment issues from $753,000 in 1981 to $50,000 in 1983. The National Institute of Mental Health's support for research about women declined by almost $3 million, over 40 percent, between 1980 and 1982. But funding for extramural research related to women in the Behavioral Sciences Research Program at the National Institute on Aging increased from $307,000 in 1980 to $765,000 in 1983.

These are some of the findings of the Commission on New Funding Priorities of the National Council for Research on Women in a recently released report entitled "A Declining Federal Commitment to Research about Women, 1980-1984." The report concentrates on eight federal agencies, and examines not only funding levels and numbers of projects but various trends in the pattern of research funding -- for example, recently, to pool research related to women into broader categories. The address of the Council, a national scholarly organization, is 47-49 East 65th Street, New York, NY 10021. The Council would be interested in having further information on this general topic brought to its attention.
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SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

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

National Endowment for the Arts

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) was created in 1965 to encourage and support American arts and artists. It fulfills this mission through providing grant and fellowship support, and through leadership and advocacy activities.

Social scientists approaching the NEA should be prepared to frame and discuss research plans within the program interests and priorities of the Endowment. Although the vast majority of NEA grants and fellowships are awarded to artists and arts organizations, several programs make awards for work utilizing social science methods and expertise. Social scientists do compete successfully for grants in several NEA programs, and serve on NEA advisory and review panels.

The Dance Program supports professional choreographers, dance companies, and organizations that present and serve dance. Anthropologists, ethnomusicologists, semioticists, social historians, and other researchers concerned with documentation and recording of performances may find support for their work in this program.

The Design Arts Program supports projects that promote excellence in the many forms of architecture and design. Design Exploration/Research Grants support studies of design issues or concerns. Grants up to $40,000 are intended to promote the understanding of aesthetic, utilitarian, economic, and social criteria used to achieve design quality and to evaluate the impact of design decisions on physical environment and human activity.

The Folk Arts Program focuses on traditional arts within the many U.S. groups that share the same ethnic heritage, language, occupation, religion, or geographic area. This program may support folklorists, cultural historians, ethnomusicologists, anthropologists, linguists, and other social scientists with research interests that include performance and ritual.

Budget: Approximately $150 million for NEA extramural support in FY 1986

Funding Mechanisms: Most grants require matching contributions. Fellowships are given only to U.S. citizens or permanent residents.

Review Process: Peer review panels

Deadline: Deadlines vary according to the many competitions within each program.

Contact: Office of Public Information, NEA, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20506; 202/682-5400
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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 Evaluation Association
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
Eastern Sociological Society
Economic History Association
Gerontological Society of America
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
Southern Sociological Society
Southwestern Social Science Association
Speech Communication Association
The Institute of Management Sciences

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
Indian University
Institute for Research in Social Science, UNC-Chapel Hill
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan
University of Iowa
The Johns Hopkins University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska
New York University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Ohio State University
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
Yale University

CONSORTIUM of Social Science Associations
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 520, Washington, D.C. 20036