Letter from the President
Alan N. Epstein

This will be my last chance to write to you from the presidential cockpit, and I will use it to do two things. First, I will meet my constitutional responsibility by giving you my report of the Society's activities during my term of office, a kind of State of the Society Report. Second I will tell you what I think our science is trying to understand.

But, before I do either, I want to thank the membership of SSIB for giving me this opportunity for leadership and for the creative and enthusiastic way that the members have made all of our activities successful. I want to thank the Board of Directors for their advice and for their concern for the welfare of the Society. I want to thank the committee chairpersons, the editor of SSIBlings, and the officers of the Society for doing all that needs to be done to keep it functioning and responsive to the membership. I want to thank my predecessor, Gerry Smith, for leaving the house in such good order, and my successor, Barbara Rolls, for helping me to prepare it for her occupancy. And last I want to thank Harry Kissileff, our Executive Officer, for making my job as easy as it looks. SSIB is Harry's baby. He incubated it, was its first President, and has since been the power behind the throne of all of his successors. All of us are fortunate that he has not lost his enthusiasm for its future and that he will continue to be the Executive Officer of SSIB for as long as it needs his help.

Now, my State of the Society Report. SSIB is thriving. We now have more than 460 members, 105 from outside the USA. And we have a group of generous Supporting Members whose checks make the difference between doing what we have to do and doing what we want to do. We have enjoyed a full schedule of scientific and social events, beginning with our reception and annual business meeting at Neuroscience last year, and including our short-paper sessions and dinner at EPA and our joint meeting with NAASO in Sacramento that many of you will attend on October 20 to 23. This will be an important event in its own right because it will be the first time that SSIB has conducted a full scientific program, and it has additional importance because it is a rehearsal for June 1992 when SSIB, with the leadership of Bart Hoebel, will have its first independent meeting at Princeton. Our committees have been active, especially the Nominating Committee which organized our annual election (see later pages for the announcement of our new officers and Board members) and the Long Range Planning Committee now chaired by Sue Ritter. Earlier this year we created a new Committee on Animal Issues, co-chaired by Jim Smith at FSU and Tom Scott at U Delaware, to assist any of you that have problems with the animal crazies and to advise the Society about issues of animal care and use. SSIBlings has continued to be our official voice and local newspaper and we are grateful to Karen Ackroff for editing it with such competence and creativity.
And now my thoughts about what our science is trying to understand. As behaviors, feeding, drinking, suckling and salt intake are functions of the brain, which is the organ of behavior. Our problem is therefore neurological. We are trying to understand how the brain governs the ingestive behaviors, and the tough conceptual problem is how to think about what the brain is doing when animals like us eat, drink, suck, and ingest salt.

For me, the reflex and the thermostat are the wrong ideas. The behaviors that interest us do not occur as innate, stereotyped and predictable responses to adequate afferent input (our animals do not eat, drink, etc. when and only when food or fluid is under their noses), and they don't just correct error signals by some form of negative feedback (my rats drink more NaCl when they need it, and drink it when they have no need for it at all). In governing the ingestive behaviors, the brain is not just registering and integrating afferent inputs (neural and chemical), and it is not just using them to maintain nutrient constancy.

Reflex controlled servomechanisms work well for the spinal cord, but the brain is a very special organ. It is a self-activating machine that issues commands continuously to action organs, and that can do so with endogenous periodicity. Read that again, please, because it is the heart of my argument. The living brain is autonomous and is never at rest. It generates action and can do so rhythmically. It is not a switch-board or computer that is inert until activated by inputs that it then deals with in elaborate preprogrammed algorithms and that it responds to in fixed modes. The brain uses inputs, but it uses them creatively. That is, they lose their identity in the brain and become percepts, feelings, intentions, and plans of action that are expressed as coordinated efferent activity (commands) to muscles and glands (action organs). If we stick to the ideas that the brain is some kind of elaborate calculator that is called into action only when the periphery calls and is interested only in balancing accounts so that constancies are maintained we will continue to impoverish our idea of what we are trying to understand.

How then to enrich our ideas about the nature of our science? What are the most useful and truthful models for our thinking? For me they are what the brain does most of the time for most mammals and birds. It goes to sleep and wakes itself up. It sends commands to the organs of grooming, and it generates locomotion. Sleep and waking, locomotion and grooming are the three most universal and most common behaviors of animals like ourselves, and are the best models for our research. In all three the behavior is governed by a continuously active and variable central state (the circadian pace-maker, oscillators for grooming, the states of sleep and arousal) that uses the animal (accepts its afferents, operates its effectors) to express itself. Why not the same for ingestion? Why not continuously variable central states for hunger and thirst in successive modes of expressed (hunger and thirst) and unexpressed (satiety) activity within which afferents inputs play a permissive and directive role (the states of active eating and drinking) or are ignored (the states of satiety). I am paying tribute here to the older idea of central motive states and am asking that we modernize it and make it the constant theme of our thinking.

To leave you with something to chew on, or, if you prefer, something to satisfy your thirst for understanding, or, if you are an unreconstructed peripheralist, something to assure that this little essay will leave you with a bad taste in your mouth, here is another way to digest what I have been saying. I believe, literally, that the brain makes itself hungry (and thirsty) and satiates itself for both food and water just as it puts itself to sleep and wakes itself up, grooms itself, and moves itself from one place to another. And I believe further that it would continue to do so even if it were disembodied. Something would be lost, of course, by way of the timing of the bouts of ingestion and the selection among commodities for consumption but the central motive states would continue to wax and wane. Without real ingestion the central state of satiety might become brief and rare but it would remain an essentially endogenous function of the brain. In short, I am convinced that the brain would continue to get hungry and thirsty even if there were no body to feed and water.

SSIB Election Results
The ballots have been counted, and the new officers of the Society are Anthony Selcufani (President-Elect), Carol Maggio (Secretary), and Suzanne Sunday (Treasurer). The new members of the Board of Directors are Robert C. Ritter and James Gibbs. They will assume their offices after the Annual Business meeting in October. Thom Castonguay and Kathy Houpt will retire from the Board, and Bart Hoebel will give up secretarial duties but will remain busy coordinating the 1992 SSIB meeting in Princeton. Tony gets a year off, more or less.
Sacramento!

Our annual meeting will be held in Sacramento, California along with the North American Association for the Study of Obesity (NAASO) October 20th-23rd, 1991.

We have programmed over 240 talks. Plenary speakers include Bart Hoebel, Judith Rodin, Tony Scalfani, Claude Bouchard, Marci Greenwood, Gordon Ringold, Bruce Spiegelman and George Bray. Prior to the opening ceremonies, there will be a workshop Sunday afternoon, October 20th, from 2-4 p.m. conducted by Van Hubbard and Bill Lands from NIH and NIADA to discuss the grant application process. The posters will be shown for the entire meeting; in addition, a special poster session is scheduled for Monday evening.

The registration fee for members is $110 (an extra $10 if you register on site) and includes food and drink on Sunday and Monday nights and continental breakfasts on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. An optional Napa Valley wine tour is scheduled for Tuesday afternoon; the fee is $33. The banquet on Tuesday night will feature a talk by Jules Hirsch, a special piano recital by Sarah Leibowitz, and dancing (including a square dance or two called by Bart Hoebel). When was the last time you did the Virginia Reel?

If you have not made your hotel reservations, please call the Hyatt Regency at (916) 443-1234 or FAX (916) 321-6699. We have special room rates: $797 single and $112 double. For more information contact: Dr. Judith Stern, 3150 B Meyer Hall, Department of Nutrition, UC Davis, Davis, CA 95616. Phone: (916) 752-6575, FAX: (916) 752-1297

Young Investigator Awards

The winners of the SSIB Young Investigator awards are: Stella Chow (University of Pennsylvania), Nancy Rawson (Monell Chemical Senses Center), and Virginia Terry (University of California, Davis). They will present their work Tuesday morning at the SSIB Presidential Symposium. Please come and congratulate them for jobs well done!

Princeton!

COLLEGE OF INGESTIVE BEHAVIOR
Summer Session 1992

Plans for our first independent SSIB meeting, June 24-28 of next year at Princeton University, are taking more definitive form. The schedule calls for science during the day and entertainment at night, a fine nycthemeral rhythm. A flyer is enclosed with this issue of SSIBlings; to encourage you to post it, the information is repeated here.

Before we meet:

January 15 Registration forms for the meeting mailed with SSIBlings
March 1 Deadline for advance registration
April 15 Deadline for receipt of abstracts
May 1 Programs for the meeting will be mailed

The meeting, June '92:

By day:
Wednesday 24th Reception and registration
Thursday-Saturday 4-11 pm Symposia, talks, posters
Sunday 28th Workshops / minicourses
until 3 pm

By night:
Thursday 25th Picnic dinner
Friday 26th Informal dinner, talent show, square dancing
Saturday 27th Banquet and award ceremony

We will stay in campus dorms (hotels are also available) and eat together in dining halls to create a “college of ingestive behavior”. Projected costs are $37 advance registration, $110 for meals, and $53 for 4 nights in the dormitory: to save you the trouble, that’s a mere $200! MARK YOUR 1992 CALENDAR to arrive in Princeton Wednesday evening, June 24 and to leave on Sunday afternoon.

Ed. note: As an informed observer (I live in New Jersey) let me point out that June is a nice time of year to visit.

See page 8 for the Call for Nominations for a new SSIB award to be presented at the Princeton meeting.
Comment: David Booth

School of Psychology, University of Birmingham

The quarter of the Society who responded initially to Don Coscina’s survey have truly blown it! Their answers demonstrate that the vast majority feel that SSIB is misnamed: it should be the Society for the Study of Intake Physiology.

If the total returns confirm this attitude, the clarity and honesty of language for which the President has been arguing require us to drop the title claiming primary interest in the behavior of eating and drinking. (If we do change to “SSIP”, the thirst people won’t be able to believe their luck.)

Personally of course I hope that there are enough behavioral scientists making later returns (or among Society officers) to block this reform.

Our cover was blown by the trick of using the highly ambiguous and subjective concept of a “prestigious” journal. The only sense that that question made seems to have been the leading journals in the respondent’s home discipline. The usual top answer was the American Journal of Physiology. Don’s speculations about “[r]igorous review criteria” and “old-world stature” disregard the Journal of Physiology (London), for instance, and the 76% return from the U.S.A. (The 14 who listed Science can’t have looked at it for years.)

A question about journal quality could have been as objective as the question on the number of papers that journals publish in the area. Respondents could have been asked to judge which were, for example, the most highly cited journals publishing papers in our field. Answers to that can be checked in SCI. American Journal of Nutrition and Appetite head their lists, with impact factors way ahead of the mode for leading biomedical and behavioral journals.

Perhaps we should use more behavioral science in our self-investigations as well as in our main research work.

Reply: Don Coscina

Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, Toronto

In his typically insightful (if not somewhat acerbic) fashion, David has raised a number of important issues which can be seen as arising from the journal survey. I am pleased to have an opportunity to comment on some of the points he has made.

First and most importantly, I believe that David is quite correct in underscoring the fact that the subset of members who chose to respond seem largely sequestered within “physiological” disciplines. As a result, their attitudes reflect that orientation. However, I am not sure that it follows that the “behavioral” disciplines are underrepresented by that same subset. To suggest such a conclusion runs the risk of dichotomizing our work and implying that research in these two domains is mutually exclusive. (I thought we resolved the Nature vs. Nurture issue many years ago?) To the contrary, it seems to me when I peruse the membership directory that a great many of our ranks have competence in both, as judged by the departments and/or disciplines which are formally listed in their addresses. However, even if the subset who responded were solely “physiological” in their orientation, one question which would remain is why did only those individuals choose to respond? Is it likely that only investigators in that discipline were interested enough in the issues raised by the survey to contribute their attitudes? If that were the case, then I think it would be very important to find out why the other individuals did not reply.

Secondly, I think David is absolutely correct in pointing out that there is a large reporting bias in the fact that the greatest number of returns came from the U.S.A. On the other hand, since the vast majority of our membership is from that country, this should not be surprising. More important to me is the fact that almost identical proportions of respondents came from the three catchment areas I described: the USA, Canada and all other countries (i.e. the three main geographic areas under which members were listed in the back of the 1990 Directory). Therefore, from a methodological standpoint, it seems to me that the data are quite representative of our membership. This, hopefully, is a sign of good “behavioral science” in ascribing meaning to the survey’s outcome.

Thirdly, I do not understand the implication of trickery on my part by using “...highly ambiguous and subjective concepts...” to elicit responses surrounding aspects of perceived journal quality. David apparently feels that this approach coerced respondents to list the leading journals in their “home discipline”. While I had no such intention, such an outcome is hardly surprising since, presumably, we read articles and develop attitudes about them vis-a-vis our individual areas of expertise! Had I left the questions more open-ended, I might have gotten responses like “Time Magazine” or “Psychology Today” (excuse the Americanocentric examples)...but somehow, I don’t think that this would have been either useful or
meaningful for a professional society such as ours.

Fourth and lastly, I agree with David that I could have asked a number of other questions in attempts to tap members’ views about journals. However, I disagree that this could have necessarily led to more “objective” responses, inasmuch as I was inquiring about opinions that members hold. More concrete, objective data can, indeed, be sought by performing computer searches of the literature which, as I indicated in the article, I have done for all of 1980 and will be presenting in part at the NAASO/SSIB meeting. That fact notwithstanding, the data which I reported represent the outcome of the questions asked. David may feel that I should have asked different questions. Fine. But this kind of criticism differs little from that leveled at any of us who submit a journal article for peer-review, only to be told that we should have done a different experiment. My own response to that kind of remark is “...but I didn’t do your experiment...I did mine; therefore, if you want an answer to your questions, you will have to run the study yourself!”.

So, David, when can we all expect to get a questionnaire in the mail from you? I’m looking forward to filling it out!

P.S. To date I have received no other responses to the survey. I’m still waiting for the “behaviorists” — or anyone else, for that matter — to express their views.

P.P.S. I think that other SSIB members should write in to SSIBlings and express their views about the implications of this survey. Debate on this or any other professional issue seems to me a very healthy sign of our society’s vitality.

Ed. Note: After Don sent his reply, he pointed out by E-mail that there is research in support of the "Americanocentric" bias in American scientists' citations. He noted the summary of a paper listed in Current Contents (Aug. 12, vol. 34, no. 32, p. 7-8). The reference is: Greeson, L.E. Cultural ethnocentrism and imperialism in citations of American and Scandinavian psychological research. Int. J. Psychol. 26(2): 262-268.

############################################################

Future Meetings in Planning Stages: Suggestions Welcomed

First Food Choice Conference
Brussels, July 1992

The Intercontinental Conference Series on Food Choice is a new series to be held in association with Congresses or Satellites of the International Scientific Unions of Anthropological and Ethnographic Sciences (ICAF), Food Science and Technology, Nutrition, Physiology (ICPFFI) and Psychology. The purpose of these meetings is to promote research by symposia, workshops and short communications on sensory, physiological, and cultural determinants of food and drink selection and consequences for health and other benefits to consumers.

The local secretaries of the series will soon be planning the framework for the program of the first conference in the series, which will be held in association with the International Congress of Psychology in Brussels, July 27-30 1992. They would appreciate specific suggestions of speakers and their presentation titles (even if they are provisional) and are particularly interested in creating symposia and workshops that represent the multiple disciplines and wide geographical distribution of the students of food choice. In addition, abstracts for short talks and posters may be submitted through February 1992.

To suggest a symposium or workshop, or for more information on the meeting, please contact David Booth (Food Choice Conferences Coordinator), School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK. Telephone +44 21 414 3683, FAX +44 21 414 4897.

ICPFFI
Oxford, July 1993

The 11th International Conference on the Physiology of Food and Fluid Intake (ICPFFI 11) will be held at the University of Oxford, Oxford, England, July 28-30, 1993. The meeting includes symposia, created primarily on the basis of submitted papers, as well as poster sessions. Some grants will be available to aid graduate student and post-doctoral scientist participation. Further information, including registration and abstract forms, will be circulated in September 1992. The conference organizer is Dr. Edmund T. Rolls, University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3UD, England. Telephone +44 865 271348, FAX +44 865 310447. E-mail: EROLLS%UK.AC.OX.VAX or EROLLS%VAX.ox.ac.uk
On Rowland’s “When is a (sham) drink a (sham) feed?” and Midkiff’s response

W.G. Hall and Susan E. Swithers-Mulvey
Department of Psychology, Duke University

The complexities involved in distinguishing between sham feeding and sham drinking have recently received considerable attention in these pages (1,2). The usefulness of this exercise notwithstanding, before we all withdraw muttering that these discussions evolve to insoluble arguments over semantics and definitions, we would like to introduce an additional perspective. Based on developmental considerations, we question the basic utility of making a feeding/drinking distinction.

We recognize, as others do, that many different stimuli elicit ingestion and that such behavior (including an animal’s accompanying physiological responses) may differ between ingesta and ingestive situations. However, we question the practical value of emphasizing a distinct dichotomy between feeding and drinking as either of the previous commentators would define them (be it for the sham versions or the real versions). Encouraging such a dichotomy can be particularly problematic and misleading when such a two-system notion causes us to view each system as somehow unitary or coherent and mechanistically different from the other.

Developmental analysis illustrates that drinking and feeding are not readily distinguished. For example, lack of such a distinction is apparent in suckling behavior, a mammal’s first form of ingestion. More importantly, other data regarding the developmental origins of adult-like ingestive behavior do not suggest uniquely distinct or independent systems. A compelling illustration of this point is seen in the emergence of dehydration anorexia—a phenomenon that is taken as a virtual sine qua non for the distinction between drinking and feeding systems in invertebrates and vertebrates, but that has a surprisingly specific and limited action when it first appears in the ingestion of young rats (the following results all from ref. 3).

Before about 15 days of age there is virtually no evidence of dehydration anorexia. Dehydration increases the intake of both water and milk in tests in which the solutions are either infused into pups’ mouths through cannulas or offered in containers on the floor. However, starting at 20 days of age, dehydration inhibits the intake of milk ingested from the floor; thus dehydration anorexia seems to have appeared. Yet, dehydration still stimulates increased intake when milk is infused into pups’ mouths. Pups seem to discriminate their current physiological state when ingesting in one manner but not in another. We subsequently showed that it was the approach and contact-maintaining features of the appetitive component of ingestion that are influenced by dehydration; these turn out to be inhibited by the olfactory properties of a diet when pups are dehydrated (in fact, odor added to sucrose or water causes dehydration to inhibit intake of these solutions when offered from the floor). In short, reaction to an olfactory signal appears to cause reduction of intake after dehydration—largely by limiting pups’ approach to or contact with the solution, not by affecting oromotor consummatory responses. Rat pups make what might be considered by some to be a distinction between feeding and drinking at one point in the ingestive sequence but not at another.

Although it is clear that the overall behavior of these pups is differentiated on the basis of diet and nutritional state, the effect is limited to only certain components of ingestion. If the label of ‘feeding’ causes us to assume that this distinction applies to all features, we will have arbitrarily unified (and reified) a system whose components may remain modulated in more individual and independent manners. It is we who impose the drinking vs. feeding agenda on the animal, and thereby risk distractions in identifying potential mechanisms by which ingestive selectivity is attained at the level of behavioral components. For workers studying ingestive responses to dehydration, such a cautionary note may seem self-evident given the divergent character of responses to different types of dehydration (e.g., 4). But especially to the degree that our interest may be in understanding the neural substrates for organizing and producing behavior, we need to remain vigilant. In the same way that affection for the simplifying intervening variables of ‘hunger’ and ‘thirst’ obscured the multiple physiological signals and effector mechanisms related to state changes, unitary concepts of both feeding and drinking can obscure the multiple elements and potentially separable controls that operate in the ingestive sequence. Thus, regarding consumption of the problematic solutions considered in the previous discussions: note that while our nose may warn of intoxicating calories, our thirsty mouth ingests the stuff nonetheless.

Comings and Goings...
Nori Geary has left the ivy halls of Columbia for points north. He is now at the Edward W. Bourne Behavioral Research Laboratory of the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, 21 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, NY 10605. His telephone number is (914) 997-5935.

Highlights of Meetings Past
Steve Woods
Department of Psychology, University of Washington

This is a brief summary of an interesting conference held in Seattle on July 12-14, 1991. The conference was titled “Promoting Dietary Change in Communities: Applying Existing Models of Dietary Change to Population-Based Interventions,” and it was sponsored by the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and the University of Washington, and subsidized by several institutes of NIH. The purpose of the conference was to begin exploring strategies, based upon current theories and knowledge, that might be useful in reducing fat consumption in entire populations. My purpose here is to inform you of the conference and to make you aware that a summary of the proceedings will be available toward the end of autumn, 1991. I’ll put a note in SSIBlings when I know the details for those who might be interested.

There were four sessions. The first dealt with interventions on individual subjects. Specific presentations covered self-control models, weight regulation, and stages of behavioral change. Examples in this and all sessions were often taken from the ‘stop-smoking’ and alcohol consumption areas, but there was a strong attempt by all speakers to address the applicability of that knowledge to changing dietary habits. The second session dealt with biobehavioral models and included presentations by several SSIB members (myself, Tony Sclafani, Judy Stern, and Adam Drewnowski) and others. The third session covered socio-environmental interventions, and the fourth covered population-based interventions. After the four sessions, there was a summary discussion and a presentation of future directions by Mickey Stunkard. I personally found the conference to be stimulating and innovative, and to cover an area of dietary change not often considered by many of us.

The Columbia Appetitive Seminar
This fall continues the 20th year of the Columbia University Seminar in Appetitive Behavior. Anyone interested in this year’s schedule or potentially interested in presenting a seminar during 1992-1993 is encouraged to contact either Harry Kissileff, Seminar Chair, or Nori Geary, Rapporteur.

Appetitive Behavior is one of several dozen ongoing interdisciplinary seminars at Columbia. The series was founded in 1945 by Frank Tannenbaum “to understand and untangle the hidden mysteries” of some area of intellectual interest. In this spirit, our seminar highlights the current ideas, theories, problems, and controversies. Speakers are encouraged to introduce the audience to a theoretical framework as a platform for stimulating discussions of ideas and data.

Seminar minutes are distributed to all participants. In addition, if the presenter, chair, and rapporteur agree, minutes are submitted to Appetite for publication.

Dinner (by reservation with Dr. Kissileff) at the Columbia University Faculty House precedes the seminars. If you expect to be in town on a seminar evening, please join us. Finally, although seminar presentation has always been voluntary, we can pay for modest travel expenses of speakers.

Scheduled Speakers for the Academic Year 1991-1992
All meetings are on Thursday evenings at the Columbia University Faculty House

- September 19 - Douglas Mook. “All or None Effects on Sham Feeding.”
- October 31 - Gary Schwartz. “Single Unit Gastric Vagal Afferent Responses to CCK in the Rat.”
- November 21 - Mark Friedman. “Integrated Metabolic Controls of Food Intake.”
- February 20 - Ilene Bernstein. “Amiloride-sensitive Sodium Channels and Salt Preference in Rats.”
- March 19 - Donald Novin. “Metabolic Correlates of Normal and Paradoxical Feeding.”
- April 30 - Theresa A. Spiegel. “Controls of Meal Size in Humans.”
- May 14 - Harvey P. Weingarten. “Mechanisms of Food Intake Suppression Induced by Inflammation of the Intestines.”
- June 4 - Ken Simansky. “Serotonergic Mechanisms and Ingestion: Pharmacological Facts and Physiological Promises.”

September 1991
Call for Nominations: The Distinguished Senior Investigator Award

The Society for the Study of Ingestive Behavior requests your suggestions for the newly-created Distinguished Senior Investigator Award, which will be given at the Princeton meeting in June, 1992. There are two criteria: the nominee must be retired from active research, and he or she must have made important and sustained contributions to basic research in the ingestive behaviors.

The deadline for nominations is January 15, 1992. Selection will be made by a committee of presidents (which at that time will be Past-President Alan Epstein, President Barbara Rolls, and President-Elect Anthony Sclafani). Nominations should be made in writing to Barbara Rolls, Department of Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Meyer 1-108, 600 N. Wolfe St., Baltimore MD 21205 USA.

E-Mail Bulletin Board Facility Available

Harry Kissileff
St. Luke's/Roosevelt Hospital, New York

In response to frequent suggestions from members that SSIB consider setting up, or subscribing to, a bulletin board service such as PSYCHNET, the executive office in cooperation with Columbia University Center for Computing Activities has set up a distributed electronic mailing list. There are almost 100 members on the list now. This list will serve as the Society’s electronic bulletin board on a trial basis, and its success will be evaluated in late December, 1991.

The advantages of this system over a subscription to a network are that a) it is almost free, b) it requires little effort on anyone’s part, c) each user employs locally understood methods for accessing it. No new commands, special language, or editor need be learned, except for those involved in getting on or off the list, which will be described in your first welcome message.

The only disadvantage of this system is that you may get more information than you want. However, whenever you receive mail you always have the option of throwing it away. It’s actually easier to discard electronic than physical junk, and it takes even less time. Since the system is closed, you will not get any junk mail, unless it’s sent by your colleagues!

The executive officer will be responsible for monitoring mail and adding names to the list. Every one who has provided an E-mail address is currently on the list. There are already at least a hundred members with E-mail. You may send to, and receive mail from, all users on the list. A copy of the list will be circulated with your first E-mail communication, which will also explain how to remove yourself from the list if you do not wish to participate. If your E-mail address is out of date or was not supplied to the treasurer with your last bill, and you wish to be placed on the list (i.e., SUBscribe), use your local E-mail system to send the following one line message to LISTSERV@CUVMB.BITNET:

    SUB INGEST firstname lastname

where firstname and lastname are respectively your first and last name. The executive officer will then add your name to the list, and you will get the welcome message which includes information on how suspend or terminate participation.

To send mail to the list, prepare your message on your own system, then simply address it by E-mail to INGEST@CUVMB.

Do not confuse the two addresses. LISTSERV is used to change your subscription status (SUB to subscribe and UNSUB to unsubscribe). INGEST is the address to which memos are sent. You will be notified by electronic mail when the bulletin board has become operational, October 1, 1991.

What good is the bulletin board?
It is anticipated that usage will fall into one of four categories:
1) Meeting notices
2) Thought provoking ideas or requests for information (we will periodically print the best of these in SSIBlings, with your permission of course).
3) Lists of new publications which a) might not ordinarily appear in citation indices, b) you would like to publicize before publication, or c) you recommend reading.
4) Job opportunities

Additional suggestions can be made, of course. It would help to preface each message in the optional subject field with a line indicating what category it falls in, so that a reader can discard items he/she is not interested in. If you encounter any problems using the bulletin board system, contact Dr. Kissileff at HRKOM@CUVMB.
Reading List

Thirst. Physiological and Psychological Aspects. (1991). D.J. Ramsay and D.A. Booth, eds. Berlin: Springer-Verlag. The subtitle indicates the emphasis on a combined approach: sensory and neural, social and cultural. 31 chapters, mutually reviewed and revised by the authors. ILSI Human Nutrition Reviews series. 545 pp. DM 245.-


Positions available

The Genetics of Obesity, Research Coordinator
This person would provide assistance to the Principal Investigator to plan research protocols, recruit families for genetic studies of obesity, perform anthropometric measurements and organize and track participant information. Qualified candidates would have a B.S. or B.A. degree in a related field and 1-3 years work experience. If you are interested in this position, please send your C.V. to: Dr. R. Arlen Price, Clinical Research Building, University of Pennsylvania, 422 Curie Blvd., Philadelphia PA 19104.

Postdoctoral Research Fellowship
for the study of eating and its disorders
Two full-time postdoctoral research training fellowships in the normal and abnormal controls of eating are available beginning 1 July 1992 at the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, Westchester Division. Individual research projects can be done in molecular, developmental, neurochemical, behavioral, or clinical research. Fellowships are usually awarded for two years and the stipends are competitive. Women and minority members are encouraged to apply. Send letter of interest and C.V. to: Gerard P. Smith, M.D., E.W. Bourne Behavioral Research Laboratory, New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, Westchester Division, 21 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, NY 10605.

Postdoctoral Position Available
Beginning July 1, 1992, a postdoctoral position, funded by a NIH training grant, will be available at St. Luke's/Roosevelt Hospital Center, (WH-10, 114th St. & Amsterdam Ave. New York, NY 10025). Candidates may pursue studies in human or animal eating behavior. This is an ideal position for someone interested in starting or continuing human research based on previous work with animals. Send your résumé and a brief letter indicating your research goals to Dr. Harry R. Kissileff, at St. Luke's, by December 1, 1991. For additional information contact Dr. Kissileff (212-523-4200).

Assistant Professor
The Psychology Department of Shippensburg University is seeking applications for a tenure-track position to start in Fall 1992. The applicant must have a Ph.D. in psychology. Responsibilities include teaching courses in Psychopharmacology and General Psychology with additional courses in Comparative and/or Sensation and Perception, and supervision and initiation of student/faculty research. Salary/benefits competitive. Women and minority members are encouraged to apply. Applications must be received by January 3, 1992. Send a letter of application, C.V., three letters of recommendation, and official graduate transcript to: Dr. Ron Mehl, Psychology Search Committee, Psychology Department, Shippensburg University, Shippensburg, PA 17257.

Note to employers and candidates: SSIBlings has January, May, and September issues each year. The deadline is the middle of the previous month (i.e., December, April, and August 15ths). Remember, these announcements are free!
From the Editor's Desk...

The deadline for the winter issue of SSIBlings is December 15. E-mail (SCLAFA@BKLNY) or disk submissions are much appreciated, since they save retyping and prevent the introduction of errors.

**Dues notices** were mailed in mid-September and should have reached you by now. Please pay promptly and save SSIB the cost of sending out repeat notices. If you do not pay by December 12, you will be placed on the delinquent list. If you do not pay by the following August, you will be dropped from membership.

But please don't wait—our **annual directory** is prepared in early January, and it can only be as accurate as its referents are prompt. One of the best possible aspects of our Society is that it puts members in touch with each other, and the directory is our vehicle. To that end, please remember to review your personal data on your bill, making changes as needed. Do you have a new E-mail address or FAX number to add to our growing list of electronic communications?

We are considering adopting a pay by VISA or MASTERCARD option. It will cost approximately $0.50 per person. We would like to know particularly whether members outside North America would find this method of payment easier than bank transfers or money orders. Please be sure to respond to the question about paying by VISA or MASTERCARD on your bill so we can decide whether to adopt this procedure in the future.

Finally, don't forget that we have a new treasurer. Your dues form and payment should be mailed to Suzanne Sunday, Department of Psychiatry, New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, 21 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, NY 10605 USA.

---

**Calendar**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oct 20-23</strong></td>
<td>Joint North American Association for the Study of Obesity (NAASO) and SSIB meeting, Sacramento, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov 7-9</strong></td>
<td>Neuroscience satellite meeting, San Antonio, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov 10-15</strong></td>
<td>Society for Neuroscience, New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov 13</strong></td>
<td>SSIB social at Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1992:</strong></td>
<td>Nutrition and CNS Function, Lake Tahoe, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb 2-5</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apr 2-5</strong></td>
<td>Intercontinental Conference Series on Food Choice (ICSFC): 1st food choice conference, a satellite meeting of the International Psychology Congress, Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 24-28</strong></td>
<td>SSIB's first independent meeting, Princeton, NJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1993:**
- International Congress on the Physiology of Food and Fluid Intake (ICPFFI), in Oxford, July 28-30.
- ICSFC: 2nd food choice conference, a satellite meeting of the International Union of Nutrition Science Congress, in Canberra, October 1-3.

**About SN and EPA...**

SSIB will have a social at the Society for Neuroscience meeting in New Orleans, on November 13. Because it follows the Sacramento meeting so closely, we will not conduct a scientific program this year.

Abstracts for the main program of the April 1992 meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association are due October 24, 1991. The Society will gather for the usual 5-minute talks and dinner in Boston, probably on Friday April 2. Because our own meeting will be several months later, we may not have as large a program as in the last few years. See the January 1992 issue of SSIBlings for further details and the call for titles.