

CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

1755 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 300, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • [202] 234-5703

TO: COSSA Members, Affiliates, Contributors and Friends

FROM: Roberta Balstad Miller, Executive Director

COSSA LEGISLATIVE REPORT

September 17, 1982

This Week . . .

House Passes NSF Appropriation Without Amendment
Another Social Scientist Appointed to Science Board
The National Center for Health Services Research
Rise of Privatism in Research Grants?
Employment and Training Legislation
Social and Behavioral Scientists Elected to IOM
Research Proposals Sought by NIMH
Action on Cultural Property Implementation Act
NEH Council
House Committee on Children Passes Hurdle

* * *

HOUSE PASSES NSF APPROPRIATION WITHOUT AMENDMENT

The National Science Foundation (NSF) appropriation was passed by the House of Representatives on Wednesday, September 15, as part of the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriation. Given the heated debates over other parts of the federal budget, the NSF appropriation was relatively uncontroversial and passed without any proposed amendments. This stands in stark contrast to the controversies occasioned in the House by the NSF appropriation last year. At that time, the prospect of restoring funds to the Foundation's social and behavioral science programs engendered strong support from both Republicans and Democrats and an amendment to reduce the NSF budget to the FY 1982 request level from administration supporters.

This year an amendment was again prepared to reduce the NSF appropriation to its original request level, but the amendment was never proposed. In part, this may have been because there was strong support in the House for the Appropriations Committee's bill for NSF. COSSA wrote to all the Representatives who voted against the Winn Amendment and for the Appropriations Committee bill for NSF last year. Most of these members were also contacted by telephone the day before the vote. In addition, the offices of over 60 Representatives who had exhibited some support for research in the

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

HOUSE PASSES NSF APPROPRIATION WITHOUT AMENDMENT (cont.)

past were visited by COSSA staff. Twelve Representatives -- both Republicans and Democrats -- had prepared statements for the debate defending the Committee bill and stressing that they supported it because it added funds for NSF's social and behavioral science programs.

The House bill passed this week adds \$9 million to the Foundation's Research and Related Directorates and specifies that this sum should be applied to the Directorates for the Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences (BBS) and Science, Technology, and International Affairs (STIA).

The Senate, which has already marked up its HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriation, is expected to consider its bill on the floor on Tuesday or Wednesday, September 21 or 22. If the Senate bill is passed, as is expected, a conference committee might meet shortly thereafter.

ANOTHER SOCIAL SCIENTIST APPOINTED TO SCIENCE BOARD

On September 8, the White House announced that four individuals had been nominated to the National Science Board. As COSSA and its member and affiliated organizations had urged, the list includes a social scientist. He is John H. Moore, an economist who is currently Associate Director and Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. Dr. Moore was previously Associate Director of the Law and Economics Center and Professor of economics at Emory University. He and the other three nominees will serve six year terms on the Board.

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH

The National Center for Health Services Research (NCHSR), an agency of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), supports research by social and behavioral scientists that examines how to improve the delivery of health care services and assesses the impact of health care technologies (i.e., the various means to promote health and to prevent, diagnose, and treat disease). In addition to supporting research, NCHSR is required to disseminate, in a timely fashion, the findings of research it supports. The incorporation of health care technology assessment into NCHSR's mission resulted from the effective dismantling of the National Center for Health Care Technology (NCHCT) in 1982. Although NCHCT continues to exist legally, it no longer functions because it lacks an appropriation.

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH (cont.)

Although NCHSR is located in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and is not a part of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), investigators who apply for support from NCHSR are required to submit their grant applications to NIH's Division of Research Grants, where they are assigned to the appropriate study sections for peer review. This arrangement, while assuring that proposals to NCHSR go through a rigorous review process, has resulted in a perception that the Center is part of NIH, which it is not.

Initially established in 1968, NCHSR has seen its budget plummet, in less than a decade, from a high of \$58 million in FY 1973 to \$10 million in FY 1982. Although the agency has always taken pride in its professional staff, the size and quality of that staff are threatened by the reductions in force (RIFs) caused by budget reductions. At one time, NCHSR had a staff of 233. In FY 1982, the number of agency employees dropped to 134, and an additional 29 RIFs have been proposed for 1983.

These staff and budget reductions prompted Representative Henry Waxman to include a provision in the reauthorization legislation for NIH (H.R. 6457) that would transfer NCHSR to NIH. The Senate bill (S. 2311), however, is silent regarding NCHSR. Both bills have been reported and await floor action.

The proposed transfer of NCHSR is opposed by NIH on the grounds that the Center supports research that is not biomedical in nature and that is, therefore, inappropriate for NIH. Those who support NCHSR's move contend that because NIH is overly concerned with biomedical aspects of health research, it has neglected the important influences of social, behavioral, and economic factors on health and physical well-being. By becoming an integral part of the NIH, it is anticipated that NCHSR will bring a concern for those social and behavioral factors to NIH, a development that proponents assert is long overdue.

COSSA will continue to cover legislative developments about NCHSR's transfer to NIH in future issues of the COSSA Legislative Report. For more information, call Helen Rauch at 202/234-5703.

RISE OF PRIVATISM IN RESEARCH GRANTS?

A public affairs spokesman from the Office of Human Development Services (OHDS), which awards over \$30 million in research grants annually, reported to COSSA that OHDS is actively trying to involve the business community in its research program by encouraging private, for-profit organizations to apply for research grants. Because of legislative prohibitions against awarding OHDS research grants to for-profit organizations, the agency is encouraging private firms to affiliate with not-for-profit organizations and apply for OHDS grants.

Until recently, the policy of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) had been to restrict the awarding of research grants in all of its agencies to not-for-profit institutions. However, last December, the Public Health Service (of which NIH and ADAMHA are a part) issued a general notice in the Federal Register rescinding the prohibition for its programs. A further amendment to the HHS regulations, which would rescind the prohibition in all DHHS divisions where it is not specified by statute, is now awaiting final approval by the Secretary, Richard Schweiker.

The reason for turning increasingly to for-profit firms is the administration's assumption that the competitive, for-profit firms will do the same work as university or not-for-profit research organizations at less cost. Some civil servants at HHS, however, fear that greater participation in social and behavioral science research by private, for-profit groups might lead to violations of confidentiality as business firms attempt to capitalize on their research findings.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING LEGISLATION

COSSA is continuing to press for adoption of the House provisions for research, data collection, and evaluation in the employment and training legislation currently under discussion in the conference committee. In addition to writing all members of the conference committee (listed in the COSSA Legislative Report, August 31, 1982), COSSA prepared a statement for the National Commission for Employment Policy stressing the need for strong provisions for research in the new legislation. For a copy of the statement, contact the COSSA office (202/234-5703).

Social and Behavioral Scientists Elected to IOM

The Institute of Medicine (IOM) has elected 49 new members, including six social and behavioral scientists.

They are:

Ralph L. Andreano, economics, University of Wisconsin, Madison;
John J. Conger, clinical psychology, School of Medicine, University of Colorado;
William C. Dement, psychiatry and behavioral science, Stanford University School of Medicine;
Carroll L. Estes, social and behavioral sciences, School of Nursing, University of California, San Francisco;
Arthur Kleinman, medical anthropology, Harvard Medical School;
Lester B. Lave, Economic Studies Program, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

In addition to the new members, two social scientists were elected to Senior membership in the IOM. They are Kenneth E. Boulding, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder, and Neal E. Miller, Rockefeller University.

RESEARCH PROPOSALS SOUGHT BY NIMH

The National Institute for Mental Health (NIMH) received an additional \$6.5 million for research as a consequence of Congress' override of President Reagan's veto of the latest Supplemental Appropriations Bill. NIMH continues to urge investigators to apply for research support. Funds are available.

NIMH asked COSSA to remind social and behavioral scientists that although NIMH no longer funds proposals for the training of clinicians, grants are still available for research training. For more information about applying for research training grants, write Dr. William Denham (Division of Manpower and Training Programs, NIMH, Rm. 8101, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857) or call him at 301/443-4257.

NIMH's Division of Special Mental Health Programs is soliciting research proposals from social and behavioral scientists in the area of mental illness prevention and mental health promotion. These activities will be sponsored by the Division's recently proposed Center for Studies of Prevention. The Center will support investigator-initiated projects and will also establish several major Preventive Intervention Research Centers around the country. For more information, write Jane Steinberg or Jon Rolf (Center for Studies of Prevention, NIMH, Rm. 18097, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857) or call 301/443-4283.

ACTION ON CULTURAL PROPERTY IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The Senate Finance Subcommittee on International Trade is expected to act on S. 1723, the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act now that Congress has returned from recess. Although the United States voted for the adoption of the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property at the 16th General Conference of UNESCO in 1970, and the Senate ratified the Convention in 1972, deposit of the Convention has been held up pending passage of implementing legislation. Although the House has passed similar legislation on two occasions, for the past 10 years the American Association of Dealers in Ancient, Oriental & Primitive Art have been successful in bottling up the legislation in the Senate Finance Committee. Senator Moynihan (D-NY) is currently representing the views of the art dealers in the Committee. The bill's co-sponsors, Senators Spark Matsunaga (D-HI) and Max Baucus (D-MT) have been representing the views of the scientific and museum communities.

This legislation provides sanctions against the import of illicitly exported artifacts. These sanctions could be imposed by the President if it seemed likely that an international effort could prevent the pillage of archaeological and ethnological sites or artifacts. The legislation has been supported by every administration since Nixon and has widespread support in the scientific and museum communities.

NEH COUNCIL

The controversy surrounding the appointment of Jeffrey Hart to the National Council on the Humanities appears to be abating. Attachment 1, an article from the New York Times (September 13, 1982), describes the concerns of Senate Democrats over Dr. Hart's appointment.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN PASSES HURDLE

The House Committee on Rules met on September 16 to hear testimony from Members of Congress on the establishment of a Select Committee for Children, Youth and Families in the House of Representatives. The Select Committee would provide researchers in the social and behavioral sciences with a single integrated forum in which to discuss current research on children with members of Congress and their staff.

The Committee voted unanimously to report the bill to establish such a committee (H.R. 421), which is co-sponsored by more than half of the Members of the House, as a privileged resolution. It is expected to reach the floor for a vote before the Congress adjourns in October.

Way Eased for Humanities Nominee

By IRVIN MOLOTSKY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 12 — The last major obstacle to the appointment of a Dartmouth College professor to the National Council on the Humanities has been removed by Senator Claiborne Pell, Democrat of Rhode Island.

The nomination of the professor, Jeffrey Hart, an outspoken conservative, was announced by the White House in April. But Congressional action on the nomination has been held up by Democrats on a Senate subcommittee, first by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, and later by Senator Pell.

Besides teaching English at Dartmouth, Professor Hart is a syndicated columnist and unofficial adviser to the student-run Dartmouth Review, which the school's Undergraduate Council earlier this year condemned for "racist and sexist articles."

Skeptical Questions Submitted

Senator Kennedy had submitted to Professor Hart a list of questions, the tone of which suggested that Mr. Kennedy doubted that the professor would be a strong advocate for minorities, women or diversity in the humanities.

Mr. Hart replied to Senator Kennedy last month that "no evidence exists as regards my academic record that I harbor any prejudice against minorities or women." He called attention to "my celebration of diversity."

An aide said that Senator Kennedy had withdrawn his "hold." The hold is a device of senatorial courtesy in which even a member of the minority party can delay for a time a vote on a nomination. Senator Kennedy said he would probably vote against the Hart appointment when it came before the Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee of the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

Nominations to the council are almost never held up or contested. The five persons nominated along with Professor Hart last spring were confirmed without a murmur of dissent.

After Senator Kennedy dropped his "hold," Senator Pell put on his own, for different reasons.

Dispute Over Pell Approach

Senator Pell is an advocate of directing Federal dollars for humanities projects through official state agencies instead of through private groups. In 1976, Mr. Hart described Senator Pell's plan as an effort to give "politicians" the right to select recipients. Senator Pell said it was a way of broadening access to humanities funds.

An aide said that Senator Pell had dropped his "hold" after having been convinced that the state agencies were in place and would not be affected by appointing Professor Hart to the council, the policy-making body of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The delay in the appointment is an illustration of the way in which the endowment, one of the smallest Federal agencies and one concerned with dispensing money for scholarly research and intellectual enterprises, has attracted controversy.

Earlier this year, members of the Senate were split when it became known that the front-runner for the endowment chairmanship was Prof. M. E. Bradford of the University of Dallas. Professor Bradford has run into even more controversy than Professor Hart, largely because of writings critical of Abraham Lincoln and because he found something "defensible" in the institution of slavery in the Old South.

TV Documentary Funds Assailed

Professor Bradford did not get the nomination, which went to William J. Bennett, also a conservative.

After assuming the chairmanship, Mr. Bennett criticized financial aid the endowment had given a television documentary on Nicaragua. He called the show "unabashed socialist-realism propaganda."

In his questions, Senator Kennedy had asked Professor Hart to discuss a newspaper column in which he wrote:

"On the American college campus there exists a widespread suspicion that on admissions, grades, scholarships and so on, minorities are getting much more than their due, and this is resented. Assertions and demands made by minorities were at one time swallowed whole. In today's climate they will be greeted skeptically and they will meet with resistance."

Mr. Hart replied that the passage referred to "the fact that college students today resent special treatment for minorities." He defended the statement's accuracy.

Senator Kennedy asked Mr. Hart to respond to criticism of The Dartmouth Review by John G. Kemeny, the former

Dartmouth president, who said that the newspaper was designed "to divide us, to set whites against blacks; to set Christians against Jews; to set men against women."

In a Review article last spring, a student wrote, in what was taken to be an imitation of black dialect: "Dese boys be sayin' dat we be comin' here to Dartmut and not takin' the classics. You know, Homa, Shakespeare; but I hes' dey all be co'd in da ground, six feet unda, and watcha be askin' us to learn from dem? We be culturally 'lightened, too.'"

In his response, Professor Hart said that The Review was an independent student newspaper and that he had "no foreknowledge of what is going into it."

Of the Kemeny criticism, he said that "he was in my opinion wrong," adding, "The paper was not 'designed' to set these groups against one another. Why would anyone want to do so?"