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A NEW MODEL OF ADVOCACY

But first a word from: THE OLDER MODEL
Non-Science Advocates

A NEW MODEL OF ADVOCACY
Congressional View of Science
APS in Washington

“How can you help us?”

“How can we help you?”
Palm greasing, back-slapping, Gucci-wearing, backroom-dealing, power-lunching, campaign-contributing, ...
APS in Washington
**APS Draft:** The Committee is deeply concerned that … NIH has not complied with Congressional directives to increase funding of basic and applied behavioral research.

[This includes] health and behavior; personality research; social and developmental psychology across the lifespan; thinking and cognitive science; treatment effectiveness; psychopathology; and the biological bases of behavior. What distinguishes these areas is that, with some exceptions, they are primarily aimed at the level of the whole person (or animal), many times in the context of the family or social structure.

**Final Legislation:** The Committee is deeply concerned that NIH has not complied with past congressional directives to increase funding of basic and applied behavioral research and expects the Office to ensure that NIH increases significantly the amount of its overall budget devoted to basic and applied behavioral research.

[This includes] health and behavior; personality research; social and developmental psychology across the lifespan; thinking and cognitive science; treatment effectiveness; psychopathology; and the biological bases of behavior. What distinguishes these areas is that they focus primarily on the whole person, many times in the context of family or social structure.
In my field, Psychology, a new mechanism is allowing young PhDs to collect pilot data while learning how things work at NIH. Known as B/START, these grants are designed to reverse the ‘graying’ of the field and support new investigators …
NIMH Behavioral Science Centers

NIMH Director responds to an APS proposal for behavioral research centers.

(was millions of dollars in funding over many years)
Influencing NIH

Preserving Behavioral Peer Review when NIMH moved to NIH: “The American Psychological Society worked closely with lawmakers in the Senate and the House...”
NSF: Anatomy of a Directorate

Rep. Doug Walgren, Chair, House NSF Authorizations:
“APS is the origin of the movement toward a separate directorate. APS really created the legislation that [House Science Chair] George Brown and I introduced.”
The Players

ANATOMY OF A DIRECTORATE

Sen. Barbara Mikulski
Sen. Daniel Inouye
Sen. John Kerry
Rep. Rick Boucher
Rep. George Brown
Rep. Doug Walgren
Rep. Robert Traxler

Walter Massey
NSF Director
Anatomy of a Directorate

Robert Traxler, Chair
NSF Appropriations
To Rep. Walgren, Chair, House NSF Authorizations:
“I hope you will continue your efforts to push NSF’s leadership to seriously examine their treatment of behavioral and social science.”
To Rep. Traxler, Chair,
House NSF Appropriations:
“Following my testimony [on a separate NSF Directorate], you indicated your support and offered to look more seriously into the matter. I want you to know how welcome this is.”
“Summit representatives generated a list of broad themes ... such as advocating a separate Psychology Directorate in the NSF.”
# Golden Fleece Awards

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td>Tequila Drinking Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td>Great Wall of Bedford, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td>How Long to Cook Breakfast?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong></td>
<td>New Jersey Sewer Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong></td>
<td>Why Do Bowlers Smile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong></td>
<td>Tennis Cheaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong></td>
<td>What is Love?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong></td>
<td>$2 Million Patrol Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong></td>
<td>Basketball Therapy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOME MEMORABLE WINNERS**
APS in Washington

A NEW MODEL OF ADVOCACY
A Streetcar Named Psychology

“I have always depended on the kindness of strangers.”
Separate Directorate a Priority

“Our highest NSF priority should be a separate directorate for behavioral and social sciences.”
United States Senate
Suite 212, Hart Senate Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-1102
(202) 224-3834
FAX (202) 224-6747

January 18, 1991

Dr. Frederick M. Bernthal
Acting Director
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20550

Dear Dr. Bernthal:

I am writing to bring to your attention language that was included in the FY 1991 HUD, Veteran’s Affairs and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill relating to the establishment of a separate directorate for behavioral and social sciences at the National Science Foundation (NSF). This language was included at my request, and I have attached a copy for your information.

I note that the Foundation appeared to be aware of the recent efforts, particularly to the 21st Century Task Force, to understand that the Task Force is planning to recommend the establishment of a separate directorate for behavioral and social sciences in a way that maintains a strong connection between biological research and research in psychology and other behavioral sciences. My colleagues on the Senate Appropriations Committee and I look forward to receiving the Task Force report.

However, the Committee has requested a report by January 31, 1991. I would like to have a summary of your activities to date concerning the establishment of a separate directorate for the behavioral and social sciences and further, your plans for implementing the recommendations of the Task Force report. This report should include an assessment of the status of NSF funding in these areas.

Daniel Inouye
Senator Appropriations

Sen. Inouye: “I would like to have a summary of your activities to date concerning the establishment of a separate directorate ... My colleagues on the Senate Appropriations Committee and I look forward to receiving the Task Force report.”
The [Senate Appropriations] Committee is aware that a Foundation-convened task force recommended the establish a separate directorate for behavioral and social science research. The Committee directs the Foundation to respond to this committee...

Barbara Mikulski, Chair Senate Appropriations

---

### Calendar No. 854

101st Congress 2nd Session  
Senate Report 101-474

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1991

September 26 (legislative day. September 30, 1990.—Ordered to be printed

Ms. Mikulski, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

**REPORT**

[To accompany H.R. 5158]

The Committee on Appropriations to which was referred the bill (H.R. 5158) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith an explanation of the contents of the bill.

**AMOUNT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of bill as recommended in House</td>
<td>$80,660,024,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of change by Committee</td>
<td>-2,069,485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of bill as reported to Senate</td>
<td>78,588,479,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of appropriations to date, 1990</td>
<td>56,148,162,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of budget estimates, 1991</td>
<td>75,861,485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over estimate for 1991</td>
<td>+2,726,994,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over appropriations for 1980</td>
<td>+12,440,317,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairs Brown and Walgren: “A thoughtful and balanced assessment of the impact of such a [Behavioral Science] Directorate would be most helpful as Congress considers legislation.”

George E. Brown, Chair
House Science Cmte
Time goes on ... and on
Once a pain in the ass, always a pain in the ass.
Senate Interest Continues

“The [Senate] Committee directs NSF to examine the recommendations that NSF create a separate directorate and increase funding for psychology, behavioral science, and social science.”
Testifying before NSF

“A behavioral and social science directorate should be funded at a level comparable to other directorates and in keeping with NSF as a whole.”
“We urge this Committee to direct that NSF study the concept of a separate directorate for behavioral and social science research at NSF, and report back to the Committee before next year's appropriations hearings.”
In the House and Senate:

“To establish a Directorate for Behavioral and Social Sciences within the National Science Foundation”
Introduced in the House

**Rep. Brown:** “Mr. Speaker, 65 psychological organizations during a National Behavioral Science Summit held under the auspices of the American Psychological Society ... voted overwhelmingly that a separate directorate at NSF would be a priority.”
Sen. Kerry: “Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Behavioral and Social Science Directorate Act... to help solve the continuing problem of insufficient NSF funding for behavioral and social sciences.”

John Kerry
Senate Authorizations
Walgren Out

Doug Walgren, Chair
House Authorizations
Boucher In

Rick Boucher, Chair
House Authorizations
“Mr. Chairman: As you requested, I am providing details on the issue of a separate NSF directorate... Your serious consideration of our request to reintroduce legislation to establish a separate directorate is greatly appreciated.”
Rep. Brown, House Science Chair: “...the establishment of a Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences at NSF should help focus attention on the importance of psychological research.”
The NSF Announcement

"NSF needs to develop these fields through a directorate level focus ... The reorganization is an acknowledgement of the rapidly advancing [social, behavioral, and economic sciences.]"
The social sciences have been put on par with [other] disciplines ... The change can be attributed to effective lobbying ...
Social scientists ... have lobbied long and hard for their own directorate. APS points out that the move will put the [behavioral and social] sciences on a par with the other disciplines in NSF hierarchy.
The Directorate in Science and Government Report

NSF Gives Social Sciences Their Own Directorate

In the venerable Washington quest for a name on the door if not on the building, the social and behavioral sciences achieved victory last week in their protracted campaign for an enclave of their own at the National Science Foundation. Director Walter Massey announced the achievement along with several other organizational shifts at the Foundation, including the creation of an Office of Planning and Assessment to gauge the effectiveness of NSF’s big programs.

To the lineup of disciplinary directorates at NSF, until now seven in all, will be added the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences (SBES). The new structure, Massey said, “will accelerate research, allow a new national focus on the social sciences, and better support interdisciplinary research.”

Science projects that aroused Congressional ire, particularly that of now-retired Senator William Proxmire. Whether because of an ideologically well-scrubbed research agenda, good luck, or whatever, NSF has been free of political flareups in recent years. But not so the National Institutes of Health, which, under the gun of right wingers in the parent Department of Health and Human Services, has cancelled two surveys on sexual behavior over the past six months. Asked at a press briefing if political intrusions into the field were likely, Massey merely

“Steady lobbying and working on Congressional friends also helped bring about the change. In the vanguard ... the American Psychological Society.”
Honorary APS’r

Rep. Rick Boucher proudly wears APS gang colors.

Shouldn’t you?
Positive Results

NSF Deputy Director Anne Petersen: “This would never have happened without APS.”
Not Always Smooth Sailing

The House ... is expected to adopt language that urges NSF to think seriously about eliminating its SBE directorate ...
$213.8 million in funding

Human and Social Dynamics: $41.5 million (some outside SBE)

Science of Learning Centers: was $36.5 million

SBE Centers (last in 05): $8.5 million
National Institutes of Health

$28.7 Billion
27 Institutes and Centers

(That’s a lot.)

1,511,321,748 CDs
## Behavior and Social Science Research by NIH Institute

FY 2001 as reported by NIH, in Millions: **B&S Total=$2,100.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Amount (in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIMH</td>
<td>$358.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDA</td>
<td>$342.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIAAA</td>
<td>$163.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINR</td>
<td>$85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHGRI</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIBIB</td>
<td>$71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHD</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCAM</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCMHD</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIC</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLM</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>$21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI</td>
<td>$238.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHLBI</td>
<td>$113.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDCR</td>
<td>$22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDDK</td>
<td>$38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGMS</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGMS</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHD</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEI</td>
<td>$49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEHS</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIA</td>
<td>$194.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIAMS</td>
<td>$17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDCD</td>
<td>$71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NIGMS Statute

“The general purpose of NIGMS is the conduct and support of research and training ... with respect to general or basic medical sciences and related natural or behavioral sciences.”
American Psychological Society

Testimony of the

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY
ALAN G. KRAUT, PH.D.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

on

FY 2000 APPROPRIATIONS

for the

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

before the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

of the

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THE HONORABLE JOHN E. PORTER
CHAIR
Wednesday, April 21, 1999
2:00 pm

“We ask the Committee to encourage development of a plan for basic behavioral science research at NIGMS.”
The Committee encourages NIGMS to support basic behavioral research...
The Committee believes that NIGMS has a scientific mandate to support basic behavioral research ...
Testimony to National Academy of Sciences

"The legislative charge to NIGMS is to support basic research. As far as I can tell, they are not following their mandate in behavioral research."

Statement of

The American Psychological Society

to the

National Research Council's
Committee on National Needs for Biomedical and Behavioral Research

presented by

Alan G. Kraut, Ph.D.
Executive Director
NAS Responds

“Each of the NIH institutes should insure that its training portfolio includes representation from behavioral and social sciences.”
NIGMS Speaks: But It’s Always “NO!”

NIGMS: “Behavioral studies largely fall outside of the Institute’s mission.”
TESTIMONY ON THE FY 2002 BUDGET OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
before the
Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
THE HONORABLE RALPH REGULA, CHAIR

March 14, 2001
9:30 am

Organization: AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY
Witness: ALAN G. KRAUT, PH.D., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Summary of Recommendations
- As a member of the Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding, APS recommends $23.7 billion for NIH in FY 2002 as the 4th installment of the 5-year doubling plan.
- APS requests Committee support for increased behavioral and social science research and training at NIH…

“APS requests Committee support for increased behavioral and social science research and training at NIH…”
From: Alan Kraut  
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2002 4:43 PM  
To: Matt Braunstein  
Subject: NIH Answers to Kennedy Questions

Dear Matt,

Just wanted to send my thanks for once again encouraging Mr. Kennedy to ask Marvin Cassman about behavioral science and mental health research at NIGMS. You both have been great on this.

You probably know that Cassman has announced his retirement from NIH. Since he has been a source of resistance in all this, I think his departure creates another opportunity. Suppose I draft a letter for Mr. Kennedy to send to Ruth Kirschstein and the NIGMS search committee, giving a brief history of Mr. Kennedy’s concern with a particular issue, and expressing that NIH has not been as forthcoming as might be hoped. Then Mr. Kennedy could ask that the next director of the NIGMS be more sensitive to this general set of issues. Would you be willing to take a look at what I draft?

Again, thanks for your support. Best, Alan

“[Think] Mr. Kennedy could ask that the next Director of NIGMS be more sensitive to [behavioral science?]”
Dear Dr. Kirschstein

I am writing to you regarding the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) and the search for its new director. You may know that I have been encouraging NIGMS to establish a program in basic behavioral science research and training. As a former director yourself, you know that NIGMS is the only National Institute specifically mandated to support basic research. That mandate includes basic behavioral science. (U.S. Code Title 42, Chapter 6A, Subchapter III, Part C, Subpart 11, Sec. 285.) The general purpose of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences is the conduct and support of research with respect to general or basic medical sciences and related natural or behavioral sciences which have significance for two or more other national research institutes or not outside the general area of responsibility of any other national research institute.) Still, despite the mandate, NIGMS does not fund basic behavioral science research and training.

NIGMS has benefited greatly from Congress' effort to double its budget. One result has been that many NIH institutes devote significant resources to behavioral science. But I believe that NIGMS should be leading these initiatives rather than following them. With one of the largest budgets at NIH, the resources are in place for NIGMS to begin a systematic expansion into basic behavioral research and training.

Support for a behavioral perspective at NIGMS has been encouraged by several of my colleagues in the House and Senate not only this year, but also in NIH appropriations reports for FY 2000, FY 2001, and FY 2002. For instance, the FY 2002 Senate appropriations report said: "The Committee is concerned that NIGMS does not support behavioral science research training. As the only institute mandated to support research not targeted to specific diseases or disorders, NIGMS is a key to research into basic behavioral research and training of NIGMS could be supporting. The Committee urges NIGMS, in consultation with the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences, to develop a plan for pursuing the most promising research topics in this area." I hope you agree this is the right direction given the context of congressional support for behavioral research, the strength of NIGMS' budget, and the need to support behavioral science and the need to train this research to address the numerous health conditions that involve behavioral factors.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Patrick J. Kennedy
Member of Congress

Rep. Patrick Kennedy: “With one of the largest budgets at NIH, the resources are in place for NIGMS to begin a systematic expansion into basic behavioral research and training.”
Response from New NIH Director

Elias Zerhouni: “Behavioral sciences will be among the areas examined when ... the new NIGMS Director reviews NIGMS’s mission.”
Testimony on
NATIONAL HEALTH RESEARCH TRAINING NEEDS
before the
Committee for Monitoring the Changing Needs for
Biomedical and Behavioral Research Personnel
of the
National Research Council
presented by
Alan G. Kraut, Ph.D.
Executive Director
American Psychological Society
April 3, 2003

“NIGMS needs to obey [its] law, and the compelling scientific reason for it: Behavior is central to many, maybe to most of our Nation’s health concerns.”
“A notable omission... is the National Institute of General Medical Sciences. [NIGMS must] incorporate the behavioral and social sciences...”
**ALL Congressional Reports**
(From the Evelyn Wood School of Speed Reading)

1999

“Behavioral science research and training – The Committee encourages NIGMS to support basic research training as part of its mandate to support basic research training in all areas of health-related research.”

(H. Rpt. 105-300)

2004

“The Committee believes that NIGMS has a scientific mandate to support basic behavioral research because of the clear relevance of fundamental behavioral factors to a variety of diseases and health conditions.”

(S. Rpt. 108-81)

2005

“The Committee encourages NIGMS to incorporate basic behavioral research as part of its portfolio, especially in the areas of cognition, behavioral neuroscience, behavioral genetics, psychophysiology, methodology and evaluation, and experimental psychology.”

(H. Rpt. 105-300)

2006

“The Committee notes the lack of a positive response to Congressional requests [and] by a special task force created by NIH that the NIH establish a basic behavioral research and training program within the National Institute of General Medical Sciences as authorized within the statutory language establishing the Institute.”

(S. Rpt. 109-103)
The New NIGMS Players

Sen. Daniel Inouye
Sen. Arlen Specter
Sen. Tom Harkin
Rep. Ralph Regula
Rep. Patrick Kennedy
Rep. Bryan Baird
Rep. Jim Leach
Rep. Jim Walsh
Proposed Congressional Resolution

“NIGMS [should immediately begin] to develop an announcement for the award of basic behavioral training grants.”
Reps. Kennedy and Baird: “The fact that NIGMS has not funded much basic behavioral research in the past ... is not [going to be] a persuasive argument that NIGMS has no role to play in behavioral science.”
NIGMS Colloquy in the Senate

Sen. Daniel Inouye: “Again the Committee urges NIGMS to fund behavioral research.”

Sen. Arlen Specter: “Behavioral research is essential.”

Sen. Tom Harkin: “Behavioral research has never been as important as it is now.”
NIH Basic Behavior Working Group

- Linda Waite, Sociology, Chicago, Chair
- Richard Axel, Biochemistry & Molecular Biophysics, Columbia
- Maja Bucan, Genetics & Psychiatry, Penn
- Laura Carstensen, Psychology, Stanford
- Richard Davidson, Psychology, Wisconsin
- Susan Fiske, Psychology, Princeton
- William Greenough, Psychology, Psychiatry, Cell & Structural Biology, Illinois
- Frances Degen Horowitz, President, CUNY
- James Jackson, Psychology, Michigan
- Robert Levenson, Psychology, Berkeley
- Bruce McEwen, Neuroendocrinology, Rockefeller
- Jane Menken, Sociology, Colorado
- James Smith, Economics, RAND
- David Takeuchi, Social Work & Sociology, Washington
Major Recommendation

“A secure and stable home for Basic Behavioral and Social Sciences Research should be established at NIH…” (e.g., NIGMS)
"... the [NIMH] welcome mat is no longer out in areas of personality, social psychology, animal behavior, theoretical modeling, language, and perception."

"Kraut and several members of Congress are pushing for the National Institute of General Medical Sciences to take up the slack."
A Reminder to NIH

Reps. Kennedy and Baird: “... we have learned that NIMH is reducing its support... More than ever, NIGMS now must unequivocally support basic behavioral science research.”
Sen. Inouye: “... great disappointment in [NIH’s] continued inattention... I have no doubt that the basic behavioral science research program can be initiated.”

Reps. Walsh, Kennedy, Leach, Baird: “... to stress the continued great interest in basic behavioral research at NIH... hope that action will be forthcoming to make the structural changes...”

1 Yr Later; No Word from NIH, so... More Letters
"I come to the floor today to highlight my disappointment ...concerning the conduct of basic behavioral research and training by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences."
Nine Democrats and Republican Members:

“...this letter is to request the inclusion of report language in the 2006 [NIH] Conference Report...to initiate a program of basic behavioral research and training...”
Another Level: House-Senate Conference on NIH Funding

The Conferees request a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees describing the new framework... for managing support of NIH basic behavioral science... by May 1, 2006.
NIH to Congress: Drop Dead!

May 2006, NIH: “... There [already] exists many avenues for the support of basic BSSR within NIH and this will continue to be the case for the future.”
Press Reaction

**Science & Government Report** “NIH has rejected repeated demands from its Congressional appropriators to establish a "home" for basic behavioral science research at the National Institute of General Medical Sciences.”
“With the changing research priorities at NIMH, the importance of establishing [a] home for basic BSSR at NIH is even more critical today than it was in 2004.”
More Press
(Science, again)

In a new analysis requested by lawmakers, a 14-person Working Group convened in 2004 by NIH complains that its call for a “secure and stable home” for basic behavioral research at NIH has been ignored.”
Walsh, Kennedy, Leach & Baird, October 2006: “We are writing to express our concern with the May 2006 Report...It is our view that this matter merits additional review.”
Different Styles of Pressure

---

From: Michael Zamore, Ofc of Rep. Patrick Kennedy
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2006 3:56 PM
To: NIH Deputy Director Raynard Kington
Cc: NIMH Director; NIGMS Director, NIH Legislation
Subject: Basic Behavioral Research

Dear Dr. Kington,

I wanted to briefly touch base regarding the issue of basic behavioral research funding at NIH. I’ve heard that there are discussions ongoing at NIH regarding the letter that my boss and Congressmen Walsh, Baird, and Leach sent last month along with the response of the Working Group members to the NIH submitted to Congress. I’m glad this issue is being examined and hope that NIGMS can pick up this portfolio.

I know that while my boss wants to see NIGMS develop this research capacity, he understands the pressures all of the Institutes are facing and certainly would not want to see NIMH or other institute’s budgets cut to accommodate it. Given the election results, he’s in a good position to be able to fight for NIH funding, and will, especially for NIMH as he always has, may need to build to the capacity that NIGMS ought to have. My boss is ready to work constructively with NIH’s leadership in that direction over time. However, he is committed to getting that done, and I hope that we can get on that path soon with a new structure that needs to be in place.

Sincerely,
Mike Zamore

Michael S. Zamore
Senior Policy Advisor
CONGRESSMAN PATRICK J. KENNEDY
407 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-4911; fax (202)225-3290
Michael.zamore@mail.house.gov
Now What?