HOUSE PASSES BUDGET RESOLUTION: SCIENCE FUNCTION REDUCED

The House of Representatives passed the FY 1988 budget resolution on April 9 on a nearly straight party line vote of 230-192. The budget resolution sets parameters for the authorization and appropriations committees (see related story on NSF authorization).

For the Science Function (#250), the resolution assumes $10.25 billion in budget authority. The President requested $11.5 billion. Yet the report language assumes $1.85 billion...
for the National Science Foundation, only $40 million below the President's request. The House budget resolution does not include a commitment to double the NSF budget by 1992, as the administration's budget did. The major reduction in the Science Function comes out of the NASA budget.

Since only the function figures are binding on the appropriations committee, NSF could be in trouble. The HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee will likely reject the budget resolution's assumptions for NASA and give it more funds. However, there is a possibility that, like last year, NASA funding will emerge from a series of trade-offs and add-ons that will not significantly affect the NSF appropriation. The Senate is expected to discuss its FY 1988 budget resolution when it returns from the recess on April 21.

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ADDS $35 MILLION FOR SCIENCE EDUCATION AT NSF

The House Science, Research, and Technology Subcommittee took one of its boldest steps in years and added $35 million for the Science and Engineering Education Directorate (SEE) during its markup of the FY 1988 authorization for the National Science Foundation on April 9. As the Subcommittee made clear during its hearings on the NSF budget (see February 27, 1987 Update), it was dissatisfied with the funding requested for pre-college science education and was going to do something about it.

Rep. Doug Walgren (D-PA), Chairman of the Subcommittee, noted that the $115 million request for SEE was only 6% of the total NSF budget. He reminded his colleagues that science education funding once made up 30% of that budget. Of the $35 million increase, $20 million will go to teacher preparation and enhancement programs, $13 million will go to materials development and informal science education programs, and $2 million will go to the College Science Instrumentation program.

The Subcommittee authorized NSF at the President's requested level of $1.89 billion. To offset the large increase in SEE, the Antarctica program was reduced by $25 million. In addition, all other Directorates, except Computer and Information Science and Engineering (CISE), suffered slight reductions from the President's requested levels. The Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences Directorate (BBS) received $294 million, $3 million less than the request. The advanced supercomputing centers within CISE received a slight increase.

The Subcommittee rejected NSF's request for a five-year authorization, sticking to the traditional one-year level. In addition, NSF was directed to use funds for establishing science and technology centers to create one dedicated to the study of information technologies relevant to instruction in two-year colleges, and to allocate 50% of all funds for the new Engineering
Research Centers for research relating to manufacturing technologies. The community and two-year colleges were made eligible for the College Science Instrumentation program.

An amendment by Rep. Claudine Schneider (R-RI) strongly suggesting NSF spend some BBS and Geosciences Directorate' funds on Marine Biology research facilities also made it into the bill. Rep. Don Ritter (R-PA) successfully added a requirement that NSF conduct a study of the impact of salary levels on the recruitment and retention of science and mathematics teachers at pre-college levels. Several amendments offered by Rep. Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY) that would reduce overall funding, rearrange the reductions necessitated by the increase for SEE, and remove what he called attempts "to micromanage NSF" all failed.

This was one of the more contentious NSF authorization markups in recent years. With the full House Science, Space, and Technology Committee and the House floor still to go on this bill, more conflict can be expected.

**COSSA SPONSORS SEMINAR ON RURAL AMERICA**

The Consortium's first Congressional breakfast seminar of the year was held on April 6 in a private dining room of the Rayburn House Office Building. The title of the seminar was "Revitalizing Rural America in an Economically Competitive World." Joining COSSA in sponsoring the breakfast were the Rural Sociological Society, a COSSA Affiliate, and the American Agricultural Economics Association. Congressional auspices were provided by the Senate Agriculture Committee (chair, Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-VT), the House Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research and Foreign Agriculture (chair, George E. Brown, Jr., D-CA), and the Rural Economy and Family Farming Subcommittee (chair, Max Baucus, D-MT) of the Senate Small Business Committee.

The three invited speakers were Gene F. Summers, professor of rural sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Thomas F. Stinson, professor of agricultural and applied economics, University of Minnesota; and Edward J. Blakely, professor of economic development planning, University of California-Berkeley. Howard J. Silver, COSSA's associate director for government relations, introduced the speakers and moderated the discussion.

The seminar was organized to examine rural development strategies for coping with the transformations and dislocations occurring today in rural America. That economy has changed from a natural resource base to a partial dependence on manufacturing and services and a close coupling with national and international macroeconomic factors. Assuming that rural America must and can compete in this larger world, all three speakers suggested policies that would address the needs and problems of depressed communities and disadvantaged individuals.
Summers, sketching in the present situation, pointed out that agriculture no longer dominates the rural economy and that agricultural products are exported beyond the boundaries of the U.S. Thus, the rural economy is increasingly linked to distant markets and trends. He commented, "Rural business people, farmers, and local government officials must think globally in order to act locally." While in the aggregate rural America has become more like the nation as a whole, diversity within the rural sector has increased as local communities and regions have become more specialized and a more complex, functionally interdependent system has evolved.

Unlike the 1970s, in the 1980s population and employment have grown more slowly in nonmetropolitan than in metropolitan areas. Employment has dropped in agriculture and mining and has increased only slightly in manufacturing; most growth has come in the retirement sector, government services, and in some portions of the service economy. In some rural areas, 'passive income' -- transfer and investment income -- accounts for a major portion of the total. This pattern will continue for some years, with the aging of the population, and presents challenges for productive investment.

According to Summers, traditional sector-specific policies or local solutions like subsidies, protective tariffs, or 'buffalo-hunting' (trying to capture a manufacturing plant or to induce an industrial park to locate nearby) are unlikely to lead to real economic growth, but are more likely to lead to divisive local competition. More truly productive strategies will involve broader marketing of goods and services; the renewal and stabilization of the labor force; investment in information and communication infrastructure; and the development locally of relevant research and technology. Carefully targeted transitional policies must be aimed at the welfare and protection of local populations: in the long run, investment in human capital, involving education, job training, and the amenities of life, are the keys to a real solution.

Stinson pointed out that a major devaluation and write-down of assets has occurred in the 1980s, especially with regard to the value of farm land and the sale of extractive industry assets. Many who were once land-rich and cash-poor have suffered a sharp loss of personal wealth. This may be tolerable among the older population who cannot or do not wish to move or take up new work and who can "hunker down and disinvest," but it has the potential among younger people of inducing outmigration or the institutionalization of a "new rural poor." Heavy industry cannot be expected to take up the slack, and high-technology manufacturing is no panacea. Hence, agriculture, mining, lumbering, etc., must recover at least to some degree; the solution there lies with control of the deficit and trade imbalances as well as with making these industries more internally efficient. In the meantime, states and localities faced with a shrinking tax base, higher unemployment, and a reduction of federal services must find new ways to invest in and develop the local population, including those who are temporarily out of the labor force.
Blakely too made the point that in times of economic downturn, investment in people, in the form of schools, quality of the labor force, and quality of life, suffers. This is particularly true of a region where corporate headquarters lie elsewhere. At best, investment in the 'human capital stock' tends to be superficial; and in bad times, branch plants and low-producing retail chain stores are the first to be jettisoned. Like the other speakers, Blakely warned against 'smokestack chasing' on the one hand and 'chip-chasing' on the other, and regarded the preservation approach, based on tourism and boutiques, as unpromising.

In general, Blakely commented that "the infrastructure of development is more important than the focus." In particular, he recommended development based on "brain centers" -- research sites, especially with local and regional emphases; information services and telecommunication networks; community colleges, including colleges without campuses that can serve adult and industrial markets; hospitals, airports, and other service enterprises. On the federal level, he recommended that the Department of Housing and Urban Development pay more attention to the rural situation, with particular attention to the spacing of infrastructural development.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Gerald Klonglan, chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Iowa State University and the immediate past president of the Rural Sociological Society, testified on behalf of the Consortium before both the House and Senate Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittees on April 7.

Professor Klonglan asked the Subcommittees to restore $2 million for rural development research that the State Agriculture Experiment Station Directors had included in the FY 1988 budget request to the Cooperative State Research Service, but which was later removed from the Department of Agriculture's budget request. The money would be used to fund social science research needed to help solve the serious problems of contemporary rural America. Among the research initiatives proposed are: telecommunications and rural development, strengthening international competitiveness of rural industries, sources of employment change, rural capital markets, rural government organization, and finance and community leadership development.

Sen. Charles Grassley (R-IA) was quite sympathetic to Klonglan's appeal, noting that social scientists have done a good job in pointing out things that need to be done about the serious social and economic problems in rural America. Grassley also wanted to know why the Department rejected the recommendation of the Experiment Station Directors. On the House side, however, Subcommittee Chairman Rep. Jamie Whitten (D-MS) noted how witnesses wanted "to substitute research for a farm program." Whitten argued for "the need to keep a balance."
A young Harvard economist is the first social or behavioral scientist to win the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Alan T. Waterman Award. That award, established in 1975 to honor the first director of the Foundation, is given annually to an American citizen or permanent resident who is 35 years of age or younger or has received the Ph.D. degree within the past five years. The recipient receives a medal and up to $500,000 in grants for three years of scientific research at an institution of his or her choice. The presentation of the award to Summers will be made on May 20 at a formal dinner held at the Department of State in Washington.

Summers is widely regarded as one of the outstanding economists of his generation. He has taught at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and at Harvard University, where he received the Ph.D. in 1982 and became a full professor of economics in 1983. He has served on the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers, has been a research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research and a member of the Brookings Panel on Economic Activity, is currently serving on the NSF economics advisory panel, and edits the Quarterly Journal of Economics. In 1986, he received the Presidential Young Investigator award, administered by NSF, which provides five years of research support.

Summers' research has ranged widely across such fields as capital accumulation, tax policy, finance, labor markets, and various aspects of macroeconomic analysis. NSF Director Erich Bloch comments, "Dr. Summers, the twelfth recipient of the Waterman Award and the first from the behavioral and social sciences, has made important contributions, not only in the field of economics, but toward an understanding of how that field interacts with other areas of science and technology. Dr. Summers will be a force within the economic sciences, and I expect that his future research will be a hallmark of excellence."

Colleagues report that Summers is an iconoclast who likes to challenge consensus in his field but who follows up such challenges with sustained and significant work. He is said to stimulate and collaborate well with other researchers -- one reason he has been able to make an impact in a number of distinct fields in his career to date.

Another coveted scientific award will be presented at the May 20th dinner. At that time the Vannevar Bush Award will be presented to David Packard, chairman of the board of the Hewlett-Packard Company and longtime advisor to the White House and the Office of Science and Technology Policy on science and technology, security and defense policy, and management efficiency in government. Packard has recently been a key figure in the move to double the present level of federal funding for basic research in the next three to five years.
COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency rather than COSSA for more information. A comprehensive list of federal funding sources is included in COSSA's Guide to Federal Funding for Social Scientists.

Demographic and Behavioral Sciences Branch
(National Institute of Child Health and Human Development)

The Demographic and Behavioral Sciences Branch (DBSB) of NICHD funds studies of social, psychological, economic, and environmental factors governing population growth and structure, as well as the impact of population changes on individuals, families, and societies.

DBSB is currently seeking grant applications for the support of research on social, demographic, economic, and behavioral aspects of infant mortality and low birthweight, especially as they relate to racial and ethnic differences in the U.S. While the focus is on understanding racial/ethnic differences, projects do not necessarily have to address such differences. Studies that deal with social/behavioral issues within one population group or subgroup differences in non-U.S. populations may also be funded.

Research issues of interest include (1) explaining the apparently favorable birthweight distributions found among Mexican-American and Native American women; (2) postneonatal mortality and the interrelationship of individual and familial behaviors, health care delivery factors, use of well and sick baby care, and sources of accidental death; (3) the role of stress on pregnancy outcome; (4) social/behavioral and economic factors that explain patterns of low birthweight/infant mortality within the Hispanic population; (5) the link between economic conditions and infant mortality; (6) mechanisms by which the planning status of a pregnancy influences the use of prenatal care; (7) fertility patterns, prenatal care, and pregnancy outcome among American Indians; and (8) socioeconomic, demographic, health behavior, and biological factors affecting perinatal outcomes in Asian Americans.

Deadline: May 15, 1987

Contact: Wendy Baldwin, Chief
Demographic and Behavioral Sciences Branch, NICHD
Room 7C25, Landow Building
7910 Woodmont Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20892
301/496-1174
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