

Almanac

Tuesday, October 22, 1985

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 32, Number 9

Nobel in Medicine: Michael Brown, C'62, M'66

Brown and Goldstein . . . Goldstein and Brown. The paired names have been candidates on the biomedical grapevine for years, and on many branches: A biochemist would stop at mid-citation and tell the class: "They're going to get the Nobel Prize for this," an internist predict "It's only a matter of time," an impatient psychiatrist assert, "They should have had two by now."

This is the year the Nobel Institute agreed, and sent the message last Monday from Stockholm that Dr. Michael S. Brown, 44, and Dr. Joseph L. Goldstein, 45, will share the 1985 Prize in medicine for work that has "revolutionized our knowledge" of cholesterol metabolism and of diseases related to it, atherosclerosis and heart attack.

In a *Chicago Tribune* account the work is described as having "isolated the cell surface receptor that recognizes and admits cholesterol to the cell. Some receptors are specialized to admit low-density lipoproteins; but the lack of [such receptors] lets in too much, leading to clogging of the arteries." For about one in 500 Americans, the defect is genetic; but it may also be acquired through diet and lifestyle.

IN BRIEF

Speaking of Prizes: Nominations open October 28 for the Lindback Awards for 1985-86. Details and criteria are on the inside back page.

Lost is Found: Dean Russell Palmer of the Wharton School thanked the FBI Monday for its role in recovering Rodin's *Jean D'Aire*, the bronze stolen from the School last year. "We would like to commend the FBI for the outstanding job it did in finding the statue," said Dean Palmer. "In particular we want to thank agent Robert Bazin and members of our campus security force." Palmer also expressed relief that the statue was unharmed. "I know I speak for the School as well as the donor of the statue, Jeffrey Loria, in saying we are looking forward to having it back with us at Wharton." Details of its recovery are sketchy but local radio reported that it was traced after an attempt to sell it in Florida.

INSIDE

- Senate Chair: Salaries, Budgets, p. 2
- Nobel Laureate as Undergraduate, p. 2
- Speaking Out: Sexual Harassment, SEC/BSL, Core Space, Apartheid, pp. 3-4
- Addendum on S. African holdings, p. 4
- Report of Steering Committee, 1984-85, p. 5
- NIH Report on Head Lab (full text), p. 6
- Lindback Nominations: How-To, p. 7
- Center Supplement: Year-End Reports of Council and Independent Committees

The *Tribune* estimated 30 to 50 million American adults as potential heart attack victims who will benefit from Brown and Goldstein's breakthrough research.

At Penn, longtime followers of the Brown and Goldstein research go farther in describing the influence of the two: In their citation to Dr. Brown during this June's Alumni Weekend, the School described a series of breakthroughs, adding, "At each step in [their research] program Drs. Brown and Goldstein have broken new ground in fundamental biology and medicine, and their studies have led to significant advances in our understanding of the function and recycling of the cell membrane . . .". The picture is of complementary genius in collaborators who start with the conviction that where there's a code to break there's a key to find.

Brown and Goldstein are with the University of Texas Medical Center at the Southwestern Medical School in Dallas, where Dr. Brown is the Paul J. Thomas Professor of Medicine and Genetics and Director of the Center for Genetic Disease. He is believed to be the first Penn baccalaureate alumnus to win a Nobel Prize, and the second medical alumnus to do so: Dr. Gerald Edelman, who shared the 1972 Prize in medicine, has the Penn M.D. (and that year Dr. Christian Anfinsen, who earned his master's degree here, won a Prize in chemistry).

Michael Brown received his B.A. from the College in 1962 (see page 2) and his M.D. in 1966 from the School of Medicine, where he won the Frederick L. Packard Prize in Internal Medicine and was elected to Alpha Omega Alpha in his junior year. Midway through medical school, in June 1964, he married the former Alice Lapin and the couple now have two daughters, Elizabeth Jane and Sara Ellen.

During his 1966-68 internship and residency at Mass General in Boston, Brown of Penn met Goldstein of Texas, who was just a year ahead of him. They stayed in touch after joining separate NIH Institutes (Dr. Brown's was Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, followed by a stint as guest worker at the Heart Institute). In 1970-71 when he set out to choose an academic home, Dr. Brown narrowed the choices to San Francisco vs. the Texas unit at Dallas—and Dr. Goldstein's alma mater won. A year later from Seattle Dr. Goldstein made the same move, and the uniquely productive collaboration began in earnest. (Of the 216 papers in a relatively recent c.v. of Dr. Brown's, only ten, all early,



At Alumni Weekend 1985, the youngest recipient of the Medical School's Distinguished Graduate Award, Dr. Michael S. Brown, with Dean Stemmler.

are without Goldstein; they also have a book, with Stanbury and Wyngaarden, *The Metabolic Basis of Inherited Disease*, plus 18 book chapters.)

"I knew Mike Brown as a student, and it's not hindsight to say his strong intellectual and personal qualities were recognized early on," said Dean Edward Stemmler. "He really stood out, and I'm sorry I wasn't able to persuade him to come back to Penn. And yet," he adds, "it might not have been the same for medicine. Those two intellects seem to have been uniquely prepared to work together. And it's magnificent work."

Drs. Brown and Goldstein have been sharing prestigious awards for over ten years, starting with the 1974 Heinrich Wieland prize for work in lipid metabolism. They hold the ACS's Pfizer, the Albion O. Bernstein, the Passano, the National Academy's Lounsbery, the Lita Annenberg Hazen, Roche Institute's V.D. Mattia, Columbia's Louisa Gross Horwitz, the 3M Award of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, and others of the Gairdner Foundation, New York Academy of Sciences, American Heart Association, and Association of American Medical Colleges. In 1982 Dr. Brown accepted two honorary degrees—one from the University of Chicago and the other from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

SENATE From the Chair

More on Salaries and Budgets

I note, with hope, that in their column in the *Almanac* of October 15, the President and Provost state the following concerning the two major points that I tried to stress in my own column in the *Almanac* of October 8, "We have every intention that the University will continue to provide real growth in faculty salaries in Fiscal Year 1987" and "The column last week by the Faculty Senate Chair emphasized the need to watch carefully non-academic expenses generally and administrative salaries particularly. We agree fully with that point," and "We agree with the Faculty Senate Chair that this matter bears continual review and we will work with him and his colleagues to that end." These statements are indeed hopeful and I trust they will be followed in earnest.

With regard to the specific few examples included in the column, I am sorry to note some inaccuracy, and even irrelevancy. For instance, my column wrote, "Interestingly enough the straight teaching salary budget for the faculty is so little that it can easily be equated in FY 1986 with simply the research overhead (\$39 million), the special student fees (\$17 million) and other miscellaneous general revenues (\$6.8 million)." It does not say that "it might be covered" directly by those funds, although, in all sincerity, the overhead of research projects compensates the University for so many kinds of general expenses, and the student fees could, ostensibly, be directed toward the faculty salaries, leaving the huge tuition income for all other types of general expenses of the University and for student activities. I confess that I do not understand the logic of why many previous non-standing faculty in A-2 positions have been shifted to the A-1 category. Are we having another faculty in disguise? And the clinical practice of the Medical School is not even included in the statistics that I cited. Further, the current computer system installation is, obviously, a capital expense, not an operating budget expense. Finally, the Faculty Senate budget increased this year by only \$1,100, or 7% of its current expenses budget, and even this minute increase was almost covered by a reduction in the salary budget of the Senate. The office also received a one-year ad hoc appropriation of \$1,800 in order to publish the Senate Bylaws this year (if they are ready for publication), a \$4,000 fund for faculty relations for special purposes and \$6,000 for computer equipment. These items can hardly qualify as regular Faculty Senate budget items.

It seems that the Administration agrees that some major review is needed of the pattern of resource allocation at Penn. I hope we will soon focus on this important objective and we will avoid being detracted by minute items as the ones discussed above.

Anthony R. Tomazinis

The Nobel Prizewinner as Undergraduate

Michael Stuart Brown was born in New York on April 13, 1941, and entered Penn as a freshman from Cheltenham High School in 1958. He was the Proctor and Gamble Scholarship holder for his four undergraduate years, winning Junior Distinction in 1961, the David L. Drabkin Prize in Biochemistry in 1962, and election to both Phi Beta Kappa and its premed counterpart, Alpha Epsilon Delta. He was a Tau Epsilon Phi who edited the *Founder's Day Magazine*, helped out at WXPB, worked part-time during the term, and worked summers. But, the Nobel laureate recalls 20-odd years later, "I really devoted about 80% of my undergraduate career to that newspaper."

That newspaper? Mike Brown was on the D.P. staff of all time. The one whose issue was confiscated. The one that was suspended by the Dean of Men. The one that came back a week later (after a nationwide furore over freedom of the press) with the cheerfully impudent *As we were saying before we were so rudely interrupted* . . . and went on with Part II of the very editorial ("Abolish Student Government") that had prompted the Dean to suspend the paper two weeks before a change of boards was due. The one that D.P. staffs still celebrate annually by publishing a joke issue—on any day but April 1—with a ritual retelling of

"Magnificent Melvin" Goldstein's probation and how the remaining staff regrouped for the bloody-but-unbowed comeback.

The editor-in-chief of the comeback was Michael S. Brown, sometime sportswriter (1958-61) and 1961-62 features editor under Goldstein. For a hectic week, until the new Board took over as scheduled, he led a daily stripped of its funding by an 18-1 vote of the Men's Student Government (and thus was the D.P. started bumpily on the road to financial independence that culminated in last year's 100th anniversary announcement on phased incorporation).

In Dallas last Friday, Dr. Brown called those weeks in 1962 "the second most exciting time of my life, next to this last week."

A look at his comeback issue of March 2, 1962, shows a note of thanks to Drs. Elizabeth Flower, Morton Keller, Glenn Morrow and Henry Hiz (along with sister student newspapers and a University Committee on Civil Liberties) for supporting freedom of the press. For their "efforts to bring about a rational settlement," it cites four faculty negotiators: Drs. Edward Janosik, William Loucks, Malcolm Preston—and the acting interim editor's future fellow Nobel, Lawrence Klein.

COUNCIL

Synopsis of Minutes: October 9

The report of the Committee on Harassment (*Almanac*, September 24) was discussed, following presentation by the co-chairs, Professors deCani and Sagi. Some criticism was raised concerning the wording of the questions in the questionnaire, definitions of harassment, and the groupings of harassing behavior. Other members spoke to support the validity of the results and to emphasize the extent and the seriousness of sexual harassment on the campus. Professor Helen Davies summarized the conversion of the survey results into absolute numbers (*Almanac*, October 1) carried out by Professor Robert Davies and herself and read into the minutes a statement of concern by the Women's Studies Advisory Board and other faculty members. Implications of the report for University policy and implementing procedures will be taken up at the November 13 meeting.

Discussion of the ways to bring the varying views of the University faculty, students, and staff to the Trustees on issues relating to South Africa followed. Reference was made to a study of the issue in the fall of 1981 by an ad hoc Council committee chaired by Professor Houston Baker and the endorsement by the Council of the committee's recommendation for divestment. Support was voiced for the Council in November to act on a resolution to divest. A resolution from GAPSA to constitute discussion groups to take up specific topics relating to the issue (*Almanac*, October 15) was introduced but was tabled to the next meeting.

—Robert G. Lorndale,
Secretary of the Council

College Fair: Representatives from over 400 colleges, universities, and technical schools will come to Philadelphia Civic Center on October 29 and 30 for the 1985 Philadelphia National College Fair, one of the largest in the country. More than 15,000 high school students and their parents are expected to meet with admissions counselors from institutions as near as Penn and as far away as Chaminade University of Honolulu, Hawaii and Hebrew University of Israel. The Fair will run from 9 a.m.-1 p.m. both days and 5-9 p.m. on Tuesday; it is open to the public free of charge.

Almanac

3601 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104-6224
(215) 898-5274 or 5275.

The University of Pennsylvania's journal of record and opinion is published Tuesdays during the academic year and as needed during summer and holiday breaks. Guidelines for readers and contributors are available on request.

EDITOR Karen C. Gaines
ASSISTANT EDITOR Marguerite F. Miller
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT Mary Corbett
STUDENT ASSISTANTS Catherine E. Clark, Mary A. Downes, Leah C. Gardiner, Michael S. Markowitz, John J. Neumann, Leonard S. Perlman
ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD Chair, Arnold Thackray; Linda Brodkey, Lucienne Frappier-Mazur, Henry Hiz, Alfred Rieber, Roger D. Soloway, Anthony R. Tomazinis, Michael Zuckerman, for the Faculty Senate; . . . William G. Owen for the Administration; . . . Carol Carr for the Librarians Assembly; . . . John Hayden for the Administrative Assembly; . . . Joseph Kane for the A-3 Assembly.

Speaking Out

Corrections from the Chair

Following is Dr. Anthony Tomazinis' own transcription of his remarks at Council on October 9. His first passage below replaces his first comments on page 6 of *Almanac*, October 15. In the second section he presents a discussion that *Almanac* alluded to but did not give in full on that page. The third consists of a paragraph inadvertently lost in retyping the October 15 transcript; I regret the omission—K.C.G.

1. (following Dr. Stern, p. 6, column 1).

Dr. Tomazinis: I have a feeling that this report has been very helpful for the simple reason that it has revealed that there is a large number of female members of this community who feel offended daily for one reason or another. I accept the point that many times the offense is not intended at all. But the feeling is there, and they said so. In Table 6 there is a tremendous preponderance of people who say "Yes there is harassment." I don't think they are the only ones. I have been harassed many times myself by unwanted jokes and discussions, and comments which really displeased and infuriated me. Oh, yes, that's harassment, that's abuse of my freedom, I thought. I have been in meetings which were absolutely gory, offensive, with people with terrible mannerisms who were even producing body odors; who were absolutely offensive and abusing my civil rights. We are sensing, in essence, the need of a new civil norm or civic norm, a new norm of behavior on our campus. I have to disagree in terms of numbers with my esteemed colleagues, Dr. deCani, and Professor Sagi. In my class I would throw this questionnaire out. I had to go to the questionnaire to find out whether it was a cooked up questionnaire. In marketing, some of you have taken marketing courses, if I go and I say: would you like to ride a dirty, offensive, terrible subway to downtown? 99% say: NO. Would you like to ride the subway downtown? 50% would say yes. If I say: would you like to ride a beautiful quiet, aromatic, with coffee service subway to downtown, 90% would say yes. If I were to start producing plans and say (if I had the first survey only) No subways it would not be right. This is what has been done here. However we cut it, they were so worried, it seems to me, to make the point that they exaggerated the point. I was terribly surprised when I read the letter by Professor and Professor Davies which concludes that if you extend these numbers there are 77 rapes a year on this campus. And who is apprehended? No one. So we have what? 500, a thousand, loose rapists running around here? And then 249 other assaults. If you multiply the number every year, we have a couple of thousand real criminals among us! I cannot accept that. I think that's too many. The numbers are too big and that's why I would take issue with the numbers of the survey. But the survey did reveal the essence of it. Which is that we have a large group of female members of this community, and some males of the community, who are

offended. And it is important for us to start thinking about ways of establishing a behavioral pattern, interaction among ourselves which takes the sting out and makes civil behavior possible, and a pleasant one. What is harassment? Well I have a daughter who is here. So, she goes to a class or to an office and hears a sequence of dirty jokes. You laugh with the first one; the second one is terrible, in bad taste; at the third, one would say "Oh for God's sake stop it!" Now what I'm going to do? Is that harassment or it is not? Is it what? Is the unwanted part of it? Well it is the insensitivity that makes people do this. If you don't believe my daughter, I have heard terrible, tasteless jokes myself, and I consider it an abuse to me, too. And I bet every one of us has. I think the essence is that we must invest sensitivity to establish norms of behavior which reduce the offense. Now, the second thing I would say, is that we must make the efforts; and that this is to be done by ourselves. Let's not establish a police state in this university, which says that anyone who says a dirty joke a day, by the time he or she tells the third joke, out you go from this university. Or by the time you ask the third girl for a date and she says no, out you go. (Laughter.) So we must make sure that the corrective actions start from where the offense starts, the individual, which means in each one of us.

2. (following Dr. Stern, page 6, column 2).

Dr. Tomazinis: It's not my perception, Mark. The quality of the questionnaire . . . affects the result, the perception of the person. If the questions are not random, but are directed to one goal we know—we have a hundred years of statistical research and we know—that if you ask a question in one way the answer will come the way you expect. They will guess what you want and they answer that way. We know this, we have failure after failure in the field of marketing of those who didn't respect this fundamental rule. The built-in expectation is there . . . If instead of 80 or 90% of the women feeling offended, that they had been harassed, we had only 10%, in my book it would have been extremely important because they are 10% of women who are feeling harassed. That's too many. The 80% is superfluous, it is not needed. But the quality of the survey is not what it should be. Now, I hate to bring this point up. Table 2 is based on question 6 of the questionnaire, which asks simply about people of authority. However, there is another question, which is question 8, which asks about people of authority over you. Now that's an extremely important difference, because people of authority start from the doorman to the president of the University. So if I hear a joke by a doorman who has some authority in his own area but has nothing to do with me, I react differently. I call him out to keep quiet, in other words. But not to report at the same time the difference between people of authority and people of authority over you, which really does state what the responsibility is (the University is responsible for harassment by people with

authority over you not the people you meet on the street who say something to you). That kind of meticulousness, I submit, is missing. In other words, we need accuracy of the numbers, and also we do not need 80 and 90% in order to do something about it. Smaller percentages, like 10%, are enough to convince us that something needs to be done, to do something about it on the campus.

3. (following Dr. Fine, page 6, column 3).

Dr. Tomazinis: Michelle, you talk about things that I don't mention. There was no trivialization. I am talking about the exaggeration of the case. I'm not telling you that it's not important. The feeling is important, and the feeling is there. It is clear. But with Table 6 you had made your point right there.

How Many "Rapists" on Campus?

Almanac of October 15, 1985, quotes from the tape of the meeting of Council on October 9 that Professor Anthony Tomazinis, chair of the Faculty Senate, said "However we cut it, they were so worried, it seems to me, to make a point that they exaggerated the point . . . I read the letter by Professor and Professor Davies which concludes that if you extend this number there are 77 rapes a year on this campus. And who is apprehended? No one. So we have got, what—500? A thousand? loose rapists running around here. And there are 249 other assaults? If you multiply every year, we have a couple of thousand real criminals among us. I cannot accept that. That's too many. And that's why I take issue with the numbers in the survey."

Now Dr. Soloway (*Almanac* page 5, October 15, 1985) said he found the "report (of the Committee to Survey Harassment, *Almanac* Supplement September 24, 1985) very difficult to follow" and assumed that many people also did. It appears that Dr. Tomazinis is included in this group. The number 77 in our letter (*Almanac*, October 1, 1985) was calculated on the assumption of "no nonresponse bias" for the 12,417 women students, faculty and staff at the University at the time of the survey. It is *not* the number of "rapes" per year, but rather the calculated number of cases of attempted rape or sexual assault "for five years or the total time at Penn, whichever was least." Similarly the number 249 does *not* refer to "other assaults," but to "women exposed to unwanted pressure for sexual favors . . ." for the same period, as stated in our letter (see also the last paragraph of section V, page VIII, of the report). It follows that the numbers "500?, a thousand? loose rapists . . ." and "a couple of thousand real criminals among us" are all based on misapprehensions. In any case on his incorrect assumptions this number "a couple of thousand real criminals" would be 77 plus 249, i.e. 326 cases of "assault" for each of over 6 years. This is another exaggeration and assumes that each case was perpetrated by separate "criminals."

(continued next page)

There is good reason to believe that many of the attempted rapes, sexual assaults and unwanted pressures for sexual favors are the actions of a much smaller number of repetitive harassers (e.g. in *Almanac* February 19, 1985, the Ombudsman's Office reports 21 complaints against 14 persons).

If, in fact, his figures are the reason why Dr. Tomazinis took "issue with the numbers in the survey", perhaps he should now reconsider his position. The situation is bad enough without these, surely inadvertent, exaggerations that led him to reject the numbers in both the report and in our letter.

We stand by our original calculations and conclusions concerning the extent of harassment and note that the survey itself includes not even one case of rape reported by the respondents, a situation that we know under-estimates the rate for the campus as a whole. Rapes have occurred and many raped women refuse to discuss or report the event until years later, if ever.

—Helen C. Davies, Professor of Microbiology
—Robert E. Davies, Benjamin Franklin Professor of Molecular Biology and University Professor

Response: Dr. Tomazinis thanked the Professors Davies for their clarification and said that he intends to discuss the survey further next week.

Insinuation

In the October 8, 1985 *Almanac*, Professor Houston A. Baker, Jr. and a group of colleagues criticized the Faculty Senate Executive Committee's (SEC) passage of a resolution deploring the recent speech made by Jamil Muhammad on this campus. Evidently, reasonable people might differ on whether it was advisable for SEC to pass the resolution as is attested to by the very close vote (13:12) taken by SEC. As a member of SEC who voted with the majority, I am saddened by the following statement made by Professor Baker and others:

"We can only conclude that *this* SEC resolution regarding *this* particular speaker reflects a degree of morally abject selectivity that is consistent with a history of institutional racism."

I am hurt and offended by my colleagues' insinuation that SEC's condemnation of a speech that contained statements of bigotry

and hatred is itself a racist position.

—Morris Hamburg, Professor of Statistics and Operations Research

Free Speech

Regarding the recent public lecture by Jamil Muhammad, the Senate Executive Committee says, in effect, "We believe in freedom of speech, but . . ."

Those are scary words. One never has to worry about the right of free speech so much as when someone invokes it only to then narrow it.

Why, when you get right down to it, did our colleagues on the committee feel that they had to issue a formal statement of their views on Muhammad's speech? He had the right to give it and the rest of us, one hopes, have the brains to form our own opinions of it.

—James C. Davis, Professor of History

Use of Campus Heartland?

The University's plans to build an executive conference center for the Wharton School at Thirty-eighth Street and Locust Walk are now being challenged in court (*Daily Pennsylvanian*, October 11, 1985, p. 1), and we should seize this opportunity to reevaluate the project. The question is whether the last buildable lot of the University's "main street" should be given over to a self-contained hotel, recreation facility, restaurant, and continuing education center for businessmen. While I am willing to believe that the executives might appreciate living close to the center of our handsome campus (and while the attachments they would thus develop might help the Wharton School's fund-raising efforts), it seems that there is little programmatic reason for them to be located there. The executive center could go elsewhere (perhaps at the lovely and sadly underused Divinity School site), or, as the lawsuit suggests, it may not be needed at all. In either case, a research university in a land-starved urban environment should certainly dedicate its heartland to functions which are more essential to its work and which more appropriately symbolize its central mission.

—David B. Brownlee, Associate Professor of History of Art

The following commendation and resolution were passed unanimously at the October 16, 1985 GAPSA meeting. The statement of the Penn Anti-Apartheid Coalition (*Almanac*, October 15) was also endorsed by GAPSA.

GAPSA Commendation

The members of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly would like to commend Professors John deCani, Phil Sagi, Michelle Fine, and Mark Stern, Dr. Barry Cooperman, and Ms. Judy Gerstl for their hard work and dedication to the completion of a thorough and accurate survey of the presence of sexual harassment on the Penn campus. The Survey on Sexual Harassment Report currently under discussion in many areas of the Penn community would not have been possible without the guidance, involvement, supervision and concern for these faculty members, administrators, and staff, and we believe they deserve many thanks for a job well done.

GAPSA Resolution

The members of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly request that the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania immediately agree to divest the University within one year of any stocks now held with companies that are actively doing business within the country of South Africa. We make this request based on:

- 1) our repugnance of the South African system of apartheid,
- 2) our belief that U.S. companies in South Africa do *not* have a good track record of improving living and working conditions for black, colored, and Indian South Africans,
- 3) our belief that the government of South Africa will continue to enforce its policies of apartheid until it feels a significant economic blow from the withdrawal of U.S. funds and companies,
- 4) that the University community has a moral responsibility to support the development and growth of humane systems of government in which racism is *not* the basis for allocating resources, employment opportunities, housing, education, and other necessities for decent human life.

We also request that in addition to divestment, the University acknowledge its moral responsibility to support the development of humane systems of government and establish a Task Force of knowledgeable university members to develop a set of measures that the University and its members can take to counter apartheid.

Addendum Statement to "The Evolution of Penn's Selective Divestment Policy"

(*Almanac*, September 17, 1985)

As requested by the Trustee's Committee on University Responsibility, the Office of Investments periodically reviews the University's equity investments to identify companies conducting business in South Africa and their rating of adherence to the Sullivan Principles. The basis for this has been a screening of equity investments against the list of companies and their relevant Sullivan Principle ratings contained in "The Report on the Signatory Companies to the Sullivan Principles" distributed each fall by Arthur D. Little, Inc. This report deals essentially with companies domiciled in the United States. But the Trustees' policy of selective divestment covers *all* companies not just those domiciled in the United States. Therefore, the University's ownership of the common stock of Royal Dutch Petroleum Company, a company incorporated in the Netherlands, which conducts business in South Africa, should have been included in the table of Equity Investments that was published in

Almanac on September 17, 1985.

The relevant statistics are shown in the table below.

Sullivan Rating*	Shares Held	Cost	Market Value	% of Total Investments	South African Assets as % of Total Assets	South African Revenues as % of Total Revenues
	324,000	13,945,177	18,954,000	2.34	N/A	1.00

*The Sullivan Principles apply to companies domiciled in the United States. Royal Dutch Petroleum Company conforms to the EEC (European Economic Community) guidelines which are similar to the Sullivan Principles.

The University also holds shares of one other company domiciled outside the United States that does business in South Africa. The market value of this investment is substantially less than \$20,000.

1984-85 Annual Report Of The Steering Committee

This is the sixth annual report of the Steering Committee of the University Council, prepared in accordance with a requirement in the bylaws that: "The Steering Committee shall publish an annual report to the University community. This report, to be published early in the academic year, shall include a review of the previous year's Council deliberations (highlighting both significant discussions and the formal votes taken on matters of substance) and a survey of major issues to be taken up by Council during the coming year."

October Meeting

The Council commissioned an ad hoc committee to review the Charter of the Student Judicial System that had been placed in effect as of the 1984-85 academic year. It discussed issue papers on alcohol use policy and a draft policy prepared by the Alcohol Use Committee; a number of suggestions for modifications were made. It adopted a resolution supporting student participation in the national elections and urging faculty members to devote class time discussing the importance of voting and announcing the locations of area polling places. Initial consideration was given to the second interim report of the Task Force on Conduct and Misconduct.

November Meeting

The Council adopted a resolution calling for increased graduate/professional student involvement in the academic planning process, with specific attention to consultation when retrenchment or reorganization are to be considered. Discussion of the report of the Task Force on Conduct and Misconduct was continued. In consideration of the recommendation by the task force that a survey on harassment on campus be conducted, the points were made that the crux of the issue was to reach solutions to the problem, that facts that could only be provided by a survey were a prerequisite to the framing of remedies, and that it was essential that the survey be conducted impartially and scientifically. A resolution asking the vice provost for research to conduct a survey of sexual harassment and harassment because of race, religion, or affectional preference was adopted.

December Meeting

Vice President for Administration Gary J. Posner gave a report on safety and security on campus. He cited a decreasing crime rate, services offered by Public Safety, physical measures being taken such as with lighting and emergency telephones, and the need to heighten awareness. Much of the ensuing discussion focused on the adequacy of the Escort Service, both as to time for response and availability in the early morning hours. The Council discussed the recommendation by the Task Force on Conduct and Misconduct that questions regarding discrimination and harassment be included in the course evaluation forms. Little support for the proposal was voiced.

January Meeting

The Council was advised that the Steering Committee had postponed further discussion of the report of the Task Force on Conduct and Misconduct until the results of the survey on harassment are in and perhaps until the report of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Behavioral Standards has been completed. The Council adopted an amendment to the bylaws revising the charge to the Community Relations Committee to give the chair cognizance of pending real estate activities of concern to the committee through regular consultation with the senior vice president. Following discussion of the decision by the Trustees to limit to one year the service of student liaisons on Trustee committees, a resolution supporting the creation of a task force to study the student liaison role was adopted. Vice Provost Barry Cooperman described a dialogue held on January 15 regarding laboratory animal rights, and Dr. Moshe Shalev, director of the Division of Laboratory Medicine, outlined the procedures followed when investigators propose research involving animals.

February Meeting

Dr. Joyce Randolph, director of international programs, described Penn's international activities. In discussion, interest was expressed in the role of the International Programs Office in assisting faculty members to

locate appropriate universities abroad at which to work during scholarly leaves. It was recognized that Penn students wishing to study abroad are at times thwarted by their own departments not accepting credit from foreign universities preferred and that the solution is the expansion of University-sponsored programs at foreign universities. President Hackney led discussion of the planning paper, "Investing in Penn's Future." He confirmed that, in redrafting the paper, more emphasis will be given to the importance of strong departments as the underpinnings for the interdisciplinary programs that are stressed in the document.

March Meeting

The sole agenda item, apart from the routine reports, was discussion of "Racial and Ethnic Diversity in a Humane Society." In the absence of a quorum, straw votes were taken on a series of resolutions upon which the discussion focused. The voting: a) endorsed continued, direct negotiations between students and the University Administration in relation to recent allegations of racial harassment on campus; b) endorsed the appointment of a committee to draft a policy on racial harassment; c) endorsed the implementation of earlier plans to strengthen Black Presence; d) asked for the suspension of Murray Dolfman, Wharton School lecturer, with pay.

April Meeting

A report prepared by the Undergraduate Assembly on the operation of the Code of Academic Integrity ("Honor Code") was discussed. The report set forth the findings that not enough students fear the consequences of cheating or know that an Honor Code exists at Penn, not enough faculty members and students abide by the code, and not all of the cases of cheating are reported. The report's recommendation for more thorough dissemination of the Code and potential punishments under the Code and for more frequent reminders to faculty members and students were generally endorsed. Suggestions were made that some faculty members hesitate to use the Code because of its technical nature, that entering students should be required to sign a pledge that they will abide by the Code, and that an attempt should be made to determine the reasons for cheating. All of the comments made in discussion of the SCUE "White Paper" on undergraduate education were supportive.

May Meeting

A proposed amendment to the bylaws to broaden the charge to the International Programs Committee was adopted. A second proposed amendment to enlarge the Council membership to include the heads of the Interfraternity Council and United Minorities Council was withdrawn. A progress report was presented by the Committee on Student Affairs on its investigation of the status of faculty-student interaction undertaken at the request of the Council. The report indicated that interaction is considerably better at the graduate/professional level than at the undergraduate level but is probably similar to the experience at peer institutions for both levels. The committee will continue its work and will cooperate with the seminars on faculty-student interaction being conducted by the vice provost for university life. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate the Fall Break was discussed. The report concluded that last year's experimental break was a success and recommended that next fall's two-day break be evaluated and that a decision on whether to make the break permanent be made early in the 1985-86 year. The committee was asked to conduct the evaluation and to make early recommendations accordingly. Vice Provost Bishop introduced a new draft policy on alcohol use noting that the Alcohol Concerns Committee had been at work for three years and had produced a number of successive drafts reflecting suggestions made by the Council and other groups and individuals. The comments by Council members generally supported the draft.

1985-86 Council Agenda

Issues which are seen by the Steering Committee as likely agenda items for this academic year are the survey on harassment and policy on sexual harassment, investments involving South Africa, Task Force on Conduct and Misconduct, fall break, student judicial system, faculty-student interaction, and possibly liaisons on Trustee committee, racial and ethnic diversity, and Honor Code.

NIH Decision on the Grant-Supported Experimental Head Injury Laboratory

The National Institutes of Health has determined that the University of Pennsylvania's Experimental Head Injury Laboratory has not been in compliance with the Public Health Service's animal welfare policy. As a result of this decision, the University must meet several conditions before NIH will consider any request to resume funding for the Laboratory's research project involving baboons and other non-human primates.

Federal grant funds for this project were suspended on July 18 on the basis of a preliminary report by NIH's Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR). HHS Secretary Margaret Heckler directed the NIH to suspend the funding, and NIH Director James B. Wyngaarden ordered an immediate suspension of funds relating to non-human primate research.

Today's [October 4, 1985] announcement comes after Dr. Wyngaarden concurred with all recommendations made by an NIH executive committee headed by Dr. William F. Raub, Deputy Director for Extramural Research and Training.

The committee based its findings and recommendations primarily on the OPRR report of July 17 (Evaluation of Experimental Procedures Conducted at the University of Pennsylvania Experimental Head Injury Laboratory 1981-1984 in Light of the Public Health Service Animal Welfare Policy) and the University of Pennsylvania responses to the OPRR report.

In making its recommendations to Dr. Wyngaarden, the committee stressed the importance of head injury as a national health problem, the need for head injury research, and the significance of contributions from the University of Pennsylvania Head Injury Clinical Research Center. However, the committee noted several deficiencies in the way the studies were performed.

Although the committee was fully convinced that the Laboratory's proposed procedures involving animals, if implemented as described, would have been appropriate and would have produced valuable scientific data, the committee accepted unanimously the conclusion that the Laboratory's research involving animals was conducted in a manner that "failed materially" to comply with PHS policy.

NIH's National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke (NINCDS) has been supporting both clinical and laboratory research projects at the University of Pennsylvania's Head Injury Clinical Research Center under Grant No. PO1 NS 08803. The non-human primate model has been being explored extensively at the Center's Experimental Head Injury Laboratory to derive information applicable to human injuries. Using this model, specific trauma can be reproduced in a reliable way, enabling investigators to differentiate the effects of destruction of brain nerve cells in localized areas from the effects due to diffuse brain damage.

Areas of Non-Compliance

Based on all the evidence, including the University's responses, the committee noted several areas where laboratory procedures were not in conformance with the NIH *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*, an integral part of the PHS animal welfare policy:

***Management of anesthesia, analgesia and sedation for research animals**—The committee concluded that the weight of evidence points to at least a few instances of inadequate pharmacologic management of the animals. This conclusion is reinforced by the adjudged inadequacies with respect to the training and supervision of laboratory personnel. (The University has challenged this area of the OPRR report.)

***Adequacy of techniques used to achieve a sterile environment**—Survival surgery was conducted in a facility that is not equipped for aseptic surgery. Procedures were carried out in the absence of aseptic techniques.

***Adequacy of the laboratory environment and occupational health program**—Staff members failed to maintain high standards of cleanliness, to wear appropriate laboratory clothing and to refrain from eating, smoking or drinking during the conduct of laboratory experiments involving animals.

***Supervision and training of laboratory personnel**—Experiments involving animals were not performed under the immediate supervision of a qualified biological or medical scientist. Assistants were either less than adequately or improperly trained to perform important procedures involving animals.

***Adequacy of veterinary participation in experiments**—Adequate records of health status and care of animals were not available. The staff veterinarian was not sufficiently involved in the choice of and/or use of anesthetics, analgesics and other pharmacologic agents.

Manadatory Conditions Set

Because of the Laboratory's failure to comply with the PHS policy, the NIH has set several conditions that must be met before it will consider any request for further funding of the project involving baboons or other non-human primates:

1. The University of Pennsylvania shall file a new animal welfare assurance and obtain approval from the NIH for all of its animal research facilities and practices, in accordance with the more restrictive recent revisions of the PHS animal welfare policy. Prior to any consideration for the approval of the assurance document, the NIH shall conduct a site visit to assess whether the University's programs and facilities for the care and use of laboratory animals are consonant with the requirements of the PHS policy and the University's assurance.

2. The University of Pennsylvania shall provide evidence that the University, through its institutional animal care and use committee, has remedied all unacceptable practices involving research animals (as described in the OPRR report). As part of the process of evaluating the evidence submitted by the University, NIH will conduct a full inspection of the Experimental Head Injury Laboratory. This inspection would include assessment of the adequacy of implementing the research protocol and complying with the PHS policy.

3. The University of Pennsylvania shall provide the NIH with evidence from the U.S. Department of Agriculture that its charges against the University relating to the Animal Welfare Act have been fully resolved.

The site visit and assessment associated with the first of these conditions must occur, whether or not the University decides to seek resumption of funding for the studies of experimental head injury involving nonhuman primates. The first condition applies to all PHS-funded animal experimentation at the University and the assessment could lead to funding restrictions on or suspension/termination of other awards if the OPRR finds additional instances of noncompliance.

In the event that all of the foregoing conditions are satisfied fully and the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke elects to resume funding of the University's research on experimental head injuries in nonhuman primates, the following special conditions shall obtain for a period of five years:

1. NINCDS scientific and technical merit site visits to the Laboratory shall include a veterinarian trained in laboratory animal science who shall, together with the other site visitors, determine and document that procedures and practices in the Laboratory meet the standards set forth in the *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*.

2. All videotapes of research in the Laboratory shall be provided to NINCDS on a quarterly basis. NINCDS shall evaluate the tapes for compliance with the standards of the *Guide*, and report the results of that evaluation to OPRR.

3. The University of Pennsylvania shall be formally notified that a U.S. Department of Agriculture determination of violation of the Animal Welfare Act shall result in the automatic suspension of the institution's PHS animal welfare assurance, or portions thereof, as determined by OPRR.

4. OPRR shall conduct unannounced inspections of the Laboratory to assess compliance with the PHS policy.

Original Complaint and NIH's Investigation

The initial complaint against the research was lodged by an animal rights group, which had in its possession copies of approximately 60 hours of videotape documenting research in the Pennsylvania Experimental Head Injury Laboratory. The original tapes were stolen from the Laboratory in May 1984 when individuals claiming to represent the Animal Liberation Front broke into the Laboratory, damaged equipment and destroyed records.

NIH's investigation of these allegations had been impeded for almost a year by the unwillingness of this animal rights group to give NIH unconditional possession of complete copies of the unaltered videotapes. Copies of the tapes were finally turned over to the NIH in successive installments between May 14 and 23, 1985, by the Department of Agriculture, which had received them from the animal rights group during April and early May.

In preparing its report, OPRR depended upon advisors, both Federal and outside experts, and reviewed four major sources of information: (1) the research protocol as described in the grant application and associated documents; (2) approximately 80 hours of videotapes portraying experiments; (3) the report of an OPRR site visit to the Experimental Head Injury Laboratory; and (4) the report of an ad hoc advisory group. The OPRR concluded that the studies involving baboons at the Experimental Head Injury Laboratory were not conducted in compliance with the PHS animal welfare policy. OPRR's report of July 17 led to the suspension of PHS grant funds.

Lindback Awards for Distinguished Teaching 1985-86

The Lindback Awards are presented annually to eight members of the Pennsylvania faculty in recognition of their distinguished contributions to teaching. They are open to teachers of undergraduates and graduate students in both the professional schools and the arts and sciences.

Four awards each year go to faculty in the non-health areas (i.e., F.A.S., Wharton, Engineering, Law, Education, Social Work, Fine Arts and Annenberg School of Communications). The Committee on Distinguished Teaching, appointed by the Vice Provost for University Life on behalf of the Provost, is charged with presenting the Provost's Staff Conference with eight final candidates from which these four non-health area winners are chosen. The Committee now welcomes nominations for

these awards from schools or departments, individual students, and student groups, faculty members, or alumni.

Nominations should be submitted to the Committee on Distinguished Teaching, 112 College Hall/CO, to the attention of Constance C. Goodman. They should be in the form of a letter, citing those qualities that make the nominee an outstanding teacher. It is particularly important to include the nominee's full name, department and rank; how you know the nominee; and your name, address and phone number. Additional supporting evidence, in the form of statistical surveys, curricula vitae, list of courses taught, etc., will also be helpful to the Committee in its selection process. *Nominations open Monday, October 28, and will close on Friday, December 6.*

Nominations: Lindbacks/Health

The Deans of the health schools will welcome nominations for the 1985-86 awards from faculty members and students. Nominations and supporting materials, including a current curriculum vitae, comments from faculty and students concerning the nominee's teaching ability and any quantitative data on the nominee's teaching activities should be sent to the school's Lindback committee. Each school committee is comprised of faculty and students who will nominate up to four individuals for awards. The dossiers of the school candidates are due in the Office of the Vice President for Health Affairs on March 3, 1986. The Vice President for Health Affairs then appoints an ad hoc committee drawn from the school committees to choose the recipients from among the candidates.

—Office of the Vice President
For Health Affairs

Criteria and Guidelines for the Lindback Awards In the Non-Health Areas 1985-86

1. The Lindback Awards are given in recognition of distinguished teaching. "Distinguished" teaching is teaching that is intellectually demanding, unusually coherent, and permanent in its effect. The distinguished teacher has the capability of changing the way in which students view the subject they are studying. The distinguished teacher provides the basis for students to look with critical and informed perception at the fundamentals of a discipline, and he/she relates this discipline to other disciplines and to the world view of the student. The distinguished teacher is accessible to students and open to new ideas, but also expresses his/her own views with articulate conviction and is willing to lead students, with a combination of clarity and challenge, to an informed understanding of an academic field. The distinguished teacher is fair, free from prejudice, and single-minded in the pursuit of truth.

2. Distinguished teaching means different things in different fields. While the distinguished teacher should be versatile, as much at home in large groups as in small, and in beginning classes as in advanced, he or she may have skills of special importance to his/her area of specialization. Skillful direction of dissertation students, effective supervision of student researchers, ability to organize a large course of many sections, skill in leading seminars, special talent with large classes, ability to handle discussions or to structure lectures—these are all relevant attributes, although it is unlikely that anyone will excel in all of them.

3. Distinguished teaching is recognized and recorded in many ways; evaluation must also take several forms. It is not enough to look

solely at letters of recommendation from students. It is not enough to consider "objective" evaluations of particular classes in tabulated form; a faculty member's influence extends beyond the classroom and beyond individual classes. Nor is it enough to look only at a candidate's most recent semester or at opinions expressed immediately after a course is over, the influence of the best teachers lasts while that of others may be great at first but lessens over time. It is not enough merely to gauge student adulation, for its basis is superficial; but neither should such feelings be discounted as unworthy of investigation. Rather, all of these factors and more, should enter into the identification and assessment of distinguished teaching.

4. The Lindback Awards have a symbolic importance that transcends the recognition of individual merit. They should be used to advance effective teaching by serving as reminders to as wide a spectrum of the University community as possible of the expectations of the University for the quality of its mission.

5. Distinguished teaching occurs in all parts of the University, and therefore faculty members from all schools are eligible for consideration. An excellent teacher who does not receive an award in a given year may be re-nominated in some future year and receive the award then.

6. The Lindback Awards may be awarded to faculty members who have many years of service remaining, or they may recognize many years of service already expended. *No faculty may be considered for the Lindback Award in a year in which the member is considered for tenure. All nominees should be members of the*

standing faculty. The teaching activities for which the Awards are granted must be components of the degree programs of the University of Pennsylvania.

7. The awards should recognize excellence in either undergraduate or graduate/professional teaching or both.

8. The recipient of a Lindback Award should be a teacher-scholar. While a long bibliography is not necessarily the mark of a fine mind, nor the lack of one a sign of mediocrity, it is legitimate to look for an active relationship between a candidate's teaching and the current state of scholarship in his/her field.

9. The process of selecting the four Lindback Awards in the non-health areas (i.e. FAS, Wharton, Engineering, Law, Social Work, Fine Arts, Education, and Annenberg) is initiated yearly when the Committee on Distinguished Teaching is appointed by the Vice Provost for University Life on behalf of the Provost. The committee is drawn from the non-health schools. It is composed of five Lindback Award recipients, three graduate and professional students, and two undergraduates. The Chairperson is one of the faculty members and is appointed by the Vice Provost. The Committee solicits nominations from the University community and reviews the documents submitted, producing a list of not more than eight nominees, in ranked order when the Committee has agreed-upon preferences.

10. The Provost then reviews the list, receives advice from the several Deans concerning distribution of the Awards among schools, and makes final designations from it.

CONFERENCES

25 Zenger Symposium: an all day program exploring contemporary issues in libel law and freedom of the press, commemorating the 250th anniversary of the noted Zenger trial. 9 a.m., Annenberg School of Communications. General Admission: \$125; public interest lawyers, senior citizens, and recent graduates, \$50; students free. Call the Bar Association, 686-1776 (Law School, Annenberg School of Communications, Philadelphia Bar Association).

FILMS

25 One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, based on Alexander Solzhenitsyn's story of life in a Siberian labor camp. This film demonstrates the failure of Russian communism, as shown by the excesses of Stalinism, 8 p.m., Room B-1, Meyerson Hall, admission: \$2 (GSAC Film Series).

29 Master Musicians of Jahouka (Morocco), artist and craftsmen in the Middle East, 5-6 p.m., 4th floor lounge, Williams Hall (MEC/Folklore Film Series).

FITNESS/LEARNING

Career Planning and Placement

28 Careers in Consulting/Research: Dick Corbet, senior research associate, Research for Better Schools; Raylene Decatur, exhibit coordinator, Lynch Museum Services; Louise Root, manager, Real Estate Advisory Services, Laven-
thol & Horwath; Jim Cohen, senior study director, national analyst; 4:30-6 p.m., Benjamin Franklin Room, 235 Houston Hall. Call Ext. 7530 to register.

Computer Resource Center

23 IBM Technical Overview, a day long series of presentations, 9-3:45 p.m., 286 McNeil Building.

24 Apple Macintosh Hands-on Day featuring demonstrations, presentations, and a hands-on area. 10 a.m.-4 p.m., 286 McNeil Building.

25 Hewlett-Packard Peripherals Fair, try out the products shown at the Computer Fair, 10 a.m.-3 p.m., 286 McNeil Building.

MEETINGS

23 Librarians Assembly, first meeting of the academic year; 3 p.m., First Floor Conference Room, Van Pelt Library.

MUSIC

24 Steel Pulse and Fishbone, concert at Irvine Auditorium, 8 p.m. Tickets: \$11.50, \$12.50, call Ext. 4444 (Penn Union Council and WXPB).

26 Cheng recital with China's most distinguished Cheng player Wang Chang-Yuan, 8 p.m., Folklife Center of International House. Admission: \$6-\$7; Call 387-5125, Ext. 219 (Folklife Center Concert Series).

ON STAGE

30 Mask and Wig's Fall Show: Eat Wit and Die, 8 p.m. and *October 31-November 2, 7 and 9:30 p.m.* Tickets \$4 and \$4.50; Houston Hall Auditorium. Call 662-0122 for ticket information.

SPECIAL EVENTS

23 Dedication of the Furness Building as a National Landmark, a bronze plaque will be unveiled and a certificate will be presented to GSFA Dean Lee Copeland by James W. Coleman, Jr., regional director, National Park Service, Mid-Atlantic Region, 2 p.m., portico of Furness Building.

28 Careful, He Might Hear You: Dr. Marla Issacs of the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic will lead a question and answer session after a free screening of the award-winning Australian film about the effects of a wrenching custody battle on a little boy, 7:30 p.m., Studio Theatre, Annenberg Center (The President's Forum on the American Family).

31 Ordinary People in Non-Ordinary Families: Varieties of Family Life; 9 a.m.-3 p.m., Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall (The President's Forum on the American Family).

TALKS

23 Social Conditions and Their Relation to Architecture; Denise Scott Brown, partner at Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown; 6:30 p.m., Alumni Hall, Towne Building (GSFA Student Lecture Series).

24 Contemporary Israeli Theater, Ideology and Politics; Dr. Freddie Rokem, department of theater studies, Hebrew University; noon, 4th floor lounge, Williams Hall (MEC, Comparative Literature, Oriental Studies).

Art and Technology: The Uneasy Liaison; Dr. Cynthia Goodman, research associate, John Paul Getty Trust/Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum; 5:30 p.m., University City Science Center (Art-in-Science V).

Theoretical Studies on Bioheat Transfer, James W. Baish, department of mechanical engineering and applied mechanics; 11 a.m., Alumni Hall, Towne Building (Department of Bioengineering).

Health Insurance for the Uninsured Poor: Eva-

luating the Options, Patricia M. Danzon, associate professor of health care systems and insurance, Wharton; 4:30-6:30 p.m., Colonial Penn Center Auditorium (LDI Research and Policy Seminar Series).

Christian-Muslim Relations in Egypt, William Soliman Kilada, vice president, Egyptian State Council, Cairo; 4:30-6 p.m., 4th floor lounge, Williams Hall (MEC and Religious Studies).

25 Regulation of Protein Kinases and Cellular Proliferation by Transforming Gene Products, Dr. Raymond Erikson, department of cellular and developmental biology, Harvard University, 11:30 a.m., 196 Med Labs Building (Microbiology Graduate Group).

Pieter Breughel, James Snyder, professor of art history, Bryn Mawr College; 8 p.m., Room B-21, Stiteler Hall (Dutch Studies Program).

28 Folk Literature and the Mass Media in Today's Brazil, Candice Slater, Spanish and Portuguese department, University of California, Berkeley; 4 p.m., Room 237, Houston Hall (The Tinker Lecture Series in Latin America).

Science and Industrial Renewal in France, 1850-1914; Professor Robert Fox, University of Lancaster and School of Historical Studies, Institute for Advanced Study; 4-6 p.m., 107 Smith Hall (Department of History and Sociology of Science).

Reexamining Privacy Concepts in an Information Society; Professor Spiro Simitis of Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität, Frankfurt, West Germany; 4 p.m., place t.b.a., call Law School, Ext. 7483 (Thomas Jefferson Lecture Series).

29 The Biology and Evolution of Language; Dr. Philip Lieberman, Brown University; 4:30 p.m., Room 109, Annenberg School of Communications (Department of Psychology).

Preschool Children in Logo-Environments; Dr. Sheila Viadva, Drexel University, noon-1 p.m., Room C-34, Graduate School of Education (Literacy Research Center, GSE).

Interaction of Ascorbic Acids and Proteins; Dr. G. Kovachich, V.A. Hospital, Philadelphia, 12:30 p.m., Physiology Library, Richards Building (Respiratory Physiology Group and Department of Anesthesiology).

Beta Transforming Growth Factors: Regulator of Growth and Phenotype, Anita Roberts, biochemist, NCI, NIH; noon, Room 404 Anatomy-Chemistry Building (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).

Inside Palestinian Camps in Lebanon, Dr. Bill Beman, department of anthropology, Brown University; noon, 4th floor lounge, Williams Hall (Middle East Center).

30 Spectroscopic Probes of Muscle Protein Dynamics, Dr. David Thomas, department of biochemistry, University of Minnesota; noon, 4th floor, Physiology Library, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

31 Human Aspects of Urban Form, Amos Rapoport, Distinguished Professor of Architecture and Anthropology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; 6:30 p.m., Alumni Hall, Towne Building (GSFA Student Lecture Series).

Deadlines

The deadline for the weekly calendar update entries is Monday, a week before the Tuesday of publication. The deadline for the December pull-out calendar is Monday, November 4. Send to *Almanac*, 3601 Locust Walk/6224 (second floor of the Christian Association Building).

Things that Go Bump:

The weekend before Halloween the University Museum marks the upcoming holiday with its Gallery Tours featuring *Mummies*, at 1:15 p.m. Saturday and Sunday beginning at the main entrance. The fun continues on Halloween eve at the Faculty Club's Hourglass, with a party "that's guaranteed to stir the bats out of the rafters", 5-8 p.m. complete with jazz and complimentary hors d'oeuvres (trick or treat). Prizes will be given for costumes. Dinner and bar are available. PUC presents *Nosferatu, the Vampire* at 9 p.m., in Irvine, also on October 30. Then, on October 31, the Curtis Organ Restoration Society shows the classic *Phantom of the Opera* accompanied by the Curtis Organ, at 8 and 10 p.m. in Irvine.

