
CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume VII, Number 15
August 5, 1988

This Week . . .

- Conference Committee Decides NSF FY 1989 Spending Levels
- Senate Passes Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Bill
- FBI Targets Librarians, Library Patrons, Science Data
- Department of Education Research Agendas Determined
- Sources of Research Support: United States Institute of Peace

* * *

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE DECIDES NSF FY 1989 SPENDING LEVELS

The House-Senate conference committee to resolve differences over spending in the HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill met on August 2. The funding levels for the FY 1989 budget of the National Science Foundation (NSF) were set as follows: Total--\$1.885 billion, a 9.8% increase over FY 1988; Research and Related Activities--\$1.583 billion, an 8.9% increase over FY 1988; and Science and Engineering Education--\$171 million, a 22.8% increase over FY 1988.

The conference agreement must now pass both the House and Senate, which will probably happen next week, and the bill must not be vetoed by President Reagan. Although there have been some signals from the White House that the HUD bill would be a likely veto target, decisions in the conference committee on NASA, EPA construction projects, and housing programs may make the bill more palatable to the president.

Congress has once again rejected the large increases for NSF (19.4%) proposed in the president's budget; it has also once again rearranged some of the spending priorities in that proposed budget--more money for science education, less of an increase for

COSSA Washington Update is published 20-24 times per year, normally biweekly, by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1625 I Street, NW, Suite 911, Washington, D.C. 20006 (202/887-6166). Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$40.00; institutional subscriptions, \$90.00; overseas airmail, \$50.00. ISSN 0749-4394. COSSA Members, Affiliates, and Contributors are listed on the back. The **Update** is written and produced by the Consortium's staff: Howard J. Silver, Simon Cordery, Brian Daly, and Katrina R. Styles.

The Consortium represents more than 185,000 American scientists across the full range of the social and behavioral sciences, functioning as a bridge between the research world and the Washington community.

Victor G. Rosenblum, *President*

Howard J. Silver, *Executive Director*

research, and no separate spending line for science and technology centers. Nevertheless, if the conference agreement becomes law, it can be considered a generally good outcome. The overall results are better than last year's 5.8% increase for the Foundation, and the FY 1989 appropriation is also significantly above the 2% increases for domestic discretionary programs agreed to in last November's budget summit agreement.

The big question remaining is how NSF will distribute the appropriation among its many programs, including those in the social and behavioral sciences. The Foundation must decide, for instance, how many new science and technology centers to start and how much to spend on them. Initially, NSF planned to start 12 to 15 centers and spend \$30 million in the first year of what was to be a five-year commitment. Both appropriations committees' reports warned NSF not to sacrifice individual investigator research grants in order to fund centers. The NSF FY 1989 operating plan, which will shed light on these issues, is expected to go to the appropriations committees for their review in October.<<

SENATE PASSES LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION BILL

On July 26 the Senate voted 80-16 to pass the FY 1989 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and a number of independent agencies. The Senate accepted the recommendations of its appropriations committee for most programs. One change, on an amendment offered by Sen. John Heinz (R-PA), shifted \$2 million from the National Institute on Dental Research's pain control and behavioral research branch to the Adoption Opportunities program. What follows is a breakdown of the bill by agencies of interest to social and behavioral scientists. Specific comments about an agency are based on the language of the appropriations committee report. For a description of House action, see Update, June 24, 1988. Figures are reported for Senate (S), House (H), FY 1989 request (R), and FY 1988 appropriation (LY). Figures are in millions of dollars.

Labor

Bureau of Labor Statistics: (S) 190.4 (H) 190.4, (R) 190.4, (LY) 176.5. The increase is 8% over last year's appropriation. Most of the increase will go toward the development of a central business establishment list.

Research, Demonstrations, and Evaluation at the Employment and Training Administration: (S) 18.6, (H) 13.6, (R) 18.6, (LY) 18.2.

Health and Human Services

AIDS funding to be channeled directly to the appropriate

agencies: (S) 1244.6, (H) 1234.6, (R) 1234.6, (LY) 926.3. The Senate increase is 34% over FY 1988 funding.

National Institutes of Health: (S, includes non-authorized programs) 7199.3, (H, excludes non-authorized programs) 6862.5, (R) 7122.8, (LY) 6666.7. AIDS funding at NIH: (S) 618.6, (H) 587.6, (R) 587.6, (LY) 467.8. Research training funding, deferred by the House, was mostly given requested levels, which in most cases were at or slightly over FY 1988 levels. Like its House counterpart, the Senate report includes "strong support for health and behavior research at NIH, and reiterates its intent that NIH expand its health and behavior research portfolio."

National Institute on Aging: (S) 225.6, (H) 202.1 (R) 205.2, (LY) 194.7. The disparity between the House and Senate figures reflects a more generous Senate by 16.0 and the funding of research training by the Senate and its deferral by the House, 8.0. NIA gets less than .5 in AIDS research funds. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development: (S) 431.4, (H) 407.7, (R) 418.4, (LY) 396.8. The Senate provided 14.7 for research training, the House deferred. NICHD receives 22.0 for AIDS research from the Senate, and 20.4 from the House.

National Institute of Mental Health research: (S) 297.0, (H) 276.8, (R) 271.8, (LY) 253.7. NIMH also receives 39.9 for AIDS research from the Senate. National Institute on Drug Abuse research: (S) 116.6 (H) defer, (R) 103.9, (LY) 107.9. NIDA also receives 25.6 for AIDS research and 40.0 for IV drug-treatment demonstrations. Other AIDS-related programs at NIDA will bring total AIDS funding to 122.0. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism research: (S) 92.7, (H) defer, (R) 83.1, (LY) 74.3. NIAAA will also receive 5.6 for AIDS research.

Centers for Disease Control AIDS activities: (S) 384.4, (H) 408.2, (R) 400.7, (LY) 304.9. The Senate denied the 22.0 for the national household seroprevalence survey. It also provided 5.0 less than the administration requested for public information and education, and wants these activities re-directed to emphasize high-risk minority populations. National Center for Health Statistics: (S) 48.9 (H) 48.9, (R) 48.9, (LY) 48.6. The Senate report calls NCHS statistical data "a national resource." Policy research in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation: (S) 7.5, (H) 8.4, (R) 5.0 (LY) 4.9. The increase is to fund the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin for two more years.

Education

Research, dissemination, and information services at the Office of Educational Research and Improvement: (S) 45.0, (H) 50.3, (R) 51.5, (LY) 46.6. The report also suggests that OERI consider substituting a center on teacher performance evaluation for a planned center on the teaching of civics and citizenship.

National Center for Education Statistics: (S) 29.5., (H) 33.2, (R) 32.9, (LY) 21.0. The Senate amount, like the House, includes 9.5 for the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

International education and foreign language programs: (S) 30.7, (H) 30.7, (R) 30.7, (LY) 30.7. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education: (S) 11.6, (H) 13.6, (R) 13.6, (LY) 13.6. The Law School Clinical Experience Program: (S) 3.8, (H) 4.0, (R) 0, (LY) 3.8. The Jacob Javits Fellowship Program: (S) 6.7, (H) 8.3, (R) 6.7, (LY) 6.7.

All differences between Senate and House funding levels will be worked out in a conference committee scheduled to meet before the break for the August recess on the 12th.<<

FBI TARGETS LIBRARIANS, LIBRARY PATRONS, SCIENCE DATA

The full extent and rationale of an FBI policy of monitoring library use has been uncovered by recently released bureau documents. The Library Awareness Program (LAP), extant for at least the past 20 years, recruits librarians in defense of the realm by asking them to track the use of documents such as scientific journals and Defense Department publications by library patrons with foreign-sounding surnames or accents. As scholars know, libraries are not the only suspects under the current administration's infophobia. Data bases, information processing organizations, and inter-library loan programs have all been investigated and the scope of secrecy laws has been extended. There have been complaints from scholars and others that freedom of information requests are taking longer than ever to fill, the definition of classifiable information has been increasingly broadened, and the process of declassifying documents at the National Archives has been slowed.

The FBI documents, obtained under a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit filed by the National Security Archive and People for the American Way, reveal that LAP is an extension of long-standing FBI concerns over the potential national security threat of libraries because of their holdings of unclassified material considered "sensitive." The FBI has long held that foreign agents use public and university libraries to gather unclassified information, creating data "mosaics" to penetrate national security, gather industrial secrets, and collect trade information. What the internal FBI documents reveal is the extent of bureau fears that Eastern bloc intelligence services have pursued librarians "as a source of information and targets for recruitment."

Under LAP, FBI agents target libraries with extensive holdings in engineering and the sciences and request information about individual users from circulation clerks. According to the library associations, agents approach junior employees and either intimidate with badges or excite with promises of adventure.

Some contacts made in this way have borne fruit, but in at least 17 cases the FBI has been turned away.

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and the American Library Association (ALA) have both criticized the program, instructing librarians to deny the FBI access to information about patrons or circulation records on the grounds that cooperation would violate ethical and legal standards (patron records are protected by confidentiality statutes in 38 states and the District of Columbia). Both associations have condemned LAP as an attempt to staunch the free flow of ideas by restricting access to unclassified information. Representatives of these organizations point out that the program would have a chilling effect on library use, with patrons uncertain of the disposition of their library records and librarians facing a twilight zone of ill-defined "unclassified but sensitive" holdings. They have advised their members not to cooperate, pointing out that legitimate needs can be met with subpoenas.

The FBI for its part claims the program protects national security by tracking foreign agents and, ultimately, denying them access to information detrimental to the United States. The FBI claims the program is limited to the New York area, but librarians across the country are reporting the use of LAP-like tactics. The Civil and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, chaired by former FBI agent Rep. Don Edwards (D-CA), held hearings on LAP earlier this year. Duane Webster, executive director of ARL, testified that, "Any restrictions... on the exchange of unclassified scientific data, and the results of scientific research, have a detrimental impact on scientific and technological accomplishments and are counterproductive to the best interests of the country."

To some observers, the Library Awareness Program is part of an attempt to create a new category of information which is neither classified nor completely open. This category, "unclassified but sensitive," was first formulated in 1984 by the National Security Agency to cover the transmission of electronic data. Its scope was broadened by then-National Security Adviser John Poindexter in 1986 to include the storage of electronic data in any (including private) data bases. From electronic data, the category seems to have been expanded--despite assurances from former White House chief of staff Howard Baker that the term "unclassified but sensitive" would be discarded--to cover any type of technical data, placing librarians in the uncomfortable position of being asked by the FBI to spy on their patrons and violate their professional code of ethics.<<

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RESEARCH AGENDAS DETERMINED

The Department of Education has published its final research priorities for fiscal years 1988 and 1989. These priorities, drafted by the Office of Research (part of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement), are the main components of

the department's research and development agenda. Comments on tentative priorities were invited last November, but despite the multitude of comments received, the final product bears the marks of remarkably few changes. Many associations and researchers responded to the invitation to comment, including COSSA, which submitted joint comments with the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and Cognitive Sciences, and the Society for Research in Child Development.

The comments of COSSA et al. recommended withdrawing these priorities on the grounds that some were too broad and others too restrictive to represent a ranking of research needs. Instead, the department was urged to develop priorities which fit the needs and definitions of education research. These comments also suggested a full review of the management and funding priorities of departmental programs. Ignoring the latter, the department responded by noting that the priorities were not specific research topics but "modes," suggesting that the department had missed the point of the COSSA comments, which expressed the need to define these modes and state their desired outcomes. The suggestions of other organizations were similarly ignored.

The final priorities, resembling a large laundry list, are: English Literacy; Improvement in Education; Home, Family, Cultural and Community Influence in Education; Improvement of Educational Outcomes for Students-at-risk; Student Achievement and Motivation; Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages; Management and Organization of Schools; Technology in Education; Parental Choice in Schooling; Limited English Proficiency; Citizenship and Character Education; Recruitment, Training, and Retention of School Professionals; Assessment of Postsecondary Education; Early Childhood Learning; Library Research; International Education; Educational Finance and Productivity; Teaching and Learning Content Knowledge; and, based on Executive Order 12606, The Family.

Another example of Education Department non-responsiveness occurred on a proposed absolute funding priority for the Department's Law-Related Education Program. This \$3.2 million program promotes efforts to educate individuals about the law, the legal process, the legal system, and the principles and values on which these are based. The proposed priority called for "civics-related projects focusing on the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution" and 'encouraged' applications on "The Federalist Papers," noting that the Secretary "is particularly interested in projects" related to that set of documents. COSSA's comments noted with dismay the undue emphasis on one aspect of the bicentennial; this observation was duly ignored. The final absolute priority, unchanged from the proposed absolute priority, commented that "the Secretary did not receive any comments on the proposed priority." Agency staffers told COSSA "the comments were not on the absolute priority." No comment!<<

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

COSSA provides this information as a service, and encourages readers to contact the agency rather than COSSA for further information or application materials.

Solicited Grants Projects

The United States Institute of Peace (USIP) funds projects addressing such topics as the role of third-party negotiators in the resolution of regional conflicts; religious and ethical questions in war and peace; the use of nonviolent sanctions in confronting political violence; and global security in the nuclear age.

In addition to its established practice of providing support for unsolicited grant proposals, the Institute is initiating a program of solicited grants projects which will serve to focus attention on topics of special interest. Topics considered in the current grant cycle are: the role of deterrence in avoiding war; comparative study of armed conflicts in the Third World; teaching public understanding of the Geneva conventions; the relationship between different types of domestic regimes and the aggressive use of force internationally; and the role of religion as an influencing force in the resolution of conflict.

Eligibility: USIP invites applications from non-profit organizations, official public institutions, and individuals.

Budget: There is no set dollar amount for each award, nor is there a predetermined number of awards. In general, an award may be \$50,000 to \$200,000.

Funding Mechanism: Grants are renewable. Most grants cover one year, but some are multi-year.

Review Process: Grant applications are reviewed by members of the USIP board of directors.

Deadline: September 1, 1988.

Contact: Solicited Grants Projects
USIP
1550 M Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005-1708
202/457-1706 <<

* * * Note to Readers * * *

The next issue of COSSA Washington Update will be published on Friday, September 9th.

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 Assembly of Collegiate Schools
of Business
American Association for Public Opinion
Research
American Educational Research
Association
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Social Sciences in Health
Eastern Sociological Society
Federation of State Humanities Councils
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
Operations Research Society of America
Population Association of America

Regional Science Association
Rural Sociological Society
Social Science History Association
Society for the History of Technology
Society for Research on Adolescence
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

American Council of Learned Societies
Boston University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
Carnegie-Mellon University
Center for Advanced Study in the
Behavioral Sciences
University of Chicago
University of Colorado
Columbia University
Cornell Institute for Social and
Economic Research
Cornell University
Duke University
Florida State University
Harvard University
Howard University
University of Illinois
Indiana University
Institute for Research in Social
Science, UNC-Chapel Hill

Institute for Social Research,
University of Michigan
University of Iowa
The Johns Hopkins University
University of Maryland
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and
Public Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
University of Missouri
National Opinion Research Center
University of Nebraska
Graduate Faculty, New School
for Social Research
New York University
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill
Northwestern University
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 Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Yale University

CONSORTIUM of Social Science Associations

1625 I STREET, N.W., SUITE 911, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

FIRST CLASS