
CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume II, Number 5
March 11, 1983

This Week . . .

Help Needed on NSF Mark-up
Walgren Asks NSF for More Social Science Funds in FY 1983
Science Policy and the Social Sciences: Reagan and Mitterand
Budget Analysis Update
House Passes Science Education Bill
OMB "Gag Rule" Withdrawn -- To be Revised
Heckler Confirmed, Sworn in as HHS Secretary
Sweet Down But Not Yet Out at NIE
NIA Gets New Director
Sources of Research Support: Housing and Urban Development

* * *

HELP NEEDED ON NSF MARK-UP

The House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, under the leadership of its chairman, Doug Walgren (D-PA), will mark up the budget authorization for the National Science Foundation (NSF) on Thursday, March 17, at 1:00 p.m. In the mark-up, Members of the Subcommittee will decide what FY 1984 budget level to recommend for each of the directorates in the Foundation.

This is the first of five budget mark-ups for NSF. Both the House and the Senate will determine an authorization level, or budget ceiling, for each directorate. (Because of the continuing dispute over which Senate Committee has jurisdiction over the NSF authorization, there will again be two authorization mark-ups in the Senate, one by the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, the other by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.) In addition to approving authorizing legislation for NSF, each House will also mark up appropriation legislation for the Foundation.

March 11, 1983

HELP NEEDED ON NSF MARK-UP (cont.)

In the past, the Walgren Subcommittee has provided strong support for the NSF social and behavioral science research programs and Rep. Walgren has continued that support in the hearings held by his Subcommittee this year (see "Walgren Asks NSF for More Social Science Funds in FY 1983" in this issue). There are, however, several new members on the Committee who are unfamiliar with the social and behavioral sciences and with the need to restore support for the Foundation's budgets in this area.

Social and behavioral scientists who live in the districts of Subcommittee members are urged to call the Washington office of their Representative prior to Thursday's mark-up. When calling your Representative, please (1) emphasize the importance of the Foundation to social and behavioral science research; (2) ask for support in restoring the social and behavioral science research budgets to their FY 1980 level; and (3) point out that even with the scheduled 12% increase for FY 1984, the budget for the social and behavioral science programs continues to receive a decreasing portion of NSF's research funds -- 5.9% in FY 1980, 3.4% in FY 1983, and 3.3% in FY 1984. For your information, and that of your Representative, a chart with the budgets for these programs is enclosed. On the reverse of the chart are suggestions for telephoning your Member of Congress.

Listed below are the members of the Walgren Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology. New members of the Subcommittee are marked with an asterisk (*).

House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Doug Walgren (D-PA, 18th), Chair | *Tim Valentine (D-NC, 2nd) |
| George Brown (D-CA, 36th) | *Harry Reid (D-NV, 1st) |
| Dave McCurdy (D-OK, 4th) | *Frederick Boucher (D-VA, 9th) |
| Mervyn Dymally (D-CA, 31st) | Judd Gregg (R-NH, 2nd) |
| *Norman Mineta (D-CA, 13th) | *Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY, 25th) |
| *Buddy MacKay (D-FL, 6th) | F. James Sensenbrenner (R-WI, 9th) |
| *Robert Torricelli (D-NJ, 9th) | Raymond McGrath (R-NY, 5th) |
| Stan Lundine (D-NY, 34th) | Joe Skeen (R-NM, 2nd) |
| *Paul Simon (D-IL, 22nd) | *Herbert Bateman (R-VA, 1st) |
| *Richard Durbin (D-IL, 20th) | |

March 11, 1983

WALGREN ASKS NSF FOR MORE SOCIAL SCIENCE FUNDS IN FY 1983

On Thursday, March 10, the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology held authorization hearings on the National Science Foundation (NSF) budget for the social and behavioral sciences. Congressman Doug Walgren (D-PA) again proved to be a strong defender of the social and behavioral science programs of the Foundation. In addition to questioning Dr. Edward Knapp, NSF Director, about the Foundation's priorities when it increased its FY 1984 research budgets in math and the physical sciences to a greater extent than the social and behavioral sciences, he also expressed concern about eventual restoration of funds to those programs after the Reagan administration budget cuts of FY 1981 and FY 1982. Mr. Walgren reminded the Director that the Congress has consistently voted to restore funds to the social and behavioral research programs in the Foundation and that the NSF has not responded to that clear message from the Congress.

Mr. Walgren also asked the Director about how NSF planned to allocate approximately \$4 million in undirected funds for FY 1983, the current fiscal year. These funds, previously scheduled for use in the ocean drilling program, are now unassigned and could be used for social and behavioral science research. Dr. Knapp did not commit himself on how the funds would be used, but did tell the Subcommittee Chairman that he and his staff were concerned about how best to use the \$4 million. He said that he will make a decision by the end of the month. In response to Mr. Walgren's earlier remarks about the FY 1984 budget, Dr. Knapp replied that the budget was set prior to his appointment as Director of the Foundation. He then said that he will be totally responsible for the FY 1985 budget for NSF, suggesting, without specifically stating, that he would then be able to be more responsive to the Congress.

Mr. Walgren concluded his remarks by reminding Foundation officials that the budget cuts in the social and behavioral science programs were arbitrarily imposed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) without consultation with Foundation officials or with the National Science Board. History, he said, will show this to be "the real Achilles heel of this administration."

F. Thomas Juster, Herschel Leibowitz, and Joe Wyatt testified before the Subcommittee on behalf of the social, behavioral and information sciences. Copies of their testimony can be obtained from the COSSA office (202/234-5703).

March 11, 1983

SCIENCE POLICY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: REAGAN AND MITTERAND

At first glance, the similarities between the Reagan administration and the Mitterand government in France are few. In science policy, however, the two governments are following courses that bear at least surface resemblances.

Both the Reagan administration, through George A. Keyworth II, head of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), and the Mitterand government, under Jean-Pierre Chevènement, Minister of Science, Technology, and Industry, are placing special emphasis on the role of science and technology in improving economic conditions and easing the economic-political crisis in each nation. Both governments, moreover, are sharply increasing their support for research and development (R & D). In France, as the result of a law passed by the National Assembly on June 30, 1982, support of non-military R & D is scheduled to increase by 17.8 percent annually (in constant francs). In the United States, the total federal R & D budget request for FY 1984 is 17 percent over the previous year (in current dollars).

Yet despite these similarities in approach, the two countries also exhibit sharp differences in research policy. The U.S. is investing proportionally less in R & D than the French. The U.S. increase in FY 1984, in addition to being in current rather than constant dollars, includes both defense and non-military R & D. When military R & D is calculated separately, the non-military increase for FY 1984 shrinks to 0.4 percent.

Another critical difference between the two countries is the Mitterand government's repeated emphasis on the need to increase support for research in the social sciences as an essential aspect of its policy to use research to alleviate the economic crisis. Current French investments in social science research, which are scheduled to increase along with other areas of R & D, are motivated by the belief that France (and all industrial nations) will be faced with severe economic and social problems as a result of the introduction of new technologies. Although these technologies, such as computers, robotics, and satellite communications, are needed to solve current economic and industrial problems, they are expected to create new problems in their wake. The head of France's newly formed Center for Studies of Systems and Advanced Technologies, Jacques Robin, is particularly concerned about the unemployment that will accompany the new technologies. He and others in France are looking to the social and behavioral sciences for research on the technological, educational, and socio-political means to avoid or alleviate the worst problems in these areas.

March 11, 1983

SCIENCE POLICY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: REAGAN AND MITTERAND (cont.)

The Reagan government, in contrast, attempted initially to disable the social science research programs supported by the federal government in the U.S. Although a number of the early cuts have since been partially restored, the basic research programs at the National Science Foundation and other agencies such as the National Institute of Mental Health have not been brought back to their pre-Reagan levels, nor have the applied research programs in the mission agencies been maintained at their former levels. In its mid-term turn toward science and technology, the Reagan administration did increase the FY 1984 budgets for social and behavioral science research at some agencies. However its overall science policy seems to assume that industrial productivity can be increased and technological innovations introduced and adopted without attending to the social and behavioral foundations of such processes. Even President Reagan's much-vaunted discovery of the role of "structural" factors in the U.S. economy has not been accompanied by the recognition that "structural" factors are both the subject and the object of social science research.

The fact that both Mitterand and Reagan are looking to science and technology for assistance in meeting structural and other problems in their economies should not be surprising. Support has long been extended to science from both the right and the left. In France, for example, Mitterand's science policy resembles that of Charles de Gaulle more than that of his immediate predecessor, Giscard d'Estaing. In France under Giscard, support for research in the social and behavioral sciences declined by 25.8 percent in constant francs, an amount similar to the 22 percent decline in support for the social and behavioral sciences at the National Science Foundation in the U.S. under Reagan. Currently, much of the Mitterand effort in the social and behavioral sciences is devoted to undoing the effects of that decline.

Next issue: The next issue of the COSSA Washington Update will discuss the consequences of the decline in social science research support in France between 1976 and 1982, examining its effect on both the content of the research and the structure of the research enterprise.

BUDGET ANALYSIS UPDATE

COSSA's budget analysis, published in the February 11 issue of the COSSA Washington Update, included figures on the intramural budgets for the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), the National Institute on Aging (NIA), and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). COSSA has since received additional information on those budgets.

March 11, 1983

BUDGET ANALYSIS UPDATE (cont.)

The amount of NICHD intramural research funds that is spent in support of social and behavioral science research has risen from \$789,000 in FY 1981 to \$920,000 in FY 1983 but the proportion of those funds has remained constant at 3%. The NIA Budget Office estimates, however, that the social and behavioral sciences have received an increasingly smaller portion of the NIA intramural pie, 14% in FY 1981, 12% in FY 1982 and 10% in FY 1983. Although exact figures are not available because of the nature of their accounting figures, officials at NIMH estimate that only 5 to 10% of intramural funds are spent to support research in the social and behavioral sciences, this research is conducted by the Laboratory of Socio-Environmental Studies, headed by Melvin Kohn, and the Laboratory of Developmental Psychology, headed by Marion Yanow.

HOUSE PASSES SCIENCE EDUCATION BILL

The House of Representatives passed H.R. 1310, the Emergency Science and Mathematics Education Act, on March 2 by a vote of 348 to 54 (31 Members did not cast votes). The bill, reported by both the Education and Labor and the Science and Technology Committees, incorporates provisions of several different proposals. It authorizes \$1 billion to be spent over the next 5 years to improve mathematics and science instruction. Included in the legislation is authorization for \$125 million to the National Science Foundation, with \$5 million earmarked specifically to support educational research and development.

The Senate appears to be following the lead of the House and is incorporating various proposals into one omnibus science and math education bill, S. 530. The Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee, chaired by Senator Stafford of Vermont held hearings on the omnibus bill and other related science and math legislation on March 9. A second hearing is scheduled for April 7.

Both houses of Congress are treating the issue as emergency legislation. However, Rep. Carl Perkins (D-KY), Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, indicated during the floor debate on H.R. 1310 that his Committee may consider more comprehensive legislation later in the session:

"Many education associations supporting the bill...consider it only a short term, emergency response to our mathematics and science needs. I agree with this view. A broader, more comprehensive proposal will be brought before our committee at a later date and hearings will be held, and I hope such a bill can be reported."

March 11, 1983

OMB "GAG RULE" WITHDRAWN -- TO BE REVISED

The proposed OMB regulations (a revision of OMB Circular A-122) governing political activities by federal grantees and contractors in the non-profit sector (see COSSA Washington Update, February 25, 1983) will be replaced by a new proposal within the next few months, according to a letter sent this week to Representative Jack Brooks (D-TX) from OMB Director David Stockman. Stockman was replying to a letter from Brooks and 170 other Members of the House of Representatives urging that he "...postpone the issuance of any further directives concerning political advocacy activities of grantees and contractors until OMB has been able to hear and carefully consider the input of all interested groups and individuals and address the problem of use of Federal funds for political advocacy, to the extent that such a problem has been shown to exist, in a manner that is fair, reasonable, and constitutional." Brooks immediately followed up Stockman's reply, saying it was a step in the right direction, but asking for clarification of the status of the original proposed revisions of OMB Circular A-122. On March 10, OMB announced that the proposed regulations were being officially withdrawn.

Representative Brooks chaired hearings on March 1 by the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security on the proposed regulations. Over two dozen non-profit groups of all political persuasions testified and criticized the proposed regulations.

A copy of Mr. Stockman's letter is enclosed as Attachment 1.

HECKLER CONFIRMED, SWORN IN AS HHS SECRETARY

The Senate voted 82 to 3 on March 3 to confirm former Representative Margaret M. Heckler as Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Voting against her confirmation were Senators East and Helms of North Carolina and Packwood of Oregon. Secretary Heckler was sworn in on March 9. She succeeds Richard Schweiker as chief administrator of one of the government's largest federal agencies and one of the principal sponsors of social and behavioral science research.

As a Member of Congress and ranking minority Member of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, Secretary Heckler was an outspoken advocate of the restoration of funds to the social and behavioral science programs of the National Science Foundation.

March 11, 1983

SWEET DOWN, BUT NOT YET OUT AT NIE

In what a Washington Post article dubbed "one of the nimblest bureaucratic end runs in recent memory," Robert Sweet has been named Executive Director of the National Council for Educational Research (NCER). Sweet, a political conservative and former head of New Hampshire Citizens for Morality, a Moral Majority affiliate, had been replaced as Acting Director of the National Institute of Education (NIE) when the Senate confirmed the nomination of Dr. Manuel Justiz as NIE Director in the closing days of the 97th Congress.

Meeting on February 18, NCER, the policy-making body for NIE, passed several resolutions which would limit the administrative authority of the Director and give greater control over NIE to the Executive Director of NCER. Although it is anticipated that the resolutions will not be enacted, the action provoked Representatives Sylvio Conte (R-MA) and David Obey (D-WI) to allude to the possibility of withholding funds from NCER in FY 1984.

Dr. Justiz has assured representatives of the American Educational Research Association, a COSSA Affiliate, that the political haggling in which NCER is presently engaged will not interfere with the functioning of NIE.

NIA GETS NEW DIRECTOR

T. Franklin Williams, M.D., has been appointed Director of the National Institute on Aging (NIA). Dr. Williams is presently Professor of Preventive, Family and Rehabilitation Medicine at the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, where he is also Co-Director of the Center on Aging, University of Rochester Medical Center. Dr. Williams is a member of the Institute of Medicine (IOM), where he was chairman of a committee studying issues involving the frail elderly. NIA, one of the National Institutes of Health, was established in 1974 to conduct and support research and training in the biomedical, social and behavioral sciences as they relate to the aging process.

Dr. Matilda White Riley, Associate Director of NIA for Behavioral Sciences Research and a member of the search committee for the new NIA Director, has told COSSA that the committee was extremely pleased with the selection of Dr. Williams. She called the new Director "a fine medical researcher." Describing Dr. Williams' leadership of the IOM committee studying the frail elderly, Dr. Riley said he was "very responsive to the behavioral and social science point of view and showed imaginative understanding and great leadership ability."

Dr. Williams will assume his new post on July 1, 1983.

March 11, 1983

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD)

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

Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R)

FY 1983 Budget: The appropriation for PD&R is \$18 million for FY 1983. The same level of support was requested in the administration's budget for FY 1984.

Program Areas: HUD's "Guidelines for Submitting Unsolicited Proposals" describes HUD's research priorities:

"In 1981, PD&R totally reoriented its research priorities and increased its emphasis on its policy development funding. Efforts were made to ensure that the Department's research and evaluation activities were coordinated and coherent, and yielded practical and useful results. PD&R's research was redirected toward projects that (1) improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and equity of the Department's programs and (2) reduce costs."

Disciplines Supported: Mostly economics, some sociology and political science.

Funding Mechanisms: Overwhelmingly contracts, solicitations for which are published in Commerce Business Daily. PD&R does accept unsolicited research proposals, but funds only 1 or 2 per year.

Restrictions on Awards: Cost sharing is required.

Review Processes Employed: In-house for the most part. Proposals are sent out for review if none of HUD's 120 member research staff has expertise in a particular area.

Contact Person: Charles Taylor, Director
Division of Budget, Contracts and Program Control
Office of Policy Development and Research
Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20410



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

Attachment 1

RECEIVED

MAR 9 1983

Honorable Jack Brooks
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Dear Jack:

On February 25, 1983, we announced that our proposed amendments to OMB Circular A-122 would not be made final and that a new proposal would be published for public comments for 45 days. We also announced that any revisions to A-122 would not apply to grants or contracts entered into during this fiscal year. We had intended to publish the revised amendments for public comment in two weeks from the date of the announcement--March 11. Because of the large number of comments received on our original proposals and the requests of several Members of Congress, including yourself, that we fully brief the concerned Committees on any revision, we plan to take more time to ensure that the necessary consultation process is followed prior to the publication of a new proposal. This will permit full consideration of the many comments received as well as needed coordination with Congress and the Comptroller General.

I am confident that a new proposal can meaningfully address our objective that appropriated funds should not be used, directly or indirectly, to pay the expenses of those who lobby on government matters, while meeting the criticisms of the initial proposal. This new proposal will be designed to implement the many statutory restrictions on the use of appropriated funds to pay for lobbying that Congress has enacted over the past several years. Although the comments indicate that the original proposal has gone further than we intended, the comments, including those of the Comptroller General, also support our view that more can be done to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not used to pay for lobbying activities.

I expect that we will publish, within the next few months, a new proposal that more closely conforms to the comments of interested parties.

Sincerely,

David A. Stockman
Director

IDENTICAL LETTERS TO CONGRESSMAN FRANK HORTON, SENATORS
WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., THOMAS F. EAGLETON AND DAVE DURENBERGER

