
SOUBORNÝ REFERÁT

History of the CINP (Collegium Internationale Neuropsychopharmacologicum)

Ban T. A.

Recognition that one of the essential prerequisites of successful neuropsychopharmacological research is a continuous dialogue between clinicians and basic scientists created a need for the founding of an association which would provide a platform for interaction among the different disciplines of the new field.

THE FOUNDING OF CINP

To start the dialogue between clinicians and basic scientists an International Symposium on Psychotropic Drugs was hosted by Emilio Trabucchi, chairman of the department of pharmacology, and Silvio Garattini, a young pharmacologist, at the University of Milan in May 1957. On the second day of this symposium Wolfgang de Boor, a psychiatrist working in Cologne, Germany, and Corneille Radouco-Thomas, a pharmacologist working in Geneva, Switzerland, proposed the founding of an „international association“ to provide a forum for interaction between clinicians and basic scientists for the study of psychotropic drugs.

The formal inauguration of CINP took place four months after the Milan Symposium, during the Second World Congress of Psychiatry in Zurich, on September 2, 1957, at a dinner meeting, hosted by Rothlin, in the buffet of the city's railway station. By the end of the dinner Rothlin, a former director of Sandoz, was elected president, W. A. Stoll, treasurer, Corneille Radouco-Thomas and Herman Denber, secretaries, and Pierre Deniker and Philip Bradley, councilors. The 32 invited guests became the founders of CINP [1].

TRANSLATION OF FINDINGS

What are the aims of CINP? According to its Constitution and By-Laws, drafted in 1957, the primary objective of the organization is „to establish (provide for) an organization whose members shall meet from time to time“ at least once every two years, „to consider and discuss matters related

to neuropsychopharmacology and through the organization encourage and promote international scientific study, teaching and application of neuropsychopharmacology.“

Prior to the inaugural meeting there was disagreement between the two main players in the founding, Rothlin and Trabucchi, regarding membership in the organization, reflecting major differences in their expectations about the collegium. In this dispute Rothlin prevailed and membership was restricted to those actively involved in the new field instead of being open to all interested in the new drugs. However, as a compromise, it was decided that congresses should alternate between „open“ meetings with free attendance for everyone interested in the field, and „closed“ meetings with attendance restricted to CINP members and their invited guests. The idea was that open meetings with larger audiences would provide a forum to communicate new developments in neuropsychopharmacology. By contrast, closed meetings would allow for interaction among the disciplines, the provision of feedback from clinicians to basic scientists, and the conversion of findings in pre-clinical neuropharmacologic research into clinical psychopharmacologic hypotheses.

The 1st CINP Congress – organized by Emilio Trabucchi – was an open meeting in 1958 in Rome, Italy, with about 500 participants from 26 countries [5]. Its central theme was drug-induced behavior; and the symposia were dedicated to methods of analyses of drug-induced behavior in animals and man; to the comparison of abnormal behavioral states induced by psychotropic drugs in animal and man; and to the comparison of drug-induced and endogenous psychoses. The Congress provided a platform for Julius Axelrod, an American biochemist who was to receive the Nobel Prize, to present his discovery that catechol-O-methyl transferase plays a role in the inactivation of norepinehrine (NE), which led to the transmethyla-tion hypothesis of schizophrenia; for Manfred Bleuler, a prominent Swiss psychiatrist, to express his belief that one should not expect that anomalies of NE or serotonin (5-HT) could explain the pathogenesis of schizophrenia; and for Pierre Lambert, a young French psychiatrist, to propose a classifica-

Presented at the CINP Regional Meeting in Brno, Czech Republic, September 10, 2004.

tion of neuroleptics, prepared by the Comité Lyonnaise, in which neuroleptics are divided into „sedative,“ chlorpromazine-type (which are less potent on a mg per kg basis and produce drowsiness and lassitude with relatively few extrapyramidal signs [EPS]) and „incisive,“ prochlorperazine-type (which are more potent on a mg per kg basis and produce ataraxy without drowsiness but with frequent and marked EPS).

The 2nd CINP congress – organized by Ernst Rothlin, during the second term of his presidency (1958–1960) – was a closed meeting in 1960 in Basle, Switzerland, with about 250 participants [21]. The program focused on methodological issues relevant to the detection of the mode of action and the therapeutic effects of psychotropic drugs. It was at the Basle meeting that Arvid Carlsson, a Swedish pharmacologist who was to receive the Nobel Prize, presented his findings on selective changes in brain monoamines with psychotropic drugs. This was to provide the theoretical framework that dominated neuropsychopharmacology for well over two decades. It was also at the Basle meeting that Fritz Freyhan, one of the American pioneers of psychopharmacology, called for a „critical examination“ of the commonly held belief that there is a linear relationship between neuroleptic potency and therapeutic effects. By presenting clinical evidence that „compounds showing higher frequencies of hyperkinetic syndromes also have higher failure rates“ in treatment, he provided the kind of feedback for researchers involved in psychotropic drug development that might have prevented the detour in the pharmacotherapy of schizophrenia that entailed „high potency“ neuroleptics, and the accompanying high prevalence of tardive dyskinesia in neuroleptic-treated patients.

The 3rd CINP Congress – organized by Dieter Bente, Hanns Hippus, and Fritz Flügel during Paul Hoch's presidency (1960–1962) – was an open meeting in 1962 in Munich, Germany [6]. It was the 10th anniversary of the introduction of chlorpromazine (CPZ), and the meeting provided an opportunity to critically examine ten years of psychopharmacology.

The 4th CINP Congress – organized by Philip Bradley during Hans Hoff's presidency (1962–1964) – was a closed meeting in 1964 in Birmingham, England [3]. The program was uniquely structured in that the first day was dedicated to a plenary session in which speakers with different backgrounds introduced the central theme from their own point of view; the second and third days were given to discussion in working groups; and the fourth and final day to a second plenary session at which deliberations of the working groups were summarized in reports.

Many of those who attended the Birmingham Congress felt that the format of the meeting, with

one topic, was optimal for interaction and should have been adopted at future meetings. But this did not happen. The 5th CINP Congress, an open meeting, organized by Jonathan Cole (69) during Jean Delay's presidency, in 1966 in Washington, DC, United States, featured 14 scientific symposia covering many areas of neuropsychopharmacology [7]; and the 6th CINP Congress, a closed meeting, organized by F. G. Valdecasas during his presidency (1966–1968), in 1968, in Tarragona, Spain, accommodated as many as eight free communications sessions with widely different topics [9].

By the end of the 1960s, despite of the restriction of membership to those actively involved in the new field, interaction between basic scientists and clinical investigators decreased at the biennial meetings, and clinical feedback was largely dismissed. Since by the early 1970s conversion (translation) of findings from one discipline to another to establish relationships, e.g., between structural changes and activity, was no longer of central importance at the meetings, the only difference remaining between open and closed meetings was in the number of registrants. However, alternation between open and closed meetings lingered on until the mid-1980s.

COMMUNICATION OF FINDINGS

During the 1970s pharmacotherapy with psychotropic drugs became the primary form of treatment in mental illness; psychiatrists involved in psychopharmacology were becoming part of the psychiatric establishment; and CINP congresses were transformed into meetings with less and less emphasis on interaction and feedback, and with more and more emphasis on presentations on newly emerging areas of research. The 7th CINP Congress – organized by Zdenek Votava and Oldrich Vinar during Heinz Lehmann's presidency (1968–1970) – in 1970, in Prague, Czechoslovakia, included symposia on lithium with special attention to the prophylactic treatment of bipolar disorder; on amine precursors with special attention on the treatment of affective disorder; and on the evaluation of anxiolytic drugs [23]. The 8th Congress – organized by Eric Jacobssen during his presidency (1970–1972) – in 1972, in Copenhagen, Denmark, featured the pharmacotherapy of sexual disorders, and the long term effects of psychotropic drugs [2]; the 9th – organized by Jacques Boissier during Hanns Hippus' presidency – in 1974, in Paris, France, looked at the effect of drugs on cyclic AMP in the brain, and at genetics in psychopharmacology [4]; the 10th – organized by Radouco-Thomas and André Villeneuve during Deniker's presidency – in Quebec City, Canada, focused on geriatric psychopharmacology, on the

role of cations in synaptic function, and on the interrelationship between neurotransmitter systems [11]; and the 11th – organized by Bernd Saletu during Leo Hollister's presidency (1976–1978) – in Vienna, Austria, dealt with psychopharmacology in children, endorphins and narcotic antagonists in the treatment of schizophrenia, and the role of GABA-ergic mechanisms in the action of benzodiazepines [22].

By the end of the 1970s it was recognized that pharmacotherapy based on hypotheses derived from studies on the mode of action of psychotropic drugs, such as the catecholamine hypothesis of depression, and the dopamine hypothesis of schizophrenia, did not work. Antidepressants, such as desipramine or nortriptyline, were more selective NE reuptake inhibitors than imipramine or amitriptyline but were not more effective in the treatment of depression; and fluphenazine and haloperidol were more potent dopamine (DA) blockers, but not more effective in the treatment of schizophrenia. In spite of this, CINP congresses have become increasingly dominated by neuropharmacology, driven by technological progress, such as the development of receptor binding assays, and receptor subtypes, which led to the delineation of the receptor profiles of neuroleptic and antidepressant drugs.

By the early 1980s basic research in neuropharmacology was no longer restricted to cerebral monoamines; it was extended to neuropeptides and prostaglandins. The 12th CINP Congress – organized by Carlsson during his presidency (1978–1980) – in 1980, in Göteborg, Sweden, was the first meeting to reflect „the shift from neurotransmitter biochemistry at the synaptic cleft to receptor research“ [8]; the 13th Congress – organized by Robert Belmaker during Paul Janssen's (90) presidency (1980–1982) – in 1982, in Jerusalem, Israel, „documented the (ongoing worldwide) effort to understand mental disease in terms of molecular processes“ [12]; the 14th – organized by Giorgio Racagni during Paul Kielholz's presidency (1982–1984) – in 1984, in Florence, Italy, reinforced the belief that employment of molecular neurobiology, an emerging new science, „could lead to research that will transcend the existing boundaries of neuropsychopharmacology“ [15]; and the 15th – organized by William Bunney and Oakley Ray (92) during Ole Rafaelsen's presidency (1984–1986) – in 1986, in San Juan, Puerto Rico, raised hopes that the study of „receptor site response to secondary transmitter systems could provide an avenue for the development of new therapeutic substances.“ The San Juan Congress featured plenary lectures by two Nobel Laureates, Julius Axelrod, and Gerald Edelman, and two first generation neuropsychopharmacologists, Solomon Snyder and Floyd Bloom. Snyder, whose background was primarily in psy-

chiatry and neurochemistry, „emphasized that neurotransmitter receptor sites are central to our understanding of synaptic functions,“ and suggested that „the techniques for identifying receptor sites can be applied to an understanding of the modified and modulated enzymatic changes that may be necessary to ameliorate, or correct behavioral disorders“; and Bloom, whose background was primarily in neurophysiology, felt „encouraged to anticipate that disturbed behavior may eventually be understood in terms of known disordered brain functions.“ In his plenary lecture he „described a Brave New World that will be known in terms of cell function at the molecular level, of anatomical connections, and of a galaxy of transmitters and their modifiers 'signaling' to each other“ [24].

COMMUNICATION OF INTERPRETATIONS

In contrast to the major advances in neuropharmacology, there was little progress in clinical psychopharmacology after the 1970s. The methodology of clinical psychopharmacology has the capability only to demonstrate therapeutic effectiveness but not to translate the differential receptor profiles of drugs into therapeutic profiles relevant to treatment. Idiosyncratic classifications, with possibly homogeneous treatment groups, are covered up by consensus-based classifications, such as the ICD-10 of the World Health Organization, or the DSM-IV of the American Psychiatric Association. Signs and symptoms which are relevant to diagnosis are dismissed by sensitized rating scales. Multi-center, centrally-coordinated clinical investigations with sample-sizes determined by power statistics lead to semi-finished psychotropic drugs without any guidance in predicting which form of illness is responsive to the drug.

By the late 1980s the gap between neuropharmacology – with the capability to „tailor drugs“ to receptor affinities by the employment of genetic technology – and psychopharmacology –with a methodology to demonstrate therapeutic effectiveness in diagnostic categories which are widely heterogeneous in responsiveness to treatment – grew so wide, that without the interpretation of neuropharmacological findings, it could not be bridged. Interpretations rendered neuropharmacological findings applicable for clinical use before establishing a definite relationship between the findings and clinical effects. Since neuropharmacology remained the driving force behind the development of new drugs, it led to neuropsychopharmacologists having close-ties with the pharmaceutical industry in order to serve as

„interpreters.“ In the absence of a suitable clinical methodology for showing anything beyond therapeutic effects, the purpose of CINP Congresses shifted from communication of findings, to communication of interpretations about the clinical implications of the mode of action of psychotropic drugs. Since all preclinical and clinical data on a new drug are in the possession of the drug company that developed it, the interpretations are inevitably cloaked in corporatemarketing decisions, even if they were made with input from a group of „impartial“ outside experts. As time passed it was to become increasingly difficult to separate education in psychopharmacology from the marketing of psychotropic drugs. Nevertheless, it was left with the psychopharmacologists involved in research and teaching – primarily at the universities – to relay (communicate) the information received at meetings, such as the CINP Congresses, to practicing psychiatrists and other medical professionals.

The shift of emphasis in CINP meetings from communication of findings to communication of interpretations with a drive to disseminate the interpretations began in 1986 at the end of Ole Rafaelsen’s presidency in the San Juan Congress, with the presentation of the first CINP Travel Awards to Young Investigators to facilitate their participation in the Congress. They were to become the Rafaelsen Travel Awards, after Rafaelsen’s untimely death in 1987. It was also during the San Juan Congress that the tradition of a President’s Reception and Dinner, conceived by Oakley Ray, and supported by Bristol-Myers Squibb, began. The current logo of CINP, prepared by a public relations company in response to a request by Ole Rafaelsen, was first presented at the San Juan Congress [19].

The transformation received a strong impetus during the presidency of William Bunney (1986–1988) in the form of an initiative to implement ongoing corporate membership of pharmaceutical firms. It was also during Bunney’s presidency at the 16th CINP Congress, organized by Hippus in 1988, in Munich, that the first meeting with presidents and secretaries of national organizations was held. It was to become the corresponding organizations luncheon meeting, supported by Hoechst Marion Roussel (now Aventis).

Bunney was succeeded by Alec Coppen as president of CINP (1988–1990). It was during Coppen’s tenure that the Max Hamilton Prize was established, with the support of Bristol-Myers Squibb, and presented for the first time at the 17th CINP Congress – organized by Takahashi and Shimazono – in 1990, in Kyoto, Japan. Later on several other awards were established with industrial support [20]. It was during Coppen’s presidency that the tradition of a presidents’ luncheon with the meeting organizers was started by Oakley

Ray. Coppen was first to organize a Presidents’ Workshop shortly after his tenure in 1991, in San Juan, Puerto Rico. Subsequently several other presidents, organized workshops, focused on their scientific interest. Coppen’s presidency culminated in the Kyoto Congress, the first major program of CINP outside of Europe and North America. From its 2430 participants about 1000 were from Japan. At the business meeting in Kyoto, several Japanese psychiatrists were elected to membership, and with 56 elected members in 1990, Japan became the country with the third largest national membership in the CINP, after the United States and the United Kingdom, outnumbering the membership of France, Germany and 50 other countries [10].

The Kyoto Congress was followed by the 18th CINP Congress in 1992, in Nice, France, the largest CINP Congress during the 20th century with 5700 participants. It was organized during Julien Mendlewicz’s presidency (2000–2002) by Guy Darcourt, a senior psychiatrist in Nice, and Philippe Robert, one of his assistants, with the help of Salomon Langer, research director of Synthelabo at the time. The Nice Congress set the stage for the 19th Congress in 1994, in Washington, DC, the second largest CINP congress in the 20th century, during the presidency Giorgio Racagni (1992–1994). Lewis Judd, a former director of the National Institute of Mental Health in the United States, was the chairman of the national organizing committee, and Oakley Ray, the secretary general of the Congress [13].

Lewis Judd (118) succeeded Giorgio Racagni as president of CINP, and during his tenure (1994–1996) activities of CINP were extended to the organization of the first regional meeting, held in part in Vienna (organized by Bernd Saletu), and in part in Prague (organized by Vaclav Filip). He proposed the establishment of a committee, consisting of the last four past presidents with the most senior past president as chair, which became the Presidents’ Committee (PC) with the mandate „to provide continuity and leadership for the CINP and to serve as an ad hoc advisory group, to the CINP president and executive committee.” Judd revived the tradition of a presidential address at congresses which stopped after the 1970s, and in his presidential address at the 20th CINP Congress, organized by Graham Burrows in 1996, in Melbourne, Australia, he described his research on the life course of unipolar depression and the implications of residual symptoms between episodes for treatment [14].

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

The regional meetings continued during the

presidency of Claude de Montigny (1996–1998), with a regional meeting in Acapulco, Mexico, organized by Gerhard Heinze, the first CINP meeting in the Latin Americas. It was during de Montigny's tenure that CINP's journal, the *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology* (published by Cambridge University Press) was launched with Bernard Lerer as editor in chief. It was also during his tenure that the Pfizer-CINP Pioneers Award was established and presented to Pierre Deniker, Joel Elkes, and Heinz Lehmann at the 21st CINP Congress, organized by Brian Leonard, in 1998, in Glasgow, Scotland, the United Kingdom [16]. Other recipients of the pioneers award in subsequent meetings were Frank Ayd, Arvid Carlsson, Jonathan Cole, Alec Coppen, Hanns Hippus, Paul Janssen, Alfred Pletscher, Mogens Schou, and Herman van Praag. De Montigny's presidency is associated with a move toward democratization of the CINP, in spite of some opposition, with the nomination of a slate of two – instead of one – candidates for election for each of the five offices (president elect, 2 vice presidents, secretary, and treasurer) on the executive, and for each of the 10 positions of councilors on the council.

Democratization was followed by incorporation during the presidency of Helmut Beckmann (1998–2000). By the time the 22nd CINP Congress, organized in 2000 in Brussels, Belgium, by Julien Mendlewicz, the organization became a legal entity registered in Switzerland with domicile in Zurich. During Beckmann's presidency regional meetings were held in Oporto (Portugal), organized by Antonio Pacheco Palha, in Asuncion (Paraguay), organized by Juan Morinigo Escalante, and in Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia), organized by Ainsah Omar.

The first president of CINP in the new millennium was Eugene Paykel (2000–2002). He was also the first democratically elected president of the organization. It was during Paykel's tenure that the decision was reached to regionalize CINP with „conveners” responsible for the coordination of activities in the different geographic regions. Regionalization was implemented at the end of the 23rd CINP Congress in 2002, in Montreal, Canada, under the direction of Brian Leonard, with the appointment of the first slate of regional „conveners.” During Paykel's presidency, the CINP had regional meetings in Budapest, Hungary, organized by Peter Gaszner, and in Hiroshima, Japan, organized by Shigeto Yamawaki. Another important decision reached during Paykel's presidency was the setting up of a central office in Nashville, Tennessee, USA, with Oakley Ray as the first executive secretary of the office, for continuity and smooth operation of the organization. Prior to the establishment of this office, continuity was provided by the presidents committee and primarily by the presidents who previously served as president-

elects, and after their presidency, as past presidents on the executive committee [18].

By the time Eugene Paykel was succeeded by Herbert Meltzer (141), CINP was a financially secure organization with about 1000 members from 53 countries. During Meltzer's tenure the activities of CINP's education committee were intensified, and the possibility of extending CINP's advisory activity to the division of mental health of the World Health Organization, was explored. It was also during Meltzer's presidency that CINP had its first regional meeting in the People's Republic of China, organized by Tianmei Si [17]. As chairman of the international scientific program of the 24th CINP Congress, a meeting organized by Jean-Pierre Olie in 2004, in Paris, France, Meltzer emphasized the importance of communicating the „most useful new knowledge about treatment and the understanding of drug and disease mechanisms,” and complemented traditional symposia with syntheses, i.e., review-like sessions, and with several „meet the expert“ interactional workshops. The Paris Congress with 6700 registered participants was so far the largest meeting in the history of CINP. Meltzer was instrumental in complementing the central office with a congress organizing group with Oakley Ray as executive director. This congress organizing group, if successful, could channel to the CINP treasury some of the funds spent on congress organizers from the revenues generated by the congress. Establishment of the congress organizing group was the first step toward resolving the situation that CINP's biennial congresses, the organization's only source of substantial revenue is not dealt with by the treasurer and the finance committee, but by the congress organizing committee, with the arrangement that the funds generated by the congress is shared between CINP (75%), and the hosting organization (25%).

ON THE CINP EXECUTIVE

I served on CINP's executive committee from 1970 to 1986. I was secretary from 1970 to 1974, vice president from 1974 to 1976, and treasurer from 1978 to 1986. It was a period which began at the congress in Prague and ended at the congress in San Juan. During those years CINP had four official languages: English, French, German and Spanish, but the activities of the college were still restricted to the organization of biennial congresses. All through my tenure as an officer the membership grew steadily – from about 200 in 1970 to over 600 in 1986 – far beyond the agreed maximum of 15% from one congress to the next, and all through this period virtually all members attend-

ed each congress and the general assembly at the congress.

I took over the treasury in 1978 from Paul Janssen with less than \$ 40,000, and passed it in 1986 to Lauren Maitre with over \$100,000. The organization operated on a shoestring budget and as treasurer I remember our largest expense was the cost of travel and hotel for the officers attending meetings of the executive.

After 1986 the situation changed and by the end of the millennium CINP has become a financially secure, flourishing organization with sufficient funds to support administration and coordination. During the 1980s the organization adopted English as its official language. And during the 1990s CINP extended its activities to include in addition to the biennial congresses other meetings, workshops, educational seminars, and programs, such as for example the „mentor program” in which senior researchers provide guidance to junior investigators. The size of the membership, and especially the membership in Asia, Australia and the Latin Americas, as well as the size of the biennial congresses has kept on growing, and yet at the dawn of the 21st century it has been noted that only about one-quarter of the membership attends the biennial meetings with hardly enough members present at the general assembly to provide a quorum.

CONCLUSIONS

By the end of the 20th century pharmacotherapy has become the primary treatment for all the various psychiatric disorders from sexual dysfunction to the dementias. The pharmaceutical industry was instrumental in reintegrating psychiatry with the other medical disciplines by supplying psychotropic drugs with demonstrated therapeutic effectiveness. They succeeded in establishing psychopharmacology as the dominant paradigm in psychiatry around the world by providing financial support for research in such areas as genetics, neuropharmacology and brain imaging. With the development of neuropsychopharmacology, the term „psychiatry“ with its implicit separation of the afflictions of the „mind“ from the diseases of the „body,“ has become anachronistic.

By the dawn of the 21st century CINP has grown into a prosperous organization incorporated in Switzerland with a central office in Nashville (Tennessee, USA), encompassing a membership from six continents. The organization has played an important role in converting psychiatrists from thinking psychologically to thinking biologically; facilitating the development of a cadre of neu-

ropsychopharmacologists; and providing a forum for the communication of new developments with psychotropic drugs. At the time it was founded in 1957, CINP was the only organization that existed in neuropsychopharmacology; consequently the pharmaceutical industry hoped that the collegium would facilitate the interaction between the many different disciplines involved in the new field. It also sought guidance from findings in „translational research“ in order to develop more effective psychotropic drugs.

Major developments in neuropharmacology, without a parallel development in the methodology of clinical investigations, created a widening gap between neuro- and psychopharmacology. This led to the filling in the missing information from translational research by the clinical interpretation of neuropharmacological findings. Translational research in neuropsychopharmacology is dedicated to the verification (establishment) of relationships between findings in the different areas of the field, e.g., between neuropharmacological actions and clinical effects. In contrast, interpretations in neuropsychopharmacology make neuropharmacological research findings applicable for clinical use before establishing a definite relationship between the findings and clinical effects.

In 2004 by the time Brian Leonard succeeded Herbert Meltzer as president, CINP had expanded its membership and evolved into its present form. Yet, CINP was no longer a unique organization dedicated to the communication of „translational research,“ but one of many organizations dedicated to the communication of interpretations of neuropharmacological research findings. This might explain the difficulty in addressing the question what can CINP offer that other similar national or regional associations in psychopharmacology or biological psychiatry cannot.

Confronted with this reality CINP will have to choose whether to continue in the direction set in the late 1980s – organize larger and larger meetings and become the most powerful organization in the communication of interpretations in neuropsychopharmacology – or to return to its original mandate by alternating between closed and open meetings, and thereby becoming a unique organization again dedicated to the communication of findings in translational research. It is gratifying that the CINP today has the necessary by-laws for deciding on this important issue in a democratic way.

At this point in time it is a mute question in which direction CINP will go. All we know is that the CINP meeting organizing group is planning a closed meeting to celebrate the founding of the collegium in Zurich, Switzerland, 50 years before.

REFERENCES

1. **Ban, T. A., Ray, O. S. (eds):** A history of the CINP. Brentwood, JM Productions, 1996.
2. **Ban, T. A., Boissier, J. R., Gessa, G. J. et al.:** Psychopharmacology, sexual disorders and drug abuse. Amsterdam/Prague: North-Holland/Avicenum, 1973.
3. **Bente, D., Bradley, P. B. (eds):** Neuropsychopharmacology, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1965.
4. **Boissier, J. R., Hippus, H., Pichot, P., (eds):** Neuropsychopharmacology. Amsterdam/New York: Excerpta Medica/American Elsevier, 1959.
5. **Bradley, P. B., Deniker, P., Radouco-Thomas, C. (eds):** Neuropsychopharmacology. Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1964.
6. **Bradley, P. B., Flügel, F., Hoch, P. (eds):** Neuropsychopharmacology Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1964.
7. **Brill, H., Cole, J. O., Deniker, P., Hippus, H., Bradley, P. B. (eds):** Neuropsychopharmacology Amsterdam, Excerpta Medica Foundation, 1967.
8. **Carlsson, A.:** The 12th CINP Congress. In: Ban, T. A., Hippus, H. (eds): Thirty Years CINP. Berlin: Springer, 1988, pp. 42–43.
9. **Cerletti, A., Bovet, J. (eds):** The present status of psychotropic drugs. Amsterdam, Excerpta Medica Foundation, 1969.
10. **Coppen, A.:** My presidency and the XVIIth CINP Congress in Kyoto. In: Ban, T. A., Healy, D., Shorter, E.: From Psychopharmacology to Neuropsychopharmacology in the 1980s and the Story of CINP As Told in Autobiography. Budapest: Animula, 2002, pp. 386–388.
11. **Deniker, P., Radouco-Thomas, C., Villeneuve, A. (eds):** Neuropsychopharmacology. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1978.
12. **Janssen, P. A. J.:** Understanding mental disease in terms of molecular processes. Report on the Congress in Jerusalem by the President of the XIIIth CINP Executive. In: Ban, T. A., Healy, D., Shorter, E. (eds): From Psychopharmacology to Neuropsychopharmacology in the 1980s and the Story of CINP As Told in Autobiography. Budapest, Animula, 2002, pp. 373–375.
13. **Judd, L. L., Racagni, G.:** The 19th Congress of the Collegium Internationale Neuro-Psychopharmacologicum. June 27–July 1, 1994, Washington, DC. In: Ban, T. A., Healy, D., Shorter, E. (eds): Reflections on Twentieth-Century Psychopharmacology. Budapest, Animula, 2004, pp. 597–599.
14. **Judd, L. L.:** President's (1994–1996) report. In: Ban, T. A., Healy, D., Shorter, E. (eds): Reflections on Twentieth-Century Psychopharmacology. Budapest, Animula, 2004, pp. 600–603.
15. **Kielholz, P.:** The 14th CINP Congress – Florence 1984. In: Ban, T. A., Hippus, H. (eds): Thirty Years CINP. Berlin, Springer, 1988, pp. 49–50.
16. **Leonard, B.:** Some reflections on the 21st CINP Congress, Glasgow, Scotland, July 12–16, 1998. In: Ban, T. A., Healy, D., Shorter, E. (eds): Reflections on Twentieth-Century Psychopharmacology. Budapest: Animula, 2004, pp. 604–606.
17. **Meltzer, H. Y.:** Mending minds: The history of psychopharmacology. In: Ban, T. A., Healy, D., Shorter, E. (eds): Reflections on Twentieth-Century Psychopharmacology. Budapest: Animula, 2004, pp. 13–14.
18. **Paykel, E.:** Psychopharmacology after the 1960s. In: Ban, T. A., Healy, D., Shorter, E. (eds): From Psychopharmacology to Neuropsychopharmacology in the 1980s and the Story of CINP as Told in Autobiography. Budapest: Animula, 2002, pp. 18–20.
19. **Ray, O. S.:** The CINP and me: The 1980s. In: Ban, T. A., Healy, D., Shorter, E. (eds): From Psychopharmacology to Neuropsychopharmacology in the 1980s and the Story of CINP As Told in Autobiography. Budapest, Animula, 2002, pp. 380–385.
20. **Ray, O. S.:** The CINP and me. The 1990s. In: Ban, T. A., Healy, D., Shorter, E. (eds): Reflections on Twentieth-Century Psychopharmacology. Budapest, Animula, 2004, pp. 591–596.
21. **Rothlin, E. (ed):** Neuropsychopharmacology, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1961.
22. **Saletu, B., Berner, P., Hollister, L. (eds):** Neuropsychopharmacology. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1979.
23. **Vinar, O., Votava, Z., Bradley, P. B. (eds):** Advances in Neuropsychopharmacology~ Amsterdam/Prague, North-Holland/Avicenum, 1973.
24. **Wittenborn, J. R.:** The 15th CINP Congress – San Juan 1986. In: TA Ban, H Hippus (eds): Thirty Years CINP. Berlin: Springer, 1988, pp. 51–55.

Dodáno redakci: 24. 1. 2005

Po skončení recenzního řízení: 13. 4. 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This manuscript is based on my plenary lecture delivered on the invitation of Dr. Eva Ceskova at the CINP Regional Meeting in Brno, Czech Republic, on Friday, September 10, 2004. The topic of the lecture was suggested by Dr. Brian Leonard, president of CINP (2004–2006). I wish to thank Dr. Edward Shorter for his editorial suggestions.