NIH Funding Increases Hinge on Reauthorization

With a series of short, summer sessions ending on September 29th, Congress was hard-pressed to complete any new legislation. But high on the list of priorities was the NIH Reauthorization bill from the House Energy and Commerce Committee which has authority over NIH. The Committee's Chairman, Rep. Joe Barton (R-TX), revealed his passion for this bill in calling the NIH the "Crown Jewel of the Federal Government" and describing passage of the bill as the "single most important achievement by the [HEC] Committee this year".

Reauthorization of NIH has not occurred in more than 13 years. During this time, FASEB and other organizations have successfully advocated to double the NIH budget, from $10.3 billion in 1993 to $20.5 billion in 2004. For the past two years, the NIH budget has remained virtually flat with 3% and 2% increases - less than flat, when factoring in inflation. Meanwhile, President Bush's American Competitiveness Initiative highlights the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy's Office of Science, so those agencies are earmarked to receive significant increases instead of NIH. For FY2007, the Senate recommended a 7.9% increase for NSF and a 14.1% increase for DOE, while the recommended increase for NIH was 0.78%. Still, the Senate's increase for NIH is more than the President recommended, which was a mere 0.07% increase. Conversely, the higher NSF and DOE increases recommended by the Senate are in line with the President's recommendations.

To improve funding prospects for NIH, Chairman Barton three years ago began planning to reauthorize the agency - a move intended to strengthen NIH's ability to thoroughly and quickly report its many advances in medical science and to increase cross-institute funding that targets high-profile and costly diseases and conditions, such as diabetes and obesity. The NIH Roadmap is one such initiative and Chairman Barton proposed the creation of a "Common Fund" that would be the umbrella source for funding all trans-institute research including the Roadmap.

(continued on page 3)
A Message from Dr. Sobel

With this issue, we proudly launch ASIP Pathways, the Society’s latest newsletter, which is designed to provide significantly more information about the public affairs issues that affect the ASIP membership, and will more accurately reflect the major effort that our Society exerts to promote biomedical research and to address important concerns affecting the pathology community. In fact, over 80% of your membership dues are directed towards our public affairs efforts. ASIP Pathways’ Managing Editor is Priscilla Markwood, who has designed the new format with the assistance of ASIP’s Director of Marketing Alta Wallington. Pathways will be published four times a year. We hope that you like our new format. Please send congratulatory notes to me at mesobel@asip.org (and any complaints to Priscilla at pmarkwood@asip.org)!

Pathway’s predecessor for the past nine years was the ASIP Bulletin. I want to express my appreciation to four special individuals who have been involved with our Society’s newsletter since 1996. The Bulletin was the brainchild of Dr. Bruce McManus, who was its first Editor. Subsequently, Dr. Alessandra Bini and then Dr. Richard (a/k/a Dick) Lynch took over as Editor; Dick will continue to be Editor of ASIP Pathways. He has authored almost all of the “Milestones” articles in the Bulletin and has agreed to continue to write them for occasional issues of ASIP Pathways. By the way, you can find a compendium of all previous “Milestones” articles on our website at www.asip.org/pubs/milestones.htm. Until now, former ASIP staff member Bernadette Englert has been the Managing Editor of ASIP newsletters, no matter what they have been called, since 1990. Those of you who were members back then might remember the two-page format we used in the old days. More recent issues have been 24 pages long, and Bernadette has put her heart and soul into gathering and organizing the information for our newsletters for over fifteen years. We owe Bernadette a debt of gratitude and a well deserved rest.

In the February edition of ASIP Pathways, we will cover additional public affairs issues for which we did not have sufficient space this month, as well as more information about the upcoming Annual Meeting at Experimental Biology 2007 and the 2007 meritorious award winners.

The 2007 Annual Meeting will be the most complex and largest meeting that the Society has ever held since we are hosting a record number of 8 guest societies, as well as merging our scientific program with the annual meetings of the American Association of Neuropathologists, the Histochemical Society, and the North American Vascular Biology Organization (NAVBO). If you missed the abstract submission deadline for

(continued on page 6)
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In an extraordinary step to win endorsements, Chairman Barton requested input on his draft legislation from leading organizations associated with medical research - FASEB, the American Association of Medical Colleges (AAMC) and the American Association of Universities (AAU). All agreed that certain measures in the bill would have to be modified to obtain their constituents’ approval. The key changes that FASEB, AAMC, and AAU advocated were:

- to reduce the target level of funding for the Common Fund from 15% of the total NIH budget to 5%;
- to ensure that it will only grow when the NIH budget is growing; furthermore, that no more than half of annual NIH budget increases will be directed to the Common Fund;
- to preserve investigator-initiated funding from institutes and centers and from the Common Fund;
- to authorize NIH budget increases of no less than 5% per year for the next 3 years; and
- to decrease the frequency of reauthorization to every 7 years (from every 3 years).

After almost three years of deliberation, Chairman Barton aggressively sought to bring the NIH reauthorization bill to the House floor in a two-week session in September 2006. He prepared the final draft of the bill and shared it with FASEB, whose Board unanimously endorsed it after full consideration of this being the best possible outcome in an otherwise adverse political and economic environment. FASEB additionally pushed to allow investigators to self-identify as having Common Fund-eligible research and to exclude attachments of any open access-related bills (see article on page 10) or bills recommending disease-specific allocations of NIH funds. On September 26th, the bill (HR 6164) moved to a House vote with almost unprecedented speed and the final vote was 414-2 in favor of passage.

By Chairman Barton's own remarks, FASEB was clearly instrumental in shaping the bill and ultimately producing a reauthorization that had remarkable bipartisan support. He credited Leo Furcht, President of FASEB and an ASIP member since 1977, for his insights and testimony on Capitol Hill as having significant impact. When the bill came to vote, Republican Manager of the bill, Rep. Michael Burgess (R-TX), responded to comments from dissenters by quoting from parts of the letter that Chairman Barton received from
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FASEB. From the House floor, Rep. Burgess stated, "I would like to quote Leo T. Furcht, President of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology. 'We thank you for your leadership in protecting NIH from disease-specific funding set asides. From the FASEB perspective, directed research initiatives fail to recognize several principles inherent to the nature of medical research. Basic research, recognized universally as the foundation of most advances in disease-specific research, will inevitably suffer in a politically-based system of allocating scarce dollars. Thus, we doubly appreciated your legislations' emphasis on investigator-initiated competitive research.'" (To watch the full testimony, visit http://energycommerce.house.gov/108/Hearings/09192006hearing2031/hearing.htm.)

Behind the scenes, Rep. Barton and House staff also artfully rallied House appropriators, who control the next step in the process to increase NIH's budget. However, all efforts may be quashed by the President's unwillingness to yield and allow increased domestic spending in FY2007. Letters are currently circulating in both the Senate and House encouraging all leadership to ensure that Labor, HHS (Health and Human Services) and Education receive at least an additional $3 billion so that their appropriations are not left underfunded in 2007. (If you subscribe to FASEB's Action Alerts, you received the alert giving you an opportunity to submit a letter to Congress on this issue. To subscribe, go to http://capwiz.com/faseb/issues/alert/?alertid=9049956&type=CO.)

Congress went out of session on September 29th and will reconvene on November 9th for only one week before adjourning for the year. Only two agencies have received appropriations for FY2007 (Defense and Homeland Security). Upon returning to session in November after the election, Congress may attempt to pass appropriations for all remaining agencies as part of an "omnibus" (all-inclusive) bill, in the interest of time. Assuming appropriation approvals come prior to a Senate vote on NIH reauthorization and without presidential support of increased domestic spending, an omnibus vote would likely result in an unfavorably low amount of appropriations for NIH in FY2007 - close to the Senate's recommended 0.78% increase.

Given the tremendous bipartisan House support of the NIH reauthorization bill, regardless of election outcomes, that bill will likely resurface in 2007 and holds promise for the future of NIH funding.

You're a scientist...

Scientists need to decide what's best for science...

FASEB can help YOU speak out for science!

Become a member of FASEB's e-Action list, and make your voice heard in Washington!

Members of the e-Action list receive:
- Timely alerts to take action on breaking legislative issues
- Updates and analyses of important science policy issues
- Subscription to the FASEB Washington Update, providing you with the latest events on Capitol Hill relevant to scientists.

To join, visit the Legislative Action Center: http://opa/faseb/org

You'll also find advocacy tools to help you take action, free downloadable materials, educational resources, and in-depth analyses of biomedical research policy issues.

Become a science advocate TODAY.

Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB)
9650 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, MD 20814
Scientists today face one of the most alarming periods to confront the biomedical research enterprise in recent years. NIH funding is diminished. Grant funding success rates are declining. Politics trumps science. Just two years after Congress successfully completed the doubling of the NIH budget, the tide has turned dramatically.

With EB 2007 conveniently taking place in Washington DC, Capitol Hill visits are being planned by the Public Affairs officers of participating EB 2007 societies from April 30 through May 2, 2007. All U.S. members of participating societies are urged to use this opportunity to make contact with their Congressional representatives. The convergence of over 10,000 scientific colleagues in the Nation’s Capitol provides a unique opportunity for constituent scientists to educate Members of Congress about the need to provide robust funding for the NIH and other agencies. As a working scientist, no one is better informed or qualified than you to speak to your Congressional Members about the need to support biomedical research. Coordination, support and talking points will be provided by the cooperating Public Affairs officers. If you are interested in participating, contact Priscilla Markwood at pmarkwood@asip.org or 301-634-7408.

It is not enough to complain about the present state of affairs. Many Members of Congress say they never hear from our community. Biomedical research needs champions on Capitol Hill, but that will only happen when we convince Congress that increased support for research funding makes political sense, improves public health, and maintains our competitiveness in the world.

We encourage you to take advantage of this opportunity to promote biomedical research. Join us by making Capitol Hill visits during Experimental Biology 2007 in support of increased funding for the NIH, NSF, and other agencies.

NOW Seeking Mentors!

ASIP’s Summer Research Opportunity in Pathology Program (SROPP) is Seeking Mentors...

In collaboration with the FASEB minority Access to Research Careers (MARC) Program and with partial financial support from the Intersociety Council for Pathology Information (ICPI), ASIP announces SROPP: a new program that provides underrepresented minority college students with financial support to participate in a summer research internship program in the laboratory of an ASIP member. Travel and lodging expenses will be funded by the FASEB MARC program. ASIP will provide an additional $2,500 stipend to the successful student applicant. The host laboratory will be reimbursed up to $1,000 for the student’s use of laboratory supplies and reagents.

If you are willing to be a mentor to host a student in your laboratory during the summer of 2007, please contact Mark Sobel for more details at mesobel@asip.org.

For a full description of this program, visit http://www.asip.org/trainees/MinorityStudents.htm.
ASIP is pleased to welcome our newest division, the Pulmonary Pathology Society (PPS).

The Pulmonary Pathology Society was established in 1995 under the leadership of Dr. William Travis and Dr. Thomas Colby who served as PPS' first President. The PPS currently has nearly 300 members from more than 25 countries. Diverse careers and positions are represented among the membership: academic pulmonary pathologists, community practice pathologists, molecular pathologists, environmental pathologists, administrators in both academic and private settings, residents and fellows and emeritus professors.

The primary mission of the PPS is to encourage education and research in the field of pulmonary pathology and to provide a forum for those interested in pulmonary pathology to exchange ideas and form collaborations. Toward this objective, the PPS holds scientific conferences three times a year: a symposium at the ASIP Annual Meeting at Experimental Biology, a Companion Meeting with the USCAP and a three-day Biennial Symposium alternating every other year with sessions at the International Academy of Pathology.

When asked about PPS' decision to become a Division of ASIP, Dr. Phil Cagle, PPS President, said, "This new affiliation will give us many benefits in terms of state-of-the-art member services and organizational management, but we will continue to have control of our society, including control of policies, programs, budget and by-laws. We are very pleased with the outstanding service and resources that the ASIP has already provided to the PPS."

For more information on the Pulmonary Pathology Society visit http://www.pulmonarypath.org.

From Dr. Sobel (cont’d. from page 2)

EB2007 (November 8), you can still submit a late breaking abstract until late February. See details of the scientific program on pages 14 and 15.

The ASIP Nominating Committee met recently and developed the ballot for the 2007 elections. Once again, balloting will be online and will open in January. On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I want to thank all of the candidates who have agreed to run for office: Vice President: Stanley Cohen and Gene P. Siegal; Secretary-Treasurer: Philip T. Cagle and William B. Coleman; Program Chair-Elect: S. Paul Monga and J.J. Steinberg; Councilor (vote for 2): Myron I. Cybulsky, Maria J. Merino, Brooke T. Mossman, and James M. Musser; Meritorious Awards Committee (vote for 2): Luisa Ann DiPietro, Anne Hamburger, and Tanya N. Mayadas; and Nominating Committee (vote for 2): Mary J. C. Hendrix, Serge Jothy, and Mary F. Lipscomb.

ASIP Members in the News

Congratulations to ASIP members who have been recently appointed permanent Chairs of departments of pathology/laboratory medicine: Sanford H. Barsky (Ohio State University Medical Center), Steven A. Bigler (University of Mississippi Medical Center), Guillermo A. Herrera (St. Louis University School of Medicine), Jay L. Hess (University of Michigan Medical School), Brian R. Smith (Yale University School of Medicine), Daniel G. Remick (Boston University School of Medicine), Ann Thor (University of Colorado Health Sciences Center), and Dani S. Zander (Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center).

Also in the news, Emil R. Unanue, who recently stepped down as Chair at Washington University School of Medicine, has been named the Paul and Ellen Lacy Professor of Pathology. Mark E. Sobel will receive the Leadership Award of the Association for Molecular Pathology in November, and has been recently appointed as a member of the Pub Med Central National Advisory Committee of the National Library of Medicine. Maria J. Merino is the President of the Arthur Purdy Stout Society, Gregory J. Tsongalis was elected President-elect of the Association for Molecular Pathology, and Philip T. Cagle is the President of the Pulmonary Pathology Society, a Division of ASIP.

To be included in this feature in future issues of ASIP Pathways, please contact tsnethen@asip.org with your news.
I would like to make a contribution to the Pathology Leadership Fund (PLF). Enclosed is my gift in the amount of:

- **Platinum**: $5,000
- **Gold**: $2,500
- **Silver**: $1,000
- **Bronze**: $___________

I would like to discuss setting up an endowment fund.

Please apply my gift to the following:

- □ PLF fund, to be used at the discretion of the ASIP Council.
- □ Symposia or Workshop at ASIP Annual Meeting at Experimental Biology
- □ Trainee Travel Awards

Enclosed is my gift.

□ Enclosed is a check payable to ASIP
□ Charge to my credit card
  □ VISA □ AmEx □ MasterCard

Card #_______________________________________
Expiration Date________________________________
Name on Card_________________________________
Billing Address_________________________________
Street________________________________________
City, Province_________________________________
State, Zip/Postal Code___________________________
Country_______________________________________
Signature_____________________________________
Name(print)____________________________________
Tel__________________________________________
Email________________________________________

**A special “thank you” to the Charter Sponsors of the Pathology Leadership Fund for their contributions, dedication, and commitment to the Society.**

**Platinum Sponsors:**
Stephen J. Galli  
Mark E. Sobel  

**Gold Sponsors:**
Carl G. Becker  
Peter M. Howley  
Susan M. Koethe  
Richard G. Lynch  
Mark Tykocinski  

**Silver Sponsors:**
Barbara Atkinson  
Dorothy F. Bainton  
Michael B. Cohen  
Stanley Cohen  
Nelson Fausto  
Avrum I. Gottlieb  
Leo T. Furcht  
Michael E. Lamm  
Linda M. McManus  
Fred Sanfilipppo  
Dani S. Zander  

**Bronze Sponsors:**
Luisa A. DiPietro  
Joseph W. Grisham  
Mary J.C. Hendrix  
Nancy L. Thompson  
Anonymous

[Image of a special “thank you” to the Charter Sponsors of the Pathology Leadership Fund for their contributions, dedication, and commitment to the Society.]
Irving Weissman & the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine: Blazing a New Frontier in Politics & Science Funding

On August 9, 2001, President George W. Bush declared that federal funding would go only toward research on select embryonic stem cell lines derived from destroyed embryos left over at fertility clinics. States retain the ability to appropriate money for research or to restrict it. Several years of debate and political jockeying later, on July 19, 2006, President Bush followed through on his five-year promise by issuing the first veto of his administration, rejecting Congress’s bid to lift funding restrictions on human embryonic stem cell research and underscoring his party’s split on an emotional issue. This decision was viewed as a victory for the President’s conservative base and at the same time seen as a huge setback by many in the scientific research community. The issue remains a rallying point in this fall’s elections.

Dr. Irving Weissman, an ASIP member since 1980 and Director of Stanford University’s Cancer and Stem Cell Biology Institute, was the pivotal authority that Senator (Dr.) Bill Frist consulted in making his controversial choice to vote for bill H.R. 810 (the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005). A story entitled “Republican vs. Republican: When the Majority Doesn’t Rule” from the May 24, 2006 issue of The St. Petersburg Times recounts what Dr. Weissman told Sen. Frist, “You need to know the facts on the issue. Not what you hope is true. Not what your religion or personal ethics tell you is true. You need to know the facts. You’re absolutely stopped with the old [stem cell] lines. This bill allows you to go ahead.”

In an interview with ASIP Pathways, Dr. Weissman explained: “There are two major objectives in human pluripotent stem cell research of the types that are not funded by the government. First, we need more classical ES [embryonic stem cell] lines that are free of mouse cells that could contain mouse viruses, more robust ES cells that grow and differentiate better than the original lines. Second, we need a class of human pluripotent stem cell lines derived not from excess blastocysts in IVF clinics, but derived from somatic cell nuclei that contributed their genome to enucleated oocytes by the process of nuclear transfer, so that genetic disease[s] present in the [patient’s] donor nucleus can be replicated in a pluripotent stem cell line. The first objective will allow medical scientists to manipulate and understand human development, perhaps allowing enough definition of normal tissue and tissue stem cell development to identify and isolate functional tissue stem and progenitor cells. These are the basic tools we need for regenerative medicine. The second objective will allow human diseases themselves to be the object of studies, albeit only for those studies funded independent of federal agencies, both as cell lines and in immunodeficient mice transplanted with tissue stem and progenitor cells. This should be a major advance in pathogenesis studies.”

Like Weissman, many medical researchers believe stem cells offer great promise for repairing and replacing tissues damaged by disease, injury, or natural aging. Through a process known as therapeutic transplantation, or cell-based therapy, stem cells could be extracted, proliferated, and then directed to differentiate into a desired cell type. The then-specialized group of cells could be directly implanted into the suffering area of the patient. This ability of stem cells to differentiate into specialized cells from almost any tissue or organ in the human body potentially could be used to treat Parkinson’s, Alzheimer’s, heart disease, diabetes, and traumatic spinal cord injuries. In addition, specialized tissues developed from stem cell cultures could be used to test prospective drugs and screen for potential toxins.

In a quote from a Lasker Foundation interview (http://www.laskerfoundation.org/news/weis/weissmant.html), Dr. Weissman compared this decision of the ban on stem cell research to what might be lost for future generations by examining if similar religious and political forces had succeeded in banning recombinant DNA technology in the ’70’s. Weissman noted, “There’s no doubt that the products of recombinant DNA research…save over 100,000 American lives a year. I am talking about drugs such as erythropoietin, interferons, antibodies to breast cancer or B-cell lymphomas, insulin, human growth hormone, GCSF (Granulocyte Colony Stimulating Factor) and so on.”

On June 26, 2006, a study was released by a team of Johns Hopkins scientists who have engineered new, completed, fully-working motor neuron circuits, neurons stretching from spinal cord to target muscles, in paralyzed adult animals. An article from the
JHU Gazette, (http://www.jhu.edu/gazette/2006/26jun06/) described that embryonic stem cells were injected into rats whose virus-damaged spinal cords model human nerve disease; this showed that such cells can be made to re-trace complex pathways of nerve development long shut off in adult mammals.

Dr. Weissman told Sen. Frist, "You need to know the facts on the issue. Not what you hope is true. Not what your religion or personal ethics tell you is true. You need to know the facts..."

This report, which appeared in the July issue of Annals of Neurology, showed that 11 of the 15 treated rats gained significant, though partial, recovery from paralysis after losing motor neurons to an aggressive infection with Sindbis virus -- one that, in rodents, specifically targets motor neurons and kills them. The animals recovered enough muscle strength to bear weight and step with the previously paralyzed hind leg. The researchers were able to create a precise cocktail to restore lost nerve function.

On November 2, 2004, Californians voted on Proposition 71 to grant $3 billion over 10 years on stem cell research, making the state the first to fund such research. Despite the federal funding ban, 59 percent of the state's voters supported the move, the outgrowth of which is the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM). The CIRM uses bond proceeds to fund basic and applied biomedical research focused on developing diagnostics and therapies and on other vital research opportunities that will lead to life-saving medical treatments. All proposals are peer-reviewed to provide the most promising scientific research. Research grants are made only to California-based research institutions - both public and private.

In the absence of federal funding, should CIRM be the future model of how the best research will occur - state-driven and funded? Commenting on CIRM's 10-year initiative, Dr. Weissman said: "If there are medical and scientific advances, and if the State figures net income to the State is growing - a combination of tax receipts, new investments, new jobs, patent income, lost work and reduced medical/administrative cost due to new diagnoses and therapies - I believe the State will renew the initiative." When asked if federal funds are the answer for the advancement of stem cell research, or if it would detract from the freedom that privately funded institutions including Stanford now have, Dr. Weissman concluded: "Federal funding is the answer, as the full NIH-funded biomedical research establishment is required for discovery so preclinical positive results can reach clinical trials; yet no [NIH-funded] labs can use the new cell lines or their derivatives or the discoveries coming from them. California will gain from getting into the general funding first, but other states, and hopefully the federal government must follow. I expect, however, that California will have a big advantage as it works out the issues of discovery, ethical oversight, intellectual property and commercialization in California."

In the meantime, the question of intellectual property ownership over patents on stem cell research must also be addressed. On October 4, 2006, the Wisconsin State Journal, cited what may be the first of many debates. The U.S. Patent Office began re-examining three stem-cell patents held by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, a move that threatens WARF'S significant financial gains and University of Wisconsin-Madison's prominence in this field. The California consumer watchdog group, Foundation for Taxpayer and Consumer Rights, involved in California's Proposition 71, filed a patent review request, arguing that the discoveries patented by WARF were "obvious," and that other scientists publicly cleared the way for what WARF accomplished. WiCell Research Institute, the stem-cell subsidiary of WARF, counters that the patent review is simply a politically and financially motivated challenge. With individual states having more to lose (or gain), stem cell patent rights are arguably made more contentious by the lack of federal funding structure and clearly there are many challenges to come.

When asked what is the most important idea the scientific community should take away from this modern Darwinian debate, Dr. Weissman said: "Stem cell research and other medical research with significant promise for human health should be passed and regulated; bans are not a way to work for the health of the American people. Regulation will guarantee that all research is done in a manner that is up to the ethical standards of our society. We should not use this issue to lose our separation of the church and state."

Stem cell research is unique in its critical intersection of science and democracy, posing new challenges to which researchers are adapting to keep alive the promises of this major scientific advancement. Evolutionary, indeed!

***************

Editor's Note: The official policy of ASIP is to support an expansion of availability of funding for stem cell research. ASIP Council recognizes that some ASIP members may disagree with this position and welcomes letters to the editor from all interested parties. Letters should be sent to Priscilla Markwood at pmarkwood@asip.org.
Will Public

Senator bill S. 2695 (the Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006 (FRPAA)), requiring Federal agencies to develop policies ensuring open, public access to research supported by their grants or conducted by their employees, is sponsored by Senators John Cornyn (R-TX) and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT). A pro-FRPAA letter was drafted and signers to the letter so far include provosts of major grant-funded academic institutions. The letter and the bill urge no more than a 6-month delay in public availability of research articles partially or fully funded by the Federal government (not just NIH).

FRPAA, commonly referred to as the Cornyn-Lieberman bill, would effectively require a shift in business models for journals, such as ASIP's The American Journal of Pathology and The Journal of Molecular Diagnostics, which consist predominantly of Federally-funded research articles. The shift would be from a subscription-based model to an open-access model. In short, the subscription-based model has mixed sources of revenue (subscriptions, advertising, publication charges); whereas, the open access model primarily relies on substantial fees paid by authors (avg. $2,000 to $4,000), so their articles can be freely accessible to all users from the date of publication. Experiments with open access models have occurred over the past 5 years (most famously by the Public Library of Science (PLoS) journals), but they are not proven successful business models and many of those journals have recently raised their author fees. If forced to shift to open access, journals published by non-profit societies will have significantly lower revenue and many societies anticipate having to fold journals that are not self-sustaining.

The financial troubles of PLoS are well-documented in a June 20, 2006 Nature News articles (online at doi:10.1038/441914a). The article states, “PLoS lost almost $1 million last year; moreover, its total income from fees and advertising currently covers just 35% of its total costs. Although this income is increasing - from...
$0.75 million in 2003/04 to $0.9 million in 2004/05 - it lags far behind spending, which has soared from $1.5 million to around $5.5 million over the past three years. To stay afloat, the firm continues to rely on philanthropic grants.

“We will continue to rely on philanthropic grant support for the foreseeable future,” says Mark Patterson, director of publishing at PLoS’ U.K. office in Cambridge, and “possibly always.” “This demonstrates once again the fragility of the author-pays model,” says David Worlock, Chairman of the London-based publishing consultancy Electronic Publishing Services. “It’s a real giveaway if they [PLoS] are now saying that they will always need some philanthropic funding.”

Furthermore, on October 1, 2006, MSNBC reported that PLoS will launch its first open-peer-reviewed journal called PLoS ONE. Like its sister publications, PLoS ONE will make research articles available free online by charging authors to publish. But unlike articles in other PLoS journals that undergo rigorous peer review, PLoS ONE articles are posted after an editor gives them cursory review. "If we publish a vast number of papers, some of which are mediocre and some of which are stellar, Nobel Prize-winning work - I will be happy," said Chris Surridge, the journal's managing editor. Though not stated, this appears to be PLoS' attempt to recover income by mass-publishing practically unreviewed material that are subject to author charges. PLoS is openly criticizing the peer-review process and suggesting PLoS ONE is an alternative model. But another impetus for this change (particularly by an open access journal) is to publish many manuscripts without incurring the usual costs of peer-review and editing, and in this case to use author income from PLoS ONE to rescue the finances of their other high-impact, rigorously peer-reviewed journals (such as PLoS Biology).

Although ASIP has a free public access policy - 6 months (AJP) to 12 months (JMD) after publication - and is currently able to maintain its subscription-based business model with this policy, ASIP does not support the irresponsible mandating of open access proposed by the Cornyn-Lieberman bill. Mandating open access, as the WellcomeTrust has done in the U.K., leads to broad acceptance by institutional libraries that purchasing subscriptions is no longer necessary. Mass subscription cancellation is anticipated and will drain a significant source of income for journals. Thus, the bulk of income will shift to author fees or journals will fold. Time and again, advertising income is raised by librarians and society members as the potential salvation to recover lost income. But smaller scientific societies - those non-profits with one or two journals - do not have the sales resources or, in general, the titles with elite sales potential in order to generate substantial new ad revenue streams. Advertising spending (particularly online, where journals are increasingly used) is dependent upon usage statistics proving readership of ads. The Cornyn-Lieberman bill proposes repositories, such as PubMed Central, as warehouses of all Federally-funded research articles which further disables the publisher’s ability to sell advertising because PMC will be the source of articles (not the publisher's web site). Also, to-date PMC has demonstrated no capability or willingness to provide usage statistics which are vital to the long-shot of maintaining or increasing subscription sales.

In opposition to the Cornyn-Lieberman bill, the DC Principles Coalition of non-profit societies for free access to science (of which ASIP is a member) and the American Association of Publishers’ Government Action Task Force (of which Mark Sobel is a member) drafted rebuttal letters. Attempts to get esteemed academic signers to the opposition letter addressed to Sen. Cornyn drafted by DC Principles have had limited success. The letter can be read at http://www.dcprinciples.org/press/cornyn.pdf.

If you or your academic administrators are interested in signing onto the DC Principles' letter, please contact Mark Sobel, Executive Officer of ASIP, at mesobel@asip.org. Dr. Sobel will arrange to have names added to the letter.
ASIP Program Committee Seeks EB2008 Ideas

The ASIP Program Committee has developed an exciting scientific program for the upcoming Experimental Biology 2007 meeting in Washington, DC (see http://www.asip.org/mtgs/eb07/).

In addition, the Committee is already beginning to plan for Experimental Biology 2008. Many of the programmatic themes and topics for EB 2007 originated from ideas put forth by the ASIP membership. Therefore, we again encourage your input concerning ideas for session topics, thematic programming, and meeting formats for EB 2008. If you think of a hot topic in experimental pathology that we should include in next year's program, please let us know. You may submit your ideas online at http://www.asip.org/EB08Suggestions.asp. All suggestions must be received by November 30, 2006 to be considered by the Program Committee at its meeting in early-December where themes and topics for EB 2008 will be decided. We look forward to receiving your suggestions and comments!!
FASEB LAUNCHES GRASSROOTS CAMPAIGN FOR NIH

In August 2006, FASEB kicked off a nationwide grassroots campaign in support of medical research and NIH. "It is time to reeducate Congress and the public about the critical value of NIH," said Leo Furcht, M.D., FASEB President and ASIP member. "There's overwhelming support for medical research - everyone looks forward to the next breakthrough, the next new treatment. We just need to make the connection between lifesaving advances and funding of the National Institutes of Health."

To kick off the campaign, FASEB unveiled a customizable slide presentation that scientists, department heads and deans can use locally to demonstrate NIH's impact on human health. "The truth is that we’ve made remarkable advances in heart disease, cancer, infectious illnesses, just to name a few, and these can all be traced back to NIH-funded research," stated Carrie Wolinetz, Ph.D., FASEB Director of Communications. "We wanted to provide scientists with a tool to help them tell the stories behind medical breakthroughs: how basic research is translated; how NIH funds research in their own community; and how our quality of life has improved thanks to NIH-sponsored discoveries."

According to Wolinetz, FASEB is working to create versions of the presentation for each of the 50 states, and added, "We would like to see researchers presenting this to community groups, neighbors, colleagues, and even their members of Congress when they’re at home in their districts." She noted that FASEB will continue to produce additional advocacy material for use by scientists, all of which will be freely available on the FASEB website (www.faseb.org/opa/). State-specific presentations have (cont'd. on back page)
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2007 Joint Annual Meeting of
- American Society for Investigative Pathology (ASIP)
- American Association of Neuropathologists (AANP)
- Histochemical Society (HCS)
- North American Vascular Biology Organization (NAVBO)

Guest Societies:
- American College of Veterinary Pathologists (ACVP)
- American Society for Matrix Biology (ASMB)
- Association for Pathology Informatics (API)
- International Society for Analytical and Molecular Morphology (ISAMM)
- International Society for Biological and Environmental Repositories (ISBER)
- Pulmonary Pathology Society (PPS)
- Society for Cardiovascular Pathology (SCVP)
- Società Italiana di Patologia/Italian Pathology Society (SIP)

Lectures

- AANP SAUL KOREY LECTURE: Neuropathology and Genetics of Parkinsonism
  Dennis W. Dickson ( Mayo Clinic Coll. of Med. Jacksonville)

- ASIP KEYNOTE LECTURE: New Strategies for Defining Critical Neuropathology in Neurodegenerative Disorders
  Floyd E. Bloom (The Scripps Res. Inst.)

- ASIP AMGEN OUTSTANDING INVESTIGATOR AWARD LECTURE: Expression and Maintenance of Mitochondrial DNA: New Insights Into Human Disease Pathology
  Gerald S. Shadel (Yale Univ. Sch. of Med.), Supported by an educational grant from Amgen

- ASIP ROUS-WHIPPLE AWARD LECTURE: Genetics and Pathogenesis of Autoimmunity
  Abul K. Abbas (UCSF)

- NAVBO EARL P. BENDITT AWARD LECTURE: H.F. Dvorak

Symposia

- AANP Presidential Symposium: Updates in Neurodegenerative Diseases
  Chair: Barbara Crain (Johns Hopkins Univ. Sch. of Med.)

- ACVP Symposium: Emerging Infectious Diseases
  Chair: William Castleman (Univ. of Florida Coll. of Vet. Med.)
  Co-Chair: Matthew R. Starost (NIH)
  Sponsored by ASIP and ACVP

- ASIP Presidential Symposium: Viruses and Human Cancer
  Chair: Peter M. Howley (Harvard Med. Sch.)
  Supported by an educational grant from Merck

- ASIP Symposium: Autophagy and Disease Pathogenesis: Cell Suicide or Self Preservation
  Chair: Xiao-Ming Yin (Univ. of Pittsburgh)
  Co-Chair: Kevin A. Roth (Univ. of Alabama at Birmingham)

- ASIP Symposium: Developmental Pathways in Cancer Progression
  Chair: Carlos Moreno (Emory Univ.)
  Co-Chair: Giancarlo Vecchio (Univ. of Naples "Federico II")

- ASIP Symposium: Intracellular Transport in Vascular Cells
  Chair: B. Lowell Langille (Toronto Gen. Res. Inst.)
  Co-Chair: Avrum I. Gottlieb (Univ. of Toronto Fac. of Med.)
  Co-sponsored by NAVBO

- ASIP Liver Pathobiology Symposium: Pathobiology of ASH and NASH
  Chairs: Anna Mae Diehl (Duke Univ. Med. Ctr.) & Sattarshan P.S. Monga (Univ. of Pittsburgh)

- ASIP Symposium: Molecular Determinants of Epithelial Polarity
  Chair: Asma Nusrat (Emory Univ.)
  Co-Chair: Tullio Pozzan (Univ. of Padua)

- ASIP Symposium: New Developments in Vascular Biology
  Chairs: Myron I. Cybulsky (Univ. of Toronto - Toronto Gen. Res. Inst.) & Martin A. Schwartz (Univ. of Virginia)
  Co-sponsored by NAVBO

- ASIP Symposium: Novel Therapies Based on Molecules of the Innate Immune System
  Chairs: H. Anne Pereira (Univ. of Oklahoma Hlth. Sci. Ctr.) & Gregory L. Stahl (Brigham & Women's Hosp.)

- ASIP Symposium: Pharmacogenomics & Targeted Therapeutics

- ASIP Symposium: Stem Cell Engineering for Therapeutics
Symposia (continued)

- ASIP/HCS Symposium: Trends in Experimental Pathology: Imaging and Histochemistry
  Chairs: Hinke A.B. Multhaupt (Imperial Col. London) & Elizabeth R. Unger (CDC)
  Sponsored by ASIP and the Histochemical Society
  Supported by an educational grant from the Robert E. Stowell Endowment Fund

- NAVBO Symposium: Hereditary Vascular Disorders: From Cloning to Pathology
  Chair: Douglas A. Marchuk (Duke University Medical Ctr.)

- NAVBO Symposium: Mechano-Sensing and Signal Transduction in the Vessel Wall
  Chairs: Morton Friedman (Duke Univ.) & Shu Chien (UCSD)

- NAVBO Symposium: Proteogenomic Mapping of Vascular Phenotypes in Health and Disease
  Chair: Jan E. Schnitzer (Sidney Kimmel Cancer Ctr.)

- NAVBO Symposium: Vascular Smooth Muscle Cell Heterogeneity and Signaling
  Chairs: Giulio Gabbiani (Ctr. Med. Univ., Geneva) & Gary K. Owens (Univ. of Virginia)

- NAVBO Vascular Development, Growth & Adaptations Mini-Meeting
  Chair: Robert Tomanek (Univ. of Iowa)
  Co-sponsored by the American Association of Anatomists

- NAVBO Symposium: Hereditary Vascular Disorders: From Cloning to Pathology
  Chair: Douglas A. Marchuk (Duke University Medical Ctr.)

- NAVBO Symposium: Mechano-Sensing and Signal Transduction in the Vessel Wall
  Chairs: Morton Friedman (Duke Univ.) & Shu Chien (UCSD)

- NAVBO Symposium: Proteogenomic Mapping of Vascular Phenotypes in Health and Disease
  Chair: Jan E. Schnitzer (Sidney Kimmel Cancer Ctr.)

- NAVBO Symposium: Vascular Smooth Muscle Cell Heterogeneity and Signaling
  Chairs: Giulio Gabbiani (Ctr. Med. Univ., Geneva) & Gary K. Owens (Univ. of Virginia)

- NAVBO Vascular Development, Growth & Adaptations Mini-Meeting
  Chair: Robert Tomanek (Univ. of Iowa)
  Co-sponsored by the American Association of Anatomists

- PPS Symposium: The New Frontiers in Pulmonary Hypertension Research
  Chair: Rubin M. Tuder (Johns Hopkins Univ Sch of Med)
  Sponsored by ASIP and the Pulmonary Pathology Society

Workshops & Special Sessions

- AANP Course: Update on Brain Tumors: Prognostic Markers and Controversies in Diagnosis
  Satellite Meeting on April 27, 2007 - Special Registration Required
  Organizer: Barbara Crain (Johns Hopkins Univ. Sch. of Med.)
  Chair: Gregory Fuller (Univ. of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Ctr.)

- AANP Diagnostic Slide Session
  Chair: E. Tessa Hedley-Whyte (Massachusetts Gen. Hosp.)

- ASIP 7th Annual Career Development Program & Lunch: Dancing with Journals: A Guide to Submission and Review
  Chairs: Luisa DiPietro (Univ. of Illinois at Chicago Col. of Dentistry) & Dani S. Zander (Penn. State Milton Hershey Med. Ctr.)
  Sponsored by the ASIP Committee for Career Development, Women & Minorities, the American Association of Anatomists, the American Association of Neuropathologists and the Histochemical Society
  Supported by educational grants from Cadmus and the FASEB Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC) Office

- ASIP Highlights: Graduate Student Posters in Pathology
  Chairs: Vallie M. Holloway (Mayo Clinic of Jacksonville) & Scott A. Tomlins (Univ. of Michigan)
  Sponsored by the ASIP Committee for Career Development, Women & Minorities

- ASIP Workshop: Funding Your Research: Non-government Sources
  Chairs: Gary R. Pasternack (Aqua Partners Inc.)
  Sponsored by the ASIP Committee for Career Development, Women & Minorities

- BLOOD VESSEL CLUB: Showcase of Recent Breakthroughs in Vascular Biology
  Chairs: William A. Muller (Weill Med. Col. at Cornell Univ.) & Klaus Ley (Univ. of Virginia)
  Sponsored by ASIP and the North American Vascular Biology Organization

- HCS/ASIP Workshop: Tissue Banking & Sample Preparation
  Chair: Gavin J. Gordon (Brigham & Women's Hosp./Harvard Med. Sch.)
  Co-Chair: Hinke A.B. Multhaupt (Imperial Col. London)
  Sponsored by ASIP, the Histochemical Society and the International Society for Biological and Environmental Repositories

- HCS Workshop: Tissue Fixation for Molecular Analysis in Pathology & Cell Biology
  Chairs: Denis G. Baskin (VA Puget Sound Hlth. Care Systems) & Shan-Rong Shi (USC Keck Sch. of Med.)
  Co-sponsored by ASIP and the International Society for Biological and Environmental Repositories

www.asip.org

Early Registration Deadline - March 2, 2007
Housing Reservations Deadline - March 23, 2007
FASEB Launches Grassroots Campaign for NIH

(Continued from page 12) been prepared for Alabama, California, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas. A generic (not state-specific) presentation on NIH is available on ASIP’s website at www.asip.org.

The FASEB slides highlighting the benefits of NIH research recently drew praise from NIH Director Elias Zerhouni. At a recent NCRR council meeting, Dr. Zerhouni discussed the importance of communicating to the public how medical discoveries improve health and save lives. He said, in part, "People need to know how research is making a difference in their own communities. For example, I think that FASEB has done a great job of preparing slides and asking people to talk about their own research in their own communities and, at the same time, explaining how research supports economic development." To further his point, he showed examples of newspaper articles which featured local investigators and their contributions to health research and their communities.

"Nothing is more important than the health and well-being of the American people. We are all only one diagnosis away from needing the hope that NIH embodies," commented Leo Furcht. "It is our obligation, as a scientific community, to explain how science is done-to explain how continued improvements in human health are dependent on a sustained commitment to NIH. Supporting medical research in concept is no longer enough."