

16 November 1973

J. R. Wittenborn, Ph.D., President
American College of Neuropsychopharmacology
Interdisciplinary Research Center
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

Dear Dick:

First, I want to thank you for your cooperation in resolving the issue of my invitation to Dr. Henk Van Riezen.

I have read your memorandum of November 6, and I am writing to respond to this. Two issues strike me: the bylaws and present policies of the fellowship; and the need --as pictured by Council--for additional income.

In the early years of the ACNP, when it was decided to keep the meetings small, the Fellows voted to limit the number of members, and in succeeding years restricted the invitation of guests to one per Fellow. I cannot recall, and in checking the bylaws cannot find, any stipulation as to who may be invited. The assumption has always been that the Fellow inviting a guest would do so for the purpose of expanding the participation in the activities at the meeting. For example, I have invited co-workers as guests when I thought that they could contribute to the sessions or when I thought it would help their education. I have also invited prospective members, and in the past years invited foreign collaborating scientists because I have wished to encourage a broader participation by the Fellows and laboratories not represented in this country. Indeed, Turan Itil, Martin Katz, and I have carried this mission so far that we have invited a number of foreign scientists who have no affiliation in this country to participate in an ad hoc meeting next month.

In this regard, I believe it is an undue assumption of authority for the Secretary, the President, or even the Council to reject an invitation extended by a Fellow. Whether Fellows should or should not invite guests to the 1974 meeting could be raised next month. If the decision is made that guests are to be invited, it is clearly each Fellow's privilege to invite whomever he pleases, and I would hope the Fellows would not delegate a veto power to any officer or to Council, but would trust the good judgment of each Fellow.

The second issue, that of the need of the ACNP for additional funds, is one that should be discussed by the Council and the fellowship next month. I think it is demeaning for the ACNP to set a quota or levy a tax on industry. Should the ACNP really need funds for missions that are in the public interest, a description of the mission, a call to the fellowship with a concurrent letter sent through the fellowship to industry, would probably bring a voluntary response consistent with the use to which the funds would be put. As it is now, neither the fellowship nor industry has been presented with a clear statement as to how the funds are spent. True, there is a financial report at each meeting, but this is glossed over. Indeed, my recollection is that the ACNP has almost \$50,000 in its treasury. (At the last meeting, I was struck by the observation that the ACNP was the second-richest organization to which I belong.)

In driving to work yesterday morning, I listened to a replay of the Senate Watergate hearings, in which the President of American Airlines indicated the pressure that Mr. Nixon's lawyers placed on industry. Reflecting on his associates and their actions, I felt these to be immoral, if not illegal. To what extent would a policy of a multi-thousand-dollar tariff for industry to participate in an educational meeting such as ours be considered of borderline morality?

I am prepared to discuss the policy of charging high membership fees to U.S. industry representatives. I should like the Council's views to be discussed by the fellowship with the view that the policy be changed. I believe that the ACNP will be on firmer ethical and financial grounds if participation in the meetings is separated from the issues of fund raising and expenditures.

Sincerely yours,

Max Fink, M.D.
Professor of Psychiatry