## PRESIDENT•S REPORT

Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory continues to produce breakthrough science and provide outstanding science education. Of particular note, 2012 saw the recruitment of six new faculty, two of whom, David Tuveson and Gholson Lyon, are not only outstanding scientists, but are clinicians who see patients. David Tuveson will oversee our exciting new Cancer Therapeutics Initiative and focus his research on pancreas cancer, melanoma and carcinoid tumors. He will also work closely with the nearby Lustgarten Foundation that focuses on pancreas cancer, where he will head its science program. Gholson Lyon works in pediatric neurology and studies inherited neurological disorders, principally in families in Utah. Molly Hammell, Jesse Gillis, Daambiatypracipitem lossifov popularly called Othedal cliff. O Amid the fractious partisan politics surrounding that term and the unresolved issue of our federal budget, dbb implications were clear for the Laboratory. We faced the prospect of yet another year in which our elected national representatives and out be a way to pass a budget, once again leaving in doubt the status of federal support for basic research.

We entered the current year, therefore, acutely aware of the urgency of attracting substantial new philanthropic contributions in order to avoid the possibility that critical cancer, brain and plant biology research be curtailed, even for a moment. That would mark an historic and tragic retreat. Although American philanthropy leads the world in support of basic and applied science, it cannot replace the substantial, stable and predictable support that historically has been provided by the federal government. Unfortunately, stagnant or even declining federal support of science is now the norm. If Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory is to remain at the forefront of research in molecular biology and genetics, we need a larger endowment as a buffer to variations in federal funding that are now occurring and will likely occur for at least the next decade.

Our nation has been without a budget for 4 years. To pay bills since approving its last budget in April 2009, Congress has passed a series of what lawmakers euphemistically call Ocontinuing resolutions. O Failing to provide the fundamental guidance and stability that an annual budget provides, our leaders have thus defaulted on a constitutionally specip

guidance has had two broad effects. One has been fault. The other is that the lack of guidance from the attempts by the scientileommunity to plan the course

## 2 President's Report

from external sources. To state the obvious: One cannot effectively prepare a plan for future



The Laboratory has always prospered because of philanthropic foresight and civic mindedness. Charles Robertson, seen here with the Watsons in 1974, seeded our endowment.

about \$1.5 billion, or 5%, more than the actual 2012 estimate. These numbers assume continued funding of science during the dramatic Þnancial crisis in 2008, but over \$10 billion was added to the NIH budget in 2009 from economic stimulus funds, which would not have been necessary if continuous and predictable funding had instead occurred. With such steady support, scientists could have planned long-term projects witherape As the situation exists now, many scientists are closing their laboratories because of lack of funding since the sudden spurt of NIH funding has withered and was not sustained. Fortunately, at Cold Spring Harbor our sources of private support have so far prevented shutting down research laboratories. Indeed, philanthropic support has even enabled starting new initiatives that have had a major impact on cancer and autism.

My point is one that prudenthencial advisors have been making for as long as capitalism has been around: a simple compounding at modest rates of annual increase is very likely to be more powerful than an occasion scholar surge, inspired by what are often unrealistic expectations of near-term payoffs. OSlow and steady wins the raceONin science as in building a nest egg.

There are powerful reasons behind this argument as it applies to research funding, and they are not only about numbers. It is instructive to look back for a moment at the history of how our federal government came to vigorously support basic science. Prior to the Second World War, federal contributions were minimal, as weighed against funds provided by the nationÕs great philanthropists. Most biomedical research was then conducted by scientists based in universities that were supported by endowment income, special research funds, and foundation grants. The year before the start of the Great Depression, The Rockefeller Institute had since its founding in 1902 received some \$65 million in endowment funds from the estate of John D. Rockefeller. As noted by the historian Paul Starr, this alone was many times the amount spent by the federal government on medical research during that same interval.

Early in the 20th century, it was the Department of Agriculture that received the lionÕs share of the governmentÕs research attention. To the very limited extent that it invested directly in medical research, the federal government focused on the Hygienic Laboratory, once part of a hospital

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Paul Starr, *The Transformation of American Medicint*(Basic Books, 1982), 339.

## 4 President's Report

in Staten Island, and later, after moving to Washington, D.C., the forerunner of the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS). Just after the turn of the 20th century, allocations were less than \$50,000 a year. During the Progressive Period, the PHS began to study infectious diseases. In 1930, the Hygienic Laboratory was renamed the National Institutes of Health, and in 1938 it moved to its present location in Bethesda, Maryland. A year prior to that, the government had established the National Cancer Institute (NCI). And in a major departure in 1944, forsther the NCI authorized federal funds to be allocated to basic researchers not directly in the government of semploy. This was the precursor of the modern extramural grant program that provides core research funds for CSHL and many other American research institutions.

On the eve of AmericaÕs entry into World War Two, the NCIÕs -13-12(n)16(s en)18(t)-16(rT8(t)0(f

A T MANY

At this moment our nation is clearly limited in its capacity to Pnance basic science. Things that might be done today in areas in which much progress has recently been made, cancer therapeutics being the most notable, are not getting done because of the scarcity of resources, both public and private.

What can we reasonably expect? I would be pleased to see a federal commitment to present levels of NIH and NSF funding, adjusted foration plus 3% per year. This would place CSHL

endowment draw, covered 50% of our research expenditures in 2012. Such a ratio of federal to private funding of research may have to be the norm for all institutions in the future, not just Cold Spring Harbor and other like-minded research institutions. Medical schools will have to provide more to their scientists, but this change also comes at a time when clinical income is dropping at a rapid clip.

## 

Philanthropic support has been a fundamental part of what makes Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory successful. It is clear to all our scientists that federal grant support provides the core funding needed to maintain a research program and its key infrastructure, but it is philanthropic support that allows our scientists to do their most innovative research. Thus we must increase philanthropy, growing our endowment so that key funds can be allocated when needed, not in the year or two that it takes to secure a federal grant, long after a new idea is stale.

Part of the logic for increasing support to Cold Spring Harbor is our track record: we have a long history of major accomplishments and greateinch in both research and science educationNall achieved through prudent use of very limited funds. The seeds of our success were sowed by the great philanthropists of the last century. The estate of Andrew Carnegie launched our genetics research and sustained it for 60 years. The Carnegie Institution of Washington put the Laboratory on the map as one of the worldOs leading centers of genetics research. CSHLOs future Nobelists AI Hershey and Barbara McClintock were beneb

ÒSurplus wealth is a sacred trust which its possessor is bound to administer in his lifetime for the good of the community. Ó That was Andrew Carnegie Ös ÒGospel, Ó and it is one that I fervently hope a civic-minded few will now take to heart so that our great institution might safely navigate some very treacherous at waters. Perhaps our nation Ös leaders will also smooth could the Þ