

# PSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY NEWSLETTER

(DIVISION 28 - THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION)

ISSUE No. 4, OCTOBER 1982

D. R. CHEREK, EDITOR

## Past Newsletter-Editor-L.D. Byrd

On behalf of all Division 28 members, I want to thank Larry Byrd for serving as Editor of the Division 28 Newsletter. Larry Byrd became editor in the fall of 1976, succeeding Travis Thompson. During the past six years, he has provided Division 28 members with a quarterly newsletter of consistently high quality. He will continue to serve Division 28 as our president during 1982-83. Again, Larry, thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Allocation of Votes

Each year, members of APA have an opportunity to determine their representation on the APA Council of Representatives by allocating apportionment votes to the various divisions and state associations of APA. A total of ten apportionment votes is available to each member, and the member can assign all ten to one division or state organization, or one or more votes to each of several divisions. The number of representatives a given division has on the Council is determined by the number of votes assigned to that division by all members of APA.

Division 28 presently has one seat on the Council of Representatives; other divisions have several seats. During recent years, Division 28 has come precariously close to losing its one seat due to a failure of APA members, and especially Division 28 members, to allocate a large number of their votes to the Division. A minimum of 0.50% of the total votes allocated by all members of APA must be assigned to Division 28 in order to retain our seat on the Council. In recent years, the Division has consistently received less than 0.50%, barely enough to assure one seat.

Your vote does make a difference. Allocating some of your votes to Division 28 is one way you can express your support for the Division. Allocating all ten votes to Division 28 will guarantee the retention of our seat on the Council and assure the presence of a voice speaking in our behalf. With other divisions experiencing a rate of growth greater than ours, we must have more members allocating all ten votes for Division 28.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Animal Rights

Last fall a number of animal protection bills were introduced in congress. In various ways, APA worked to amend this legislation to reflect behavioral scientists viewpoints and needs. One bill, H. R. 6928, was approved by the House Science and Technology Committee. It was sponsored by Representatives Fuqua, Walgren, Heckler, Brown of California, Roe, Lundine, Dymally, Fisk, Schuler, Carney, Young of Missouri, Ertel, Fauntroy, Lantos, Jacobs, Wylie, Moffett, and Mikulski. Your representative or APA's Scientific Affairs Office can provide a copy of the bill.

As approved by the Science and Technology Committee, H. R. 6928 will promote the development of alternatives to the use of animals in experiments by providing special grants aimed at developing alternative models. The Department of Health and Human Services would administer the grant program. H. R. 6928 will also require evidence of having met "rigorous standards" of accreditation in proposals submitted to federal granting and contracting agencies. Proposals, involving animal use, to agencies for financial support will be scrutinized by Health and Human Services to insure that the work will minimize potential pain and distress to the animals. The proposed legislation would require laboratories to show compliance with NIH's "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals" for funding. Full accreditation by the Association for the Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care or a similar accrediting body will be necessary within ten years. At present, only 171 of 566 institutions receiving NIH support for research using animals are accredited by ALAC.

Division members who are concerned with the provision of H. R. 6928 and the direction of recently proposed legislation in this area should let Kate O'Bryant in APA's Scientific Affairs office know they want to receive information on the topic. In addition, invite your representative and/or senator to visit your lab when he or she is next in the district. Often this is a relatively quiet period for people who are accustomed to a hectic pace. Most representatives are open to new information. If you make the importance of your work clear to them and they see that your animal procedures are reasonable, your voice and that of APA will continue to be heard on these bills. H. R. 6928 will come to the House for a vote when Congress reconvenes.

M. Kilbey

\*\*\*\*\*

#### 1982 APA Meeting in Washington, D.C.

Part of the informal paper sessions at the 1982 APA Meeting included a discussion of research funding. The discussion leader was C.R. Schuster, and the participants were, L.D. Byrd, R. Pickens and J.H. Woods. Many in attendance commented favorably about the content of these discussions. Because of these comments, and the relevance of the topic to all Division 28 members, I have asked each participant to write a short summary of their remarks and thoughts on this subject. Some of these articles will be published in the next issue of the newsletter.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### RESEARCH FUNDS

The current funding situation in Washington is certainly not encouraging for anyone interested in basic research in the behavioral and biomedical sciences. Congressionally authorized funding levels for categorical institutes have been reduced, funds for certain programs have been deleted as those programs have been relegated to block-grant status, and certain areas of research have been placed "off limits" by the present administration. Overall, the number of grants supported by Federal funds is decreasing.

Each year when the Federal budget is being prepared, questions are raised about which agencies will get increases or decreases in funds. There are always rumors that certain agencies will receive major cuts or even be abolished. For the individual scientist, it is important not to let budget discussions affect grant or contract activity in a negative way. The best strategy is to maintain contact with the agencies one would normally deal with, in addition to others of potential interest. It is quite important for scientists to keep submitting applications for research funds, because applications and proposals are the existence of a review committee and an agency. If the number of applications and the work load of a committee diminish to a sufficiently low level, there is little justification for that committee and funding in that area may be discontinued.

Although agencies with the best financial outlook should be near the top of one's list for research funds, those which may seem to be facing large cuts and related difficulties should not be forgotten. Often, an agency or program may be slated for discontinuation, only to be funded quite well at the last moment. Having an application on file could mean the opportunity to receive support that normally might not be available.

Members of the Division of Psychopharmacology should reach out and contact persons in agencies that are interested in trying to develop new areas of research activities or new and novel approaches to old problems. Division 28 can claim the membership of several scientist-administrators within the Federal government, and most of them are more than willing to provide information and to assist the individual scientist in his or her quest for funds. Many of these scientist-administrators have indicated a strong commitment to finding ways in which their agencies can support research on drugs and behavior, even though their agencies have not traditionally been a major source of funds for behavioral pharmacology.

Finally, a significant but easily underestimated threat to research in behavioral pharmacology, psychopharmacology and drug abuse is the renewed activity of groups dedicated to preventing laboratory studies with animals. These groups can have as detrimental an effect on research as cuts in grant funds. Without substantial research support from Federal agencies, a scientist can continue some level of laboratory activity, albeit reduced. The stated objectives of various animal protection groups, however, is to stop studies with animals, in which case no amount of Federal support will enable the scientist to conduct research. It behooves all members of the scientific community to communicate to their representatives in Congress the dangers represented by these animal protection groups and continued reductions in research funds.

L. D. Byrd

\*\*\*\*\*

I strongly believe that members of the Division should not have tunnel vision in looking for sources of research support. We often fail to recognize the many achievements that have been made in the area of behavioral pharmacology over the past decade or so, and also fail to recognize the extent to which these achievements have significance to a variety of health-related research fields. Thus, we should be looking to a number of funding sources for project support, not just the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), as we have typically relied on in the past.

Both NIDA and NIMH have been very supportive of the research activities of the Division in the past, and, for this, certainly deserve our continuing support. In particular, the staffs of these institutes have long recognized the need for basic behavioral research and have been most helpful in securing funds that have, in turn, been made available through research grants to members of the Division. However, in these troubled economic times, we should recognize that our science has grown and that we have contributions to make to other institutions as well. Therefore, we should also be looking to other federal agencies and non-federal agencies as potential sources of research funding.

Among federal agencies, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) is an obvious source of potential research support. The National Cancer Institute (NCI) is another example of a federal agency that has shown some interest in behavioral research. Basic research on behavioral factors in nicotine self-administration and on smoking topography are two areas in which NCI has expressed a research interest. Both the National Institute on Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and the National Institute on Aging (NIA) have also expressed an interest in behavioral pharmacological studies. Both grant and contract funding are available from these agencies. Among non-federal agencies, pharmaceutical companies have a long history of support of behavioral pharmacological research.

It should be recognized, however, that as one moves away from NIDA and NIMH as sources of federal grant support, it will be increasingly difficult to obtain funding for basic animal studies of variables controlling behavior. Other agencies simply do not appear to be as interested in the study of behavior qua science as are NIDA and NIMH. Instead these other agencies appear to be more interested in the application of existing behavioral technology to their areas of interest than in the development of a better understanding in the structure of behavior itself. Nevertheless, the other federal agencies offer a strong possibility of grant support, for research directed towards the more immediate understanding of human health problems.

Because the amount of money appropriated for research has not kept up with inflation, it would appear that the number of grant applications being funded is being reduced while at the same time the amount of each award is being increased. This suggests to me that the direction of research funding is towards fewer and larger research projects. My concern is with the future of the small-size research project. If fewer and larger projects continues to be the direction of federal

funding, the result will most surely be a reduction in the diversity of research being conducted in the area. While the ADAMHA Small Grant Program is intended as a seed for new research ideas, the gulf between the maximum amount of the Small Grant and the increasingly larger amount of the regular grant is widening and becoming more difficult to span. Perhaps some consideration should be given at the present time to increasing the maximum amount of single awards in the Small Grant Program or to changing the current funding policy to insure adequate funding in the future for the small-size research grant.

Roy Pickens

\*\*\*\*\*

Division 28 Business Meeting  
August 26, 1982 - Washington, D.C.

President Falk called the meeting to order at 2 pm. About thirty members were present. The minutes of the August 1981 Business Meeting, which had been published in the Newsletter, were accepted without revision.

President Falk announced that J. Woods had been elected President-elect and R. Baister had been elected Member-at-Large. He also announced that the Executive Committee had made the following appointments: M. Stitzer and D. Overton will continue, respectively, as Treasurer and Membership Chair (until 1985), Elkan Ganzu will be Program Chair for the 1984 Meeting, and D. Cherek will succeed Larry Byrd as Newsletter Editor. In addition, the Executive Committee made the following nominations for elected office: J. Harvey and C. Kornetsky as President-elect, and L. Dykstra and E. Gritz as Member-at-Large. No further nominations were made from the floor. A list of the current membership of the Executive Committee is appended to these minutes, as is the membership of three ad hoc committees.

Larry Byrd reported that our Newsletter currently goes to 1000-1100 members and other interested persons. He also announced that D. Cherek has agreed to succeed him as Editor. Members with suggestions for Newsletter items are requested to contact: Dr. Don R. Cherek; Department of Psychiatry; PO Box 33932; Shreveport, LA 71130. It was moved and agreed that the Division extend thanks to Larry Byrd for his efforts at making the Newsletter a success during his tenure as Editor.

Maxine Stitzer reported that the Division has approximately seven thousand dollars, which is now in our own interest-bearing account (having been withdrawn from the APA Central Office). We now have 13 Corporate Affiliates, due partly to the

diligent efforts of President Falk in encouraging corporate contributions. A list of the Corporate Affiliates will be published in a forthcoming issue of the Newsletter.

The Division congratulates the following members who have been elected to Fellow status in the Division:

H. Begleiter  
L. Dykstra  
H. Evans  
E. Gritz  
H. Moscovitz  
R. Siegel  
J. Stewart  
M. Stitzer.

M. Kilbey, APA Council Representative, reported that APA is considering publication of *PsychSCAN* in various topic areas including psychopharmacology. This is a quarterly publication containing abstracts of published papers in defined topic areas. It was suggested that this might be an appropriate place for the Division to explore the possibility of publishing abstracts of papers presented at the Annual APA Meeting. This possibility will be brought to the attention of a division subcommittee charged with exploring various options for publications of abstracts (see appended list).

Alice Young (Program Chair, 1982) reported that APA is considering changing the convention format to one in which various selected topic areas are emphasized rather than organizing the program along traditional divisional lines. J. Howard (Program Chair 1983) invited members' suggestions for the 1983 program in Anaheim.

R. Balster reported that preliminary arrangements are being made for the Division to hold a joint meeting with the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics (ASPET) at the 1984 Federation meetings in St. Louis. A request is pending to grant Division 28 members official "guest-member" status for this meeting, which would mean that they would receive relevant mailings and pay a reduced registration fee. Program suggestions for this meeting should be transmitted either to R. Balster or L. Seiden.

President Falk noted that he and several members (Schuster, Bigelow, Woods) have written a "position paper" on future directions and needs for research in psychopharmacology, to be published in the October 1982 issue of the *American Psychologist*. It was called to the attention of members that the division currently has three committees charged with specific responsibilities. Suggestions or comments should be forwarded to these committees (see below).

Finally, it was moved and carried that the division membership extend thanks to John Falk for his excellent performance as President during the current year.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Division 28 Executive Committee, 1982-1983

##### Elected Officers:

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| President        | L. Byrd  |
| President-elect  | J. Woods   |
| Past-President   | J. Falk  |
| Council rep.     | M. Kilbey  |
| Members-at-Large | L. Gollub (83)<br>G. Bigelow (84)<br>R. Balster (85) |

##### Appointed Officers:

|                      |                             |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Treasurer            | M. Stitzer                  |
| Secretary            | J. McKearney                |
| Program Chair        | J. Howard                   |
| Past Program Chair   | A. Young                    |
| Program Chair elect  | E. Ganzu                    |
| Newsletter Editor    | D. Cherek                   |
| Membership Chair     | D. Overton                  |
| CPDD Liaison         | J. Woods                    |
| Public Info. Officer | C. Schuster                 |
| ASPET Liaison        | R. Balster and<br>L. Seiden |

## Division 28, Ad Hoc Committees

1. To explore the feasibility of publishing abstracts of APA papers: D. Cherek, H. Barry, R. Balster and L. Byrd.
2. To explore a possible division award for an outstanding dissertation in psychopharmacology: L. Byrd, J. Howard and J. Woods.
3. To plan division reaction to pending legislation on limitations on the use of experimental animals: C. Schuster and M. Kilbey.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Council Representative's Report

This column is the first in what will be a regular series reporting to the membership the actions taken by the Council of Representatives as well as Council-related activities during my term as Division 28's representative. Since form dictates function, a word on structure. APA's Council is divided into two forums: 1 and 2 with 1 being predominantly professional/applied and 2 research/academic. These forums meet prior to full meetings of the Council. They are intended to debate agenda items especially relative to the subunit and to bring recommendations to the full Council. This structure was adapted in an attempt to reconcile conflicts of interest and discrepancies in relative power between the subunits. It (the structure) they (the forums) are not working. Most representatives split their vote between the two forums. Many of the same people take in both forum meetings or don't talk until the full meeting ("holding my fire until it really counts" was the comment I heard from several representatives), and Forum 1 even moved to abolish the system which is in a trial period. This motion was defeated - more I suspect from an absence of an alternative than from a commitment to the forum structure. In addition to the forum, there are committees and boards and the informal caucuses. Division 28 is a member of the Research Academic Forum (this means I cast a full vote during its meetings) and the Academic/Research Caucus and since Anatomy is Destiny, I have joined the Women's Caucus. Since I participated actively in all these units, a considerable portion of the convention week was spent in meetings.

The cumbersome structure certainly does not facilitate rapid solution of problems, and one has to score somewhere near the 90th percentile on the manic scale to feel that anything at all is being accomplished. The following is a synopsis of issues that I found interesting and may be of interest to you.

## Actions

(1) Dissatisfaction has been expressed over the criteria for election of fellow. Each division has been asked to submit an explanation of its interpretation of APA's policy on fellow status and its nomination criteria. A subcommittee (Siegel, Abeles, Ketzwill, Kinble and Staudt-Sexton) will review the criteria for consistency and validity and report in December. A motion to broaden fellow criteria failed.

(2) Council passed a motion forbidding one to serve simultaneously on more than one standing board or committee and rejected a motion to require a one-year hiatus between terms on boards or committees.

(3) The APA Psychology Defense fund has raised \$185,000 since its inception and made approximately 3 dozen awards (loans, grants, challenge/match grants).

(4) Approved division of the Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology beginning Jan. 1983 into (1) Journal of Comparative Psychology and (2) Behavioral Neuroscience.

(5) Adopted a policy statement on "Creationism" which defines creationism as "a set of religious doctrines that do not conform to criteria of Science".

(6) Heard reports on APA's political actions on: NSF research authorizations and appropriations, research and research training appropriations for NIMH, NIMH clinical training funds, mental health benefits in federal insurance programs, NIE's budget and programs, and animal research legislation.

(7) Endorsed a nuclear freeze resolution.

## Issues

(1) Structure, balance of power among applied and academic factions as outlined above.

(2) "Limits of advocacy". To what extent should council take stands on public/social issues. How does one define "psychology's special interests and expertise"?

(3) "Proliferation of Divisions". There is a moratorium on creation of new divisions (two nascent divisions are concerned with families and gays). Should or how should feeble divisions be dissolved. Both (2) and (3) are, of course, debates on the proper content of psychology and APA's role as a professional/political organization.

(4) The MA psychologist: Role and function reconsidered in light of fact that the National Association of School Psychologists and APA are to jointly accredit school psychology programs and NASP takes a more equalitarian view of the MA.

In summary, interactions on Council have the makings of a terrific Saturday Night Live skit. I love it and plan to see that Division 28's views are heard.

M. Kilbey

\*\*\*\*\*

~~1983 APA Meeting in Anaheim, California -~~  
Message from the Program Chair, James L. Howard

Jim wishes to convey the following information to those Division 28 members who will be submitting symposia and/or papers for the 1983 Meeting. Prior to formal submissions, usually around January 20, 1983, please send him tentative ideas for themes and symposia prior to this formal deadline. Jim also wants you to send names of suggested speakers for the 83 Meeting. He wishes to particularly encourage submission of symposia. Please send this information to:

Dr. James L. Howard  
Department of Pharmacology  
Burrhoughs, Wellcome, Co.  
3030 Cornwallis Road  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

\*\*\*\*\*

ITEMS WANTED OR FOR SALE

Wanted: Used pigeon rack to house 16-20 birds.  
Contact Chris E. Jonsson, Psychiatry, University of Chicago, 950 E. 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637, (312) 962-6361.

\*\*\*\*\*

Members wishing to submit information or articles for inclusion in future Division 28 Newsletters, should send them to:

D. R. Cherek  
Department of Psychiatry  
LSU Medical Center  
P.O. Box 33932  
Shreveport, LA 71130

\*\*\*\*\*

I would like to include an items wanted or for sale section and pre- and postdoctoral training information in each issue.

\*\*\*\*\*