

## ADOPTING FROM RUSSIA

Part 2

By G. Preston Sims, Ph.D.

I couldn't believe it. Just one month after returning from Moscow, my wife Amy and I were seated on Acroflot, the Russian Airline, on trip #2. This was the big one, the trip where we would pick up our 7-month-old son from the orphanage in Kirov, a 13 hour train ride from Moscow.



Instead of chasing the moon around the globe like we did before, this time we left in daylight and chased the sun. Thus it never was dark throughout our 13 1/2 hour flight. Thank God for Drew Barrymore and Adam Sandler in "50 First Dates". The movie helped, but it only filled 2 hours of the flight! As usual, the rest of the movies were foreign and looked like they had been shot with a home movie camera. I turned to my Reid Meloy text on assessing the risk of violence.

We were happy to arrive the next day in

*Continued on p5*

## Featured This Month:

- *President's Corner*
- *From the Ethics Committee*
- *Caregiver Support*
- *Speaker's Bureau*

*and much more....*

## CRISIS COUNSELING WITH MEDICAL PATIENTS

By Gerald P. Koocher, Ph.D., ABPP

The diagnosis of a chronic illness carries with it many rapid and stressful life changes that in turn generate considerable emotional distress. A frequent result is symptoms of psychological distress, such as anxiety, depression, and family conflict, which are easily overlooked or ignored by medical personnel whose attention is justifiably focused chiefly on the physical illness. Ignoring the psychological symptoms, however, reduces the quality of life of both patients and their families, while putting them at risk for increased morbidity and mortality by contributing to non-adherence with prescribed treatment. Such patients, driven by their emotional distress and accompanying symptoms, may become frequent visitors to physicians' offices, experience unnecessary hospital admissions, or find themselves subjected to invasive medical procedures that later prove costly and unnecessary.

When distress becomes intense enough to generate a referral for mental health consultation, patients and families struggling to cope with chronic medical illness too often find themselves being assessed from the traditional psychopathology perspective. Many mental health practitioners approach



*Continued on p7*

## RESEARCH, INDUSTRY, AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

By Dale N. Glaser, Psy.D.  
Glaser Consulting

In an article in the San Diego Union dated 9/25/04 and titled: "NIH May Call a Halt to Consulting Work", the Associated Press reports that "Some 5,000 scientists at the National Institutes of Health may be banned from doing consulting work with drug companies for at least a year, the latest fallout from a conflict-of-interest scandal. In a surprise move, the government's premier research agency announced the proposed moratorium in a memo to employees yesterday. It still must be approved by top Bush administration officials before taking effect. The issue doesn't affect scientists' official duties in turning basic research into health treatments, duties that often involve work with industry. Instead, it has to do with a fraction of NIH scientists, about 120 by one count, apparently arranging secret consulting deals with industry. In one case uncovered by Congress, Pfizer Inc. allegedly paid an NIH researcher \$500,000 over five years."

In an article titled: *Conflict-of-Interest Policies for Investigators in Clinical Trials*, Bernard I.o. M.D., Leslie E. Wolf, J.D., M.P.H., and Abiona Berkeley, J.D. (2000) conclude that "Policies governing conflicts of



*Continued on p6*

interest at leading medical schools in the United States vary widely. We suggest that university-based investigators and research staff be prohibited from holding stock, stock options, or decision-making positions in a company that may reasonably appear to be affected by the results of their clinical research. Of the 10 medical schools we studied, only 1 had a policy that was close to this standard.” (<http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/short/343/22/1616>).

Afterwards, the New England Journal of Medicine tightened up its editorial requirements in regards to author affiliation with the funding source. However, in a June 2002 report, the same journal announced “that it has given up finding truly independent doctors to write and review articles and editorials for it, as a result of the financial ties physicians have with so many drug companies in the United States. The Journal says the drug companies' reach is just too deep” (<http://www.vaccinationnews.com/dailynews/june2002/conflictinterest14.htm>).

In the last year, I have come upon more than a few articles addressing conflict of interest as university and industries merge talents and monies and the push to generate revenues for industrial concerns (with pharmaceutical companies particularly the focus of keen interest) increases. I recall when I first became familiar with the collaborative efforts of industry and academia as an undergraduate at University of California, Irvine in the early to mid 1970's. With the nascent flourish of industry in the Irvine area at that time, it seemed to make sense that corporate mavens would mine the intelligentsia that graced the ivory towers that were in close proximity. Why not capitalize on the best and brightest? Given that federal funds for research have a pattern of fluctuating with the ebb and flow of political climates, it seemed logical that universities would seek alternative sources for research funding. The win-win outcome seemed evident: the industrial complex would benefit from

the scientific objectivity associated with university research and academia would mutually benefit from the anticipated lining of coffers.

However, the assumption is that the objectivity the scientist brings to the fore would not be compromised, irrespective of intentions of the funding source. Apparently, though, at least per the newsreels of the last few years, there have been more than a few incidents that have had major peer reviewed journals reconsider the propriety of what had been deemed to be publishable manuscripts. With corporations offering large consulting fees to top flight researchers, it is understandable that the offer would be too seductive to turn down. However, what we may not be privy to, and we can only surmise, is closed-door discussions that involve research design, methodology, and interpretation of findings that may serve in optimizing the corporation's interest. I am of the opinion that it is much too cynical and glib to readily dismiss the findings of any industrial/academic collaboration. I have the attitude that most scientists honor codes of integrity, objectivity, and scientific verisimilitude. However, in the last decade we have come upon incidents that, to the layperson, tarnish the image of science. For example, we had CEOs citing research publicly dismissing the addictive properties of nicotine, (<http://www.ash.org.uk/html/conduct/html/tobexpld2.html>), and the brouhaha over Herrnstein and Murray's 1994 “*The Bell Curve*” and the dubious motivations and possible affiliations of the 2<sup>nd</sup> author as purported in the fascinating *The Bell Curve Debate* edited by Russell Jacoby and Naomi Glauberman, 1995. There are no easy answers as the *New England Journal of Medicine* has found, as to what constraints should be upheld for those engaged in research who have vested interests with the funding source. Minimally, there should be a full disclosure of the researchers' affiliation, and this process will allow the public to better understand the research. Though this has primarily embroiled the medical and

pharmaceutical sciences. it is inevitable that as the largesse of federal funding for psychological research waxes and wanes, psychologists accessing alternatives for funding will also be expected to reveal their sources.

## NEW MEMBERS OCTOBER 2004

### Full Members

Cathy Hammond, Ph.D.  
Robert Cureton, Ph.D.  
Nina Akin, Ph.D.  
Kenneth Ryan, Ph.D.  
Drue Bogdonoff, Ph.D.  
Leslie Ann Ziegenhorn, Ph.D.  
Susan Pitarresi, Ph.D.  
Lynda Brooks, Ph.D.  
Cynthia Chapman, Psy.D.  
Noll Evans, Ph.D.

### Out of County/State

Carrie Jaffe, Ph.D.  
Diane Sterling, Psy.D.

### Associate Member

Marilee L. Maki, Ph.D.

### Student Members

Natanya Glezer  
Karyn Harmon  
Paula Maness, M.A.  
Nikki Vito  
Allyson Volzke

## WHAT'S HOT!

Car:	Crossfire
Shrinks:	Mark Katz, Amy Montague
Restaurant:	Aesops'
Travel spot:	New Zealand
Author:	Alice Hoffman
Singer:	Diana Krall
Town:	Glenwood Springs, CO
Food:	St. Andre Cheese