Letter from the President

Alan N. Epstein

I'm happy to move into the President's Column for this volume of SSIBlings. I plan to use it later to complain to you about the almost universal abuse of several of my favorite words. We have acquired some bad habits when writing and talking about the subjects of our work (we call them "organisms" when, in fact, most organisms aren't a bit like the creatures we work with), and we are careless about the name we use for things that cause animals to behave (we call them "stimuli" whether they generate afferent signals or not), and about the organ that governs their behavior (we call it "the" nervous system as if there is only one kind).

But I will defer this and will let you stew in suspense while you wait for my scolding because I want to say something about Prioritis, one of the two dread diseases of investigators (the other being Technomania) that Gerry Smith discussed the last time he sat in this cockpit.

Paralytic Prioritis is an especially pernicious form of the disease. It strikes investigators who learn that someone has already done or is doing the experiment that they have underway. They feel "scooped", are discouraged, and often abandon their plans.

For some there is no cure. They are convinced that being first is the most important thing in science. But there is a treatment, even for the incurable. It is the acknowledgement that being right and interesting is more important than being first. That is, telling the truth about a phenomenon or a theoretical issue and thereby making it understandable and conceptually useful is more important than mere discovery. We do deal, as basic scientists, with discovery, but the best of these are not just findings. They are discoveries of new meanings that our colleagues can incorporate into their thinking. It is important to be first, but not just with the naked facts.

So, here's my prescription for those of you who suffer from Paralytic Prioritis. Go ahead and do your experiment even if you have been scooped if you think you can do it in a more truthful and interesting way. If you succeed, the credit for discovery will be yours.

There are plenty of good examples of just this outcome in the history of our science. First, Pavlov was not the first to report the elicitation of reflexes by incidental acquired stimuli. E.B. Twitmeier came across the phenomenon while studying the knee-jerk reflex here at Penn and reported it in what may have been his doctoral work in 1902. Pavlov's book on the conditioned reflexes did not appear in English until 1926. But Twitmeier did not appreciate the meaning of what he had found, did not use it to think in interesting new ways about how the brain governs behavior, and did not give the phenomenon its name. Second, Bayliss and Starling are the true discoverers of hormones despite earlier work by Berthold, published in 1849, who showed that masculinity is restored to capons by transplantation of testes into their abdomens, and who speculated that the testes somehow changed the character of the bird's blood in ways that are necessary for masculine structure (comb and wattles) and behavior (crowing and copulating). Close, but not interesting enough. We only know about Berthold's work because it was rediscovered after Bayliss and Starling invented the word "hormone" to describe a class of chemicals that are produced in one organ (the small bowel, in their experiment), travel in the blood, and produce specific effects elsewhere (they were studying the control of the secretion of Pancreatic digestive juices by what they called secretin) in experiments that were clear, rigorous, and interesting. And third, close to home and for the same reasons, I believe that Fitzsimons, Barbara Rolls, and I deserve credit for the discovery of the dopaminergic effect of intracranial angiotensin despite the work of David Booth and Walter Severs who had either reported it several years before we did (Booth) or was working on it at the same time (Severs). For them it was an incidental finding. For us it was the main event from which we could say something truthful and interesting about how the brain gets thirsty.

My favorite example of the importance of being right and interesting is the discovery of America, even
though hero-worship has gotten in the way of historical fact. Columbus is the hero of the adventure. He insisted that land would be found by sailing west into the Atlantic and between 1492 and 1502 he did so four times in small ships (the Santa Maria was only 85 feet long) despite the fact that because of the prevailing winds getting there was a lot easier than getting back. After his well-known trouble getting funded he went everywhere the wind would take him, suffering through hostile encounters with the natives, hurricanes that wrecked his ships (including the Santa Maria), rebellions among his crews, arrest and jailing by his Spanish superiors, and bouts of malaria which ruined his health. Nevertheless, before he reached his early fifties he had discovered more new geography (the entire Caribbean basin, the mainland of present-day Mexico and Central America) than any sailor before him in history.

But Columbus does not deserve the credit for the discovery of the New World, and the sixteenth-century cartographers knew it. After all, those of us who live on this side of the world do not live in North and South Columbia. The continents and their inhabitants were named for Amerigo Vespucci, a fellow Italian who went with Columbus on his second voyage and who on his return wrote a best-seller that announced the discovery of a New World (Novus Mundi) in the western Atlantic. Columbus never understood what he had done. He believed until the day he died that he had explored eastern Asia (the Malay archipelago, Japan, and India, hence his name for the natives). Ogden Nash, a Columbus sympathizer, summed it up this way:

So Columbus said, Somebody show me the sunset
And somebody did and he set sail for it
And he discovered America and they put him in jail for it,
And the fetters gave him welts,
And they named America for somebody else.

But that somebody else, who only went along once for the ride, got it right. Vespucci ignored the imaginations of his contemporaries by understanding the truth about what Columbus had done, and rightly it is his name and not that of Columbus that is all over the Western Hemisphere.

Philosopher’s Corner

Harry R. Kissileff

I received two replies to my last query about how to separate effects of a treatment on reward value of a stimulus from the treatment’s effects on specific motivation to consume. Harvey Weingarten (McMaster University) suggests that dose-effect curves with concentration as the dose and consumption as the effect are the answer. Nancy Dess (Occidental College) reminded me that this is an old problem in psychology and that both taste reactivity testing and operant responding have been applied to it.

Here is Harvey Weingarten’s reply:

The query you raise in the recent SSIBlings regarding the interpretation of sham feeding data is perfectly appropriate. Certainly not all changes in sham intake represent changes in palatability. To assume this would force the conclusion that a strong blow to the paw of a rat alters palatability because, without doubt, this manipulation would reduce sham feeding! It is important to recognize that the problem of separating reward from performance is not unique to the problem of palatability. In fact this distinction has dominated research in the area of brain stimulation reward. The problem in that area was to distinguish manipulations which influenced operant responding for brain stimulation because of change in the rewarding value of the stimulation from manipulations which altered responding because of a change in performance capacity. That field developed quantitative techniques, specifically curve-shift procedures derived from dose-response analyses in pharmacology, to allow this discrimination [1]. I have argued that it is only with the use of these quantitative procedures that the full potential of the sham feeding preparation can be realized [2]. One of the realizations possible with the curve shift technique is the potential to separate rewarding from performance effects in sham feeding. The data supporting this assertion were reported in an abstract (#376.17) at the recent Neuroscience meeting and in a manuscript in preparation. I would be glad to propagandize the importance and utility of a more quantitative approach to the analysis of sham feeding data on any occasion.
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Here is Nancy Dess’ reply: (slightly edited to remove chattiness - it was originally an E-mail off the cuff reply).

I thought your piece in the latest SSIBlings was very provocative... There are two types of measures that I think, in conjunction with intake measures, potentially can help identify the "locus" (i.e., hedonic (evaluative) vs. motivational D("reward" or molar behavior control)) of experimental effects. The first is taste reactivity [1]; though not independent of visceral state, taste reactivity
can vary independently of consumption and the organization of other complex behaviors (given its validity even in decerebrate rats and anencephalic babies). So if a treatment affects intake (normal or sham) without affecting mimetic responses, hedonics probably are not involved.

The second approach is operant: The cyclic-ratio schedule [2] and the reward summation function [3] both provide assays for palatability (hedonic) shifts vs. changes in performance due to regulation/motivation (cyclic-ratio) or motor activity (RSF). Now, interpreting results in these paradigms does rely on comparison with patterns established with "known" quantities (i.e., how quinine adulteration alters performance, how deprivation alters performance, etc.); to the extent the methods used in the standardization of the paradigms rest on assumptions you questioned in your column, their usefulness is reduced. However, joint examination of the effects of an experimental manipulation on sham and normal feeding, taste reactivity, and performance in the cyclic-ratio or RSF paradigms is likely to make some inferences about its site of action (in terms of constructs or neural mechanisms) more reasonable than others. At least, if we can agree that, in principle, palatability and "behavioral gain" (or motivation) are separable, these paradigms taken together allow operational definition of them.
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Response: Although Weingarten discusses the distinction between motor and motivational effects, which is not what I had in mind, his presentation at the Neuroscience meeting showed that deprivation did not affect sham drinking across sucrose concentrations the way pimozone and quinine adulteration affected it. His procedure squarely addressed the issue. The techniques cited by Dess, though they were intended to, really don’t solve the problem, because, as she implies, changes in motivational state and reward value of stimuli tend to move these two measures in the same directions. Only when it can be shown that the measures of motivation and the measures of reward are differentially affected by an experimental manipulation can it be inferred that the manipulation is affecting behavior via one mediator and not the other. Indeed the basic question remains: What is measure of reward and what of motivation. Or are they really the same thing? Weingarten’s presentation at the 1990 Neuroscience meeting claimed to offer the required disjunction. However, the solution offered by Weingarten involves the tacit assumption that certain manipulations change reward value (e.g. quinine adulteration) and others change motivational state (e.g. deprivation). However, it has been argued that deprivation changes palatability and that offering a bitter diet blunts appetite. Without agreement at the basic level of how we will use terms in this field, progress seems elusive. Do others agree that Weingarten’s demonstration is a solution to the problem I posed, or do different dose-effect curves resulting from different operations simply indicate that the operations are different without specifying on what mediator they are relying?

When is a (sham) drink a (sham) feed?

Neil E. Rowland

Behavioral scientists study observable events, and most of those events are thus described using common vocabulary. In science, these common words should assume definitions that are more rigorous than “at large”. Occasionally we get into debates about what we mean by terms like thirst or satiety. I’ve just come across an example I’d not considered before.

According to the dictionary, and everyday use, “drink” means to take liquid into the mouth and swallow it (verb) or any liquid that one drinks (noun). Thus we drink ice cream floats, liquid diets, alcoholic beverages, and even water. In our experiments, however, “drinking” almost always refers to water intake.

A problem arises when we use liquid diets, and I’ll use the example of “sham ingestion” because liquids are always used so that they drain from a fistula. I used the key terms sham feeding and sham drinking to search a biomedical data base. “Sham feeding” is used commonly for studies in which a liquid food (either a simple sugar, or complex diet) is the consumable. “Sham drinking” is used for intake of water. Sometimes, both terms are used in the same paper to refer to different commodities (e.g., [1]). With usual clarity, Mook has stood alone with the dictionary in his use of “sham drinking” in reference to consumption of glucose or other sweet solutions (e.g., [2,3]).

This remains an academic issue as long as we stick to empirical data. However, it is more serious when the term “drinking” is used in a volume on thirst (I’ll not embarrass the editors), yet data pertaining to caloric fluids are used in a theoretical analysis without specific reference to the commodity. From some perspectives, it is the operant (verb: lick, sip) that is the theoretical focus and defines the use of the word drink. For many of us, however, I suspect that it is the commodity (noun: what is being consumed) that defines the use.
Thus, "feeding" is the preferred term when the fluid imparts metabolic energy or, as used in both research and clinical "sham feeding" tests, elicits cephalic phase digestive reflexes.

Having confused an issue you never thought confusing, may I offer three remedies (most of you practice these already):

- In the abstract and index words, as well as in the title, if you must use "drinking" instead of "water intake" then be sure to specify the fluid(s) under investigation.
- If not otherwise obvious, be explicit about whether your use of the word "drink" is as either a noun or a verb.
- Go and feed yourself a drink of your choice. No shamming.
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Secretary's report
B.G. Hoebel

Annual Membership Meeting
St. Louis, October 31, 1990

President Gerry Smith opened the meeting.
Treasurer Tony Scafani reported SSIB has 466 members from 18 countries, including 357 from the USA and 166 who have paid-up dues. He encouraged the rest to pay dues by Dec. 15. He announced the next meeting will be with EPA April 11-15, 1991 in NYC with the typical 5 min. talks with 25 slides each. Suzanne Sunday and Allan Geliebter will make the local arrangements for an innovative program of grouped talks. The next major SSIB meeting will be with NAASO Oct. 20-23, 1991 in Sacramento with a registration fee of about $110 for meals suitable for ingestive behavior and obesity.

Executive Officer Harry Kissileff conducted final balloting on the five prepublished amendments, which all passed, and are here paraphrased in brief:

Amendment 1: Regular members must have conducted research and published.
Amendment 2: Student members can apply for regular membership upon completion of the doctoral degree.
Amendment 3: A new category of Associate Members is for others with an interest in the field of ingestive behavior.

Amendment 4: The secretary and treasurer will serve 3-year terms.
Amendment 5: The method of amendment will be by majority vote of the regular and emeritus members polled by mail.

Never-tiring President Smith introduced retiring President Reagan, who introduced newly retired President Bush. Reagan and Bush smiled incessantly, with arms raised jubilantly in the traditional sign of political prowess and power that comes with getting the most Halloween candy. In true Bush fashion the newly elected president invited the multitude to share in the fruit of our $10 taxes, forgetting entirely the people's thirst to find out if the outgoing president had learned anything in his years of office. Offered the choice of a debate on the question: "Can we survive the administrations of Woods, Smith & Epstein?" or a Presidential Address on Pavlov, the audience reflexly chose the option with the most slides.

Gerry Smith delivered an account of Pavlov from boyhood to Nobel Prize that would make every one of us wish we had signed up all our students for SSIB and brought them along to hear and learn. The first slide was the cover sheet of Pavlov's book The Work of the Digestive Glands. Fifty people in the audience turned to the other fifty to note in a whisper that the once-worthless treasure has been stamped DISCARDED from the Washington Sanatorium and Hospital Physicians Library. Pavlov, according to Gerry's account, was the non-precocious son of a priest who read books twice. Thus Pavlov learned the importance of reading. Daily exercise gave him "muscular gladness"; thus Pavlov learned fitness. A right-wing mentor taught him amazing surgical skill by good example and scientific politics by bad example. Thus Pavlov became surgically and politically ambidextrous. Next he went to work with Sechenov at home in his Mother Russia, then off to Ludwig in Leipzig and Heidenhain in Breslou and completed his journey from the Provinces to the Prize in 1904. Gerry emphasized that for Pavlov science was not a career: it was an act of life, it was living itself. Said Pavlov, "Even if you had two lives to give, it would not be enough". Gerry's was an inspiring speech, because it was given for the younger scientists in the audience, which somehow included everyone.

SSIBlings
Pavlov's Letter to Young Scientists

G.P. Smith

Following my recent talk on Pavlov at our meeting in St. Louis, several people asked me where they could find the complete text of his letter to young scientists. I thought it was of sufficient interest to be circulated to the membership in SSIBlings and the editor agreed. The quotation is from B.P. Babkin's Pavlov, A Biography, University of Chicago Press, 1949, p. 110.

"At the beginning of his last illness, when he was still carrying on his work, an organization of Russian youth (the Komsomol) asked Pavlov to write an article for their journal. He acceded to this request, submitting a short contribution, which may now be considered in the light of a legacy to students—not to Russian students only but to students of all lands. Here is what he wrote:

This is the message I would like to give to the youth of my country. First of all, be systematic. I repeat—be systematic. Train yourself to be strictly systematic in the acquisition of knowledge. First study the rudiments of science before attempting to reach its heights. Never pass on to the next stage until you have thoroughly mastered the one on hand. Never try to conceal the defects in your knowledge even by the most daring conjectures and hypotheses. Practice self-restraint and patience. Learn to do the drudgery of scientific work. Although a bird's wing is perfect, the bird could never soar if it did not lean upon the air. Facts are the air on which the scientist leans. Without them you will never fly upward. Without them your theories will be mere empty efforts. However, when studying, experimenting, or observing, try not to remain on the surface of things. Do not become a mere collector of facts but try to penetrate into the mystery of their origin. Search persistently for the laws which govern them.

The second important requisite is modesty. Never at any time imagine that you know everything. No matter how highly you are appreciated by others, have the courage to say to yourself, 'I am ignorant'. Do not let pride possess you.

The third thing that is necessary is passion. Remember that science demands of a man his whole life. And even if you could have two lives, they would not be sufficient. Science calls for tremendous effort and great passion. Be passionate in your work and your search for truth."

A Query from the President-Elect

Barbara Rolls

I would like to thank you for electing me as the Fifth President of SSIB (1991-1992). I consider this an honor, and will do my best to serve you well. I would like my term to be memorable and have an idea that I hope will achieve this. I am writing to tell you about it and to solicit your help.

Recently I was reviewing some of the old literature on human feeding and was struck by how much it has influenced our current thinking. I wished that the seminal papers on ingestive behavior were in one place so that I could be reminded of the development of the field. Of course, such a collection would be extremely useful for teaching. Therefore, I propose that we publish a book of reprints of key articles on food and fluid intake.

What I would like are your suggestions for the papers that you think have most influenced the field. These could be either the original publication or a follow-up review which might perhaps be more readable. Titles of papers that are frequently used for teaching would also be welcome. Harry Kissileff and I will then compile your suggestions and organize them into sections. We will hope to include the most frequently suggested papers and will make editorial judgments about whether to include those less frequently suggested. When the articles have been selected and we have obtained permission from the publishers to include them, we will ask those individuals who made the suggestions if they would like to write a short statement about the article (how it influenced the field or their own thinking). This statement would be entirely optional (making a suggestion does not commit you to any further work). We want to hear from as many of you as possible. At present, the plan is for just one volume, but if the response from you is large, we could consider separate volumes on food intake and fluid intake.

We will not try to finalize getting a publisher (suggestions welcome) until we have a firm outline, but we have made preliminary enquiries which have been received enthusiastically.

Please send your suggestions (names of authors, date, title of article, journal or book title including editors, volume and page numbers) to:

January 1991
Society Educational Materials Interest Survey

The Society would like to assess the feasibility of developing an "Ingestive Behavior Educational Resources Database." The database could then be used by members as well as nonmembers for the teaching of ingestive behavior, either as part of a larger course or a course by itself at the advanced undergraduate, beginning graduate level. Details about the justification for such a course and the needs it would serve are available from the executive officer (Harry Kissileff). The purpose of the present survey is to determine who would like to contribute to this effort. If enough individuals (10 or more) indicate their willingness to provide materials and the nature of the materials is sufficiently complex to warrant it, a proposal will be submitted to a funding organization to collate, edit, and distribute the material to society members and others who might be interested.

Development of educational materials is envisioned as a major mission of the society as defined in its bylaws: "In furtherance of its purposes the Society shall: Promote and facilitate dissemination of knowledge about the field of ingestive behavior to the public and to educators, scholars, and health professionals." However, this effort cannot occur without input from you, the members. Two Board members have already responded to an earlier circulation of the survey. Please return your surveys to the executive officer as quickly as possible and no later than March 15, 1991.

Appetite to Offer Letters Option

David Booth has announced that beginning in 1991 there will be a new section in the journal, Appetite, devoted to short communications under the provisional title of "Appetite Letters". Individual letters should be short empirical or theoretical communications submitted to an Executive Editor or member of the Editorial Advisory Board, listed inside the back cover of each issue of Appetite. A submitted Letter should have an attached evaluated review from a referee not involved in the reported research and not affiliated with the institution(s) of the author(s). The referee should have expertise, complementary (where appropriate) to that of the Editor or Advisor to whom the submission is directed. The referee should agree in the report to be named on the published letter as approving its acceptance. Any revision should be approved and reported by the referee. Alternatively, the author may request the Editor to find a referee. Both the Editor's and referee's names will be published on the letter they accept. Further questions about guidelines for lengths of submissions and appropriate content should be directed to Dr. Booth. Psychology, P.O. Box 363, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, England.

—Harry R. Kissileff

Membership Notes

A call for nominations for officers of the Society is enclosed with this mailing for regular members of SSIB. Please send in your suggestions posthaste!

In 1990 the Society passed three amendments involving membership categories. We have always had student memberships, which offer the advantages of reduced rates for dues and meeting attendance for individuals working on their degrees. One amendment clarifies the fact that students do not automatically become regular members upon completion of the degree; rather, they must apply for regular membership. Another amendment defines eligibility for regular membership as conduct of research and publication. The third amendment creates a new membership category, Associate Member, intended for people who are not currently working on a degree, but have an active interest in the field, e.g., laboratory technicians.

An application for membership is enclosed with this mailing. For eligibility for membership discounts on the SSIB-EPA and SSIB-NAASO meetings, your dues should be received by the deadlines for registration for these meetings.

Practical Matters

RIA

Mike Tordoff wrote to offer some useful information: "Many SSIB scientists would like to measure insulin and glucagon, but don't have the facilities to do it. One solution is to use the services of the Radioimmunoassay (RIA) core facility at U.Penn.]. This is one of several centers around the U.S. that was developed to assist investigators with NIH grants analyze plasma insulin and glucagon. The
RIA core facility assays approximately 40,000 samples a year, which it receives from all over the country. The cost is trivial: it currently charges 15¢ for rat insulin and 30¢ for rat glucagon determinations. Human blood assays are twice this price. The assay results are generally available 3-10 days after samples arrive. There are certain requirements for reliable plasma/serum preparation—particularly for glucagon. The minimum volume of plasma for rat insulin can be as little as 50 µl/sample."

The assay services are provided by Diabetes Research Centers, which are intended to provide shared core facilities for NIH investigators in diabetes research and related endocrine and metabolic disorders. The centers are funded by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, a component of NIH. According to program director Dr. Sanford Garfield, the centers' resources have been capped for several years, so that the per-sample charges cited by Mike represent the difference between the centers' funds and the actual cost of running the assays. He suggested that interested investigators should contact their nearby centers for more information. I have extracted the contact numbers that are specific to hormone assays from a summary document prepared in May 1989.

University of Chicago       IL (312) 702-6217
Indiana University          IN (317) 630-6056
Joslin Diabetes Center     MA (617) 732-2608
Washington University      MO (314) 454-6049
Einstein College of Medicine NY (212) 430-2408
University of Pennsylvania  PA (215) 898-4368
Vanderbilt University       TN (615) 322-2197
Baylor College of Medicine  TX (713) 798-6053
University of Virginia      VA (804) 924-5600
VA Medical Center (Seattle) WA (206) 762-1010
[x2138]

More about rat diets

Israel Ramirez wrote to add information about the estimation of the caloric density of rat diets. He points out that the Atwater values (4, 9, and 4 kcal/g for protein, fat, and carbohydrate) are based on people eating mixed meat and vegetable diets, and their use may be inappropriate for rats eating cereal-based diets. Among the problems are different levels of utilizable energy in different sources of macronutrients (e.g., protein from animal vs. vegetable sources [1], carbohydrate from starch vs. sugar, fat as a function of fat type [2] and postabsorptive disposition [3]) and possible caecal utilization of fiber. He suggests that a self-appointed committee could summarize the literature and provide guidelines on estimating the energy values for rat foods. If you've dealt with this issue in the course of your research or your reading, you can easily contribute information to this effort by contacting Israel at the Monell Center.
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Meetings

Pennington Symposium

The 2nd Pennington Biomedical Research Center Symposium, "The Science of Food Regulation", will be held March 14-15 at the Center. Two dozen speakers will overview the areas of energy balance, nutrient partitioning, peptides and monoamines, and taste and afferent signals for nutrient ingestion. A poster session is included. Because total attendance is limited to 100 people, early application is advised. For more information, contact George A. Bray, M.D., or Barbara York, Ph.D., Pennington Biomedical Research Center, 6400 Perkins Road, Baton Rouge, LA 70808-4124. Tel: 504-765-2513/2542 Fax: 504-765-2525.

SSIB @ EPA

I ♥ NY The next opportunity to get together with your SSIBlings will be in April, when the Society convenes with the 62nd annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association in New York City. Besides the array of papers given by our members, that meeting also features several invited speakers working in ingestive behavior: Linda Bartoshuk (current President of EPA), Robert Bolles, Alan Epstein (current President of SSIB), Bennett G. Galef, and Ralph Norgren. And if these aren’t reasons enough to attend, we will once again be holding two SSIB sessions, on the first two evenings of the main meeting.

Recently, many SSIB members have been discussing the shortcomings of the 5-minute SSIB/EPA presentations. In the last few years, the number of presentations has proliferated at the expense of the quality and discussion time following the talks. They have, in some sense, become easy substitutes for the longer EPA talks. In addition, more members requested time for open, less formal discussions during our meetings. The revised structure of the 1991 SSIB/EPA talks is an attempt to address these needs. Rather than one type of presentation, this year there will be two types, one on Thursday evening and one on Friday
evening; each person may submit for one presentation type only.

Thursday evening will begin with a cocktail hour at 5 PM in the hotel (Sheraton Centre, at 52nd St. and 7th Ave.). From 6 to 8 PM we will have a limited number of the "traditional" 5-minute talks with absolutely no more than 2 slides. This format is especially useful for presenting pilot studies or work in progress. The session will be facilitated by Harry Kissileff and since we will be having fewer talks, we will have time for questions and discussion. This presentation format is geared for students and newer members of SSIB. Following the talks, we will reconvene for a "traditional" New York City meal at The Carnegie Deli (854 7th Ave. at 55th St., three blocks from the hotel).

The Friday evening meeting will be from 8 to 10 pm in the hotel. Refreshments and light snacks will be provided. This meeting will consist of a workshop/problem-solving session comprised of a series of 1-2 minute presentations with either 1 or no slide. This format is intended for regular members of SSIB. The presentations will not be "data oriented" but will focus instead on a problem, a controversial topic, a new approach, puzzling data — something that will generate discussion. There will be 3 sections: one on human digestive behavior and two on animal digestive behavior, with the latter sections grouped post hoc from the submitted titles. The sections will be facilitated by Barbara Rolls, Tony Sclafani, and Dennis Vanderweele. After the presentations in each section, there will be 15-20 minutes of open discussion on the topic.

If you plan to join us, please return the "Call for Titles" mailed with this issue of SSIBlings. For a dinner and/or cocktail hour reservation for Thursday night, check the appropriate line and enclose a check for the appropriate amount. Checks should be made out to SSIB; please do not make them payable to an individual. If you are interested in presenting either a 5 minute talk or a 1-2 minute talk, please indicate on the form and include your title. Return your form by February 15 to: Suzanne Sunday, Dept. of Psychiatry, NY Hospital-Cornell University Medical College, 21 Bloomingdale Rd., White Plains, NY 10605. If you have further questions call Suzanne at 914-997-5860 or Allan at 212-523-4184.

—Suzanne Sunday and Allan Geliebter
1991 SSIB / EPA Co-Chairs

Joint SSIB/NAASO meeting

On October 20-23, SSIB will meet with the North American Association for the Study of Obesity in Sacramento. This meeting, our first joint effort with NAASO, will have a format different from previous SSIB gatherings; detailed information and registration and abstract forms are included with this mailing. Note that the poster sessions permit the simultaneous assimilation of nutrients and knowledge.

A limited number of "Young Investigator" travel fellowships for this meeting will be available for graduate student and first-year postdoctoral members of SSIB. Selection will be based on the quality of submitted abstracts; the selection committee may also solicit a letter of recommendation from the individual's mentor.

Princeton in '92

At the Board meeting in October, Bart Hoebel described plans for the first independent SSIB meeting, to be held June 25-27, 1992 in Princeton. He hopes to design the format of symposia to increase integration and interaction among the symposium speakers. Industry support will be sought to defray the cost of the meeting, estimated at $200 per participant for college-style room and board. Exhibitors for the meeting will also be sought. Bart will need the help of an Organizing/Local Arrangements Committee; volunteers and suggestions are welcome. Thom Castonguay and Sarah Leibowitz have agreed to help with the entertainment; polish up your rusty band instruments, jokes and magic tricks!

Job openings

Assistant Professor. The Department of Psychology at Kansas State University invites applications for a tenure-track position in Behavioral or Cognitive Neuroscience (available in the Fall, 1991). Candidates must have a Ph.D. at the time of appointment, and post-doctoral training is preferred. Responsibilities include: teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in one’s area of specialization or related areas, as well as establishing and maintaining a strong research program as evidenced by supervision of graduate student research, publication, and obtaining extramural funding. Salary is competitive and dependent on qualifications. Submit a letter of application indicating areas of professional interest and objectives, vita, three letters of recommendation and reprints/preprints to: Dr. Mark Barnett, Search Committee, Department of Psychology, Bluemont Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan KS 66506-5302. Applications should be received by February 15, 1991. Kansas State University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer and encourages applications from qualified female and minority candidates.

Don Coscina has an opening for a post-doctoral fellow in his laboratory. The general area of research to be pursued by this fellow is the metabolic covariates of manipulating brain neurochemical systems that elicit eating. Hard funds may be available for this position starting in the fall of 1991. Other candidates interested in applying for salary support from external sources can apply at any time. If interested, contact Don by phone (416) 979-6821, fax (416)
Pre- and postdoctoral training at the Monell Chemical Senses Center.

Through a grant from the Howard Heinz Endowment, the Monell Chemical Senses Center offers pre- and postdoctoral fellowships and internships for basic research training. This multidisciplinary program deals with the relationship of nutrition and the chemical senses (taste and smell) in humans and animals with an emphasis on biomedical and clinical research.

Predoctoral fellowships support graduate students enrolled in an accredited doctoral program who wish to conduct their dissertation research at the Center. Arrangements are made with the sponsoring institution to satisfy requirements for the degree. The fellowship includes a stipend, research supplies and travel to a scientific meeting and the home institution.

Postdoctoral fellowships are available for new doctoral level scientists, although more established investigators seeking specialized training are also encouraged to apply. Support includes a stipend, research supplies and travel to a scientific meeting.

Internships for 2-3 months are intended primarily for graduate students to participate in ongoing research during the summer or for laboratory rotations. Support includes travel to Philadelphia and return, and an allowance for lodging and meals.

For further information, contact Dr. Mark I. Friedman, Monell Chemical Senses Center, 3500 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104 Tel: 215-898-6666.

From the Editor's Desk

The large number of articles submitted for this issue and the large number of new members are both welcome events for the Society, bringing new ideas into our midst. However, their numberosity, and the many changes of address, preclude the publication of the directory update that I had planned for this issue. But you won’t have to wait too long—the 1991 Directory is slated for publication in early spring.

You may have noticed that a number of the articles in this issue ask for your input on a variety of topics. You can join Harry Kissileff’s ongoing philosophical forum, contribute suggestions to two educational projects (part of our reason for being), help develop guidelines for estimating animal diet contents, and get involved in the planning stages of SSIB’s first independent meeting. Offering your ideas costs little more than a postage stamp (or even less with E-mail) and is valued by the organizers of these efforts. This is your chance to help shape useful books on your shelf and meetings worth attending!

Reminder: Please stop putting those finishing touches on your SSIB logo suggestions and just send them in the way they are. Your sketch could become the Society’s letterhead!

There is a new fax number you can use to contact me at Hoffman-La Roche: (201) 235-2775. Although you can also fax material to me at the number listed in the SSIB directory, it takes longer to come by "courier" from Brooklyn.

If you are submitting relatively long documents, it would be very helpful if you sent them either as E-mail [SCLAFANI@BKLYN (Bitnet)] or as word-processor documents on disk. I compose SSIBlings on a Macintosh, but I can also translate files created by most popular IBM programs.

The next issue of SSIBlings should be mailed in mid-May; the deadline for submissions is April 15.

Calendar

These are the 1991 scientific meetings recorded on SSIB’s calendar so far. Contact Karen Ackroff to add items to this list, which appears in every issue.

Mar. 14-15 Pennington Center Symposium
Baton Rouge, LA

Apr 11-14 Eastern Psychological Association
New York

Apr 11-12 SSIB meeting with EPA, New York

Apr 21-26 Federation of American Societies for
Experimental Biology, Atlanta, GA

Oct 20-23 Joint North American Association for
the Study of Obesity (NAASO) and
SSIB meeting, Sacramento, CA

Nov 7-9 Neuroscience satellite meeting
San Antonio, TX

Nov 10-15 Society for Neuroscience, New Orleans,
LA

1992:
• SSIB’s first independent meeting, in Princeton, June 25-27.
• A satellite meeting to the International Psychology Congress in Brussels, July 15-18.

1993:
• International Congress on the Physiology of Food and Fluid Intake, in Oxford, summer.
• A British meeting (just before ICPFFI), at which overseas attendance would be welcome, in Oxford, late June or early July.
• A satellite to the Nutrition Congress, in Cambra, October 1-3.
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