The Top Secret Social Committee anonymously invites you to the next departmental outing!

Urban Bike Tour
Sunday, April 7

Join faculty, staff and students on a two-wheeled tour of the 'burgh...

If you have a bike, meet us outside Baker Hall (near Hunt Library) at 10 am.

Don’t have 2 wheels of your own? We will arrange a rental bike for you!
If you're interested in renting a bike, please meet us in the parking lot of the Eliza Furnace Trail (aka “The Jail Trail”) at 10:30 am.

For directions to the Eliza Furnace Trail... see http://pittsburgh.citysearch.com/profile?id=11356698
We will meet at the eastern end of the trail (opposite the jail)

We will take an easy ride (no big Pittsburgh-style hills!) through Schenley Park, down the South Side, through Downtown, past Heinz Stadium and PNC park, onto Washington’s Island, through downtown and across the Jail Trail to return to CMU!

Please pack a picnic lunch and bring water.

Estimated return time is 3:00 pm

So that we may plan for the ride, please RSVP to Rochelle Croom (rmcroom@andrew.cmu.edu) by March 29th. Please indicate whether you will need to rent a bicycle for the tour.

We all know Marsha Lovett conducts solid empirical work, but it seems that she is going above and beyond the usual call of duty to strengthen her skills. Marsha recently received this conference announcement...

AMERICAN CONCRETE INSTITUTE
2002 Seminars

The American Concrete Institute has scheduled seminars in the spring of 2002 on a variety of concrete related topics throughout the United States.

All seminars provide the latest information for the specification, design, testing, and construction of concrete for government agencies, engineers, architects, contractors, specifiers, designers, material suppliers, building inspectors, testing agencies, and all others involved in concrete design and construction.

All seminar participants receive free publications related to the seminar topics, which include...

BUILDING CODE 101
DESIGN OF MASONRY STRUCTURES
FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE
PARKING LOTS AND SITE PAVING
PRACTICAL CONCRETE MATERIALS
REPAIR OF CONCRETE WORKSHOP
SLABS ON GROUND
SUPPLEMENTARY CEMENTITIOUS MATERIALS
TROUBLESHOOTING CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION

Those interested in advanced topics like “Supplementary Cementitious Materials” should contact Marsha directly.

This is your chance to get the word out to the entire department!

Forward announcements to Rochelle Croom (rmcroom@andrew.cmu.edu).

You can also use the anonymous suggestion box in the 336B Lounge.
UPCOMING EVENT!

graceful light

in weightless darkness

a mary miller dance company production

groundbreaking fusion of choreographed movement, light and computer technology

Friday and Saturday
April 12 & 13, 2002, 8:00 p.m.
Kelly-Strayhorn Community Performing Arts Center
5941 Penn Avenue, East Liberty

Pre-sale tickets: $13 general admission, $15 at the door.
Special offer for groups of 5 or more.

PRO ARTS 412-394-3353 www.proartstickets.org

Funded in part by the A W Mellon Educational & Charitable Trust fund of The Pittsburgh Foundation and by the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts
photo: Adam Koe Leong   e-advert design: McM

mary miller dance company  601 Wood St., Pittsburgh, PA 15222  412-434-1169
Bob Villa Tip of the Month from Sheldon Cohen...

Guess what? If you are an Equitable Gas customer and gas supplier is Dominion Peoples Plus, you are probably paying 25-30% more than you need to. Dominion used to charge $8.65 per mcf (thousand cubic feet) and then you would pay Equitable Gas another $3 + for delivery. However, if you call Dominion and tell them you would like their new price: $8.65 for gas and delivery... they will change your arrangement with them to the cheaper version... However, this will happen only if you request it. If not they will continue to rip you off for the delivery charge. Try calling 888-284-3593 (Dominion Peoples Plus).

Wining & Dining

This is the first in what I hope will be a continuing series of discussions of wines, restaurants, bakeries, and other subjects related to food and drink. When I write the column, I’ll usually focus on wine and will include recommendations for good wines that are available at fairly reasonable prices at State Stores. I hope that other people will contribute their opinions concerning what to eat and drink in Pittsburgh.

Because readers will have very different initial knowledge about wine, I’ll start with some basics and then move up from there. The most basic distinction is between red wines and white wines. In general (and these, like all generalizations about wine, have exceptions), red wines differ from whites in the following ways:

1) Red wines have stronger, more distinctive tastes
2) Red wines have greater potential for aging (almost all white wines are as good as they will ever be the day that you buy them, and they should be consumed no more than a year or two after being purchased. This is true of many inexpensive and medium price red wines as well, but top quality red wines can improve for anywhere from 10-50 years).
3) Red wines go better with red meat or with food with strongly flavored sauces; white wines go better with fish, chicken, and other less strongly flavored foods.

As I mentioned before, there are important exceptions to all of these rules. Here’s one that I find particularly intriguing. Completely inconsistent with Generalization #3, good quality, sweet white wines, particularly German and Alsatian wines, go exceptionally well with spicy Indian food. Try it sometime.

One aspect of wine that scares away many people who are mildly curious about it is the bewildering complexity of the classification systems. Most labels on a wine bottle have all kinds of information, some important and some trivial. To make things much worse, different countries use different classification systems, and information that is very important in understanding the wines of one country will not correspond to any information provided about the wines of another country. Sometimes there are good reasons for the differences; more often, it’s just an accident of history. However, there are three kinds of information that are always important and that are always provided somewhere on the label.

1) The country of origin, and the region or state within the country
2) The year in which the grapes were grown
3) The predominant kind of grape or the type of blend of grapes
The first two dimensions are self-explanatory, but the third requires some elaboration. There are about 10 major grapes, and a much larger number of grapes that are used in one or two countries or in minor amounts in blends of other grapes. Here, I’ll describe the 6 grapes that I think will be of greatest interest:

1) **Cabernet Sauvignon**: A red grape that is the sole or dominant constituent in the wines labeled “Bordeaux” in France and “Cabernet Sauvignon” in the U. S. and Australia. Bordeaux wines always include other grapes as part of the blend; Cabernet Sauvignon wines may or may not. Wines that are largely or completely made with the Cabernet grape have a full, strong, fruity taste, often with many subtler tastes mixed in. Many of them can age (and improve) for many years, and most are not ready to drink for a couple of years after you buy them.

2) **Merlot**: A red grape quite similar in taste to Cabernet Sauvignon but somewhat softer and usually somewhat shorter-lived. It’s almost always included in Bordeaux wines, as well as being included on its own in wines made in the U. S.

3) **Pinot Noir**: Another red grape, lighter and softer than either Merlot or Cabernet. Pinots are less consistent from year to year and from winery to winery than the other major grapes, but when they’re good they’re very good. The French wines labeled “Red Burgundy” are made predominantly from Pinot grapes, as are most wines labeled “Champagne” (which are white because after the juice is extracted from the grapes, it is left in contact with the grape skins for a shorter time.)

4) **Zinfandel**: Our fourth and final red grape, native and pretty much limited to the U.S. Zinfandels tend to be peppery and fruity, to be good to drink as soon as you buy the wine, and to be reasonably priced. DO NOT under any circumstances confuse Zinfandels with “White Zinfandel,” which as far as I’m concerned, should only be consumed by livestock (and if PETA members were knowledgeable about wine, they’d probably object to that).

5) **Chardonnay**: By far the most popular grape for white wine. It’s referred to simply as “Chardonnay” in wines made in the U.S., but as “White Burgundy” in wines made in France. (You’re probably getting a sense of one difference in classification systems; the French system emphasizes the region in which the grapes were grown, the U.S. system emphasizes the predominant type of grape.) Chardonnays have a predominant taste that I’d describe as creamy vanilla; like other white wines, they generally should be consumed in the first year or two after you buy it.

6) **Riesling**: The predominant grape in many high-quality German and Alsatian wines. Like other white wines, Riesling has a milder, easier to grasp, taste than Cabernet or Merlot.

One final point. Most people who get interested in wine go through a “developmental sequence,” in which they initially prefer white wines (including champagne), then come to like Zinfandels and Pinots, and only later come to enjoy Cabernet Sauvignon and Merlot. It’s also true that most people who are into wine eventually come to enjoy the Cabernets and Merlots the best.

OK, that’s enough general information for now. I’ll close with a few recommendations for wines that can currently be purchased at the State Store in the shopping center at the intersection of Shakespeare St. and Shady Ave. That store, and the store in the Waterworks shopping center, are the two best ones in this area. Unfortunately, none of the stores in Squirrel Hill or Oakland carry as good a selection. Wine stores can be pretty confusing; if you want to buy one of the wines listed below and you aren't real familiar with wine stores, I’d suggest asking a clerk to find the wine for you.

1) **Cambria Winery Katherine’s Chardonnay**, 1999. $15.45. A very high quality California Chardonnay, ready to be consumed now.

2) **Grande Cassagne**, 2000, $10.99. A red wine from the Rhone region of France. I’d wait a year to drink it, but it’ll be very good and last for several years thereafter.

3) **Pacific Echo Sparkling Wine**, $21.00. It’s not technically a champagne, that term being limited to wines made of grapes grown in the Champagne region of France, but it tastes like a very good quality champagne; I think it’s also available at a wider range of State Stores than the others.

**Cheers!**
**MARK YOUR CALENDAR...**

**March 16, 9 am - 4 pm, Scaife (Pitt), 4th Floor, Room 3**  
Job Hunting: The Process  
**WORKSHOP TOPICS:** Moving on; preparing your package; interview skills. **REGISTRATION:** $10 at the door, includes continental breakfast (8:30 am), and lunch. 624-7098.

**March 18, Noon, BH 336B**  
CogBog, Glenn Gunzelman will lead a follow up on last semester's discussion of imagery.

**March 18, 4:00-5:20 pm, BH A53**  
Department Colloquium  
Dr. David Geary, University of Missouri  
A Darwinian perspective on mathematics and the acquisition of mathematical competence  
Reception to follow in the Department Lounge.

**March 20, Noon, BH 340A**  
Faculty Meeting – With guest, President Cohon

**March 20, 5:00 pm, University Center**  
Campus-wide Faculty Social Hour

**March 21, Noon, BH 336B**  
Cognitive Modeling Seminar, Glenn Gunzelman

**March 25, Noon, BH 336B**  
CogBog  
Kim Plunkett, University of Oxford, Title TBA

**March 26, Noon, BH 336B**  
DDG, Brad Morris presents his research

**March 27, Noon, BH 336B**  
Erica Michael and Natasha Tokowicz will give practice talks for upcoming talks at the International Linguistic Association Conference

**March 28, Noon, BH 336B**  
Cognitive Modeling Seminar, Jay Brown

**April 3, Noon, BH 340A**  
Faculty Meeting

**April 8, Noon, BH 336B**  
Cognitive Modeling Seminar, Marsha Lovett

**April 9-10**  
Advisory Board Visit (see Top of Right Column)

**April 11**  
Terry Sejnowski Neuroscience Colloquium

**April 11, Noon, BH 336B**  
Cognitive Modeling Seminar, Matt Botvinick

**April 18, Noon, BH 336 B**  
Cognitive Modeling Seminar, Raluca Budiu

**April 25, Noon, BH 336B**  
Cognitive Modeling Seminar, Evan Smith

**ADVISORY BOARD VISITS DEPARTMENT**

On April 9 and 10, a visiting committee will be here to take a comprehensive look at our department and report to the administration about how we are currently doing and about our prospects and challenges for the future. Every department has such a visit every three years, and this will be our forth such visit. In preparation, the department has written for the committee a length document describing the department and its activities, challenges, and accomplishments.

When they are here subgroups of them will be meeting with each segment of the faculty (by sub-area), with undergraduates, with grad students and with the faculty as a whole. There are sessions on undergraduate education, graduate education and on the research agendas of each sub-area of the department. There are also some future oriented sessions on diversity, on issues pertaining to more junior faculty, and one on our integrated intellectual agenda which will include brief talks on plasticity and learning, mind-body relationships and psychology in the real world (dealing with applications of our research to real-world issues).

The committee is made up of highly esteemed psychologists and a couple of members of our board of trustees, including Eric Cooper, the chairman of the trustees. He is a former member of the CS faculty and was a founder and CEO of Fore Systems. The psychologist members include:

Dr. Mark Appelbaum, Dr. Andrew Baum, Dr. Gordon H. Bower, Dr. Stuart Card, Dr. Rachel K. Clifton, Dr. Judy S. DeLoache, Dr. Richard Held, Dr. John Jonides, Dr. Walter Kintsch, Dr. George Miller, and Dr. Harry T. Reis

**SURPRISING FINDING OF THE MONTH...**

From Eurekalert, 2/26/02.

Childless elderly, unmarried men more at risk of loneliness


**CONGRATULATIONS ARE IN ORDER!**

Jason Arndt will be starting a faculty position at Middlebury.  
Melanie Cary has accepted a faculty position at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.  
Michael Erickson will be leaving Pittsburgh for a faculty position at UC Riverside Department of Psychology.  
Jeremy Gottleib will soon be a Cheesehead! He's accepted a faculty position at Carthage College in Wisconsin.  
Jay Brown will be a new faculty member at Southwest Missouri State University.
I’ve been thinking about this year’s Oscar®™ awards from a scientific perspective. Are there any rules we can abstract from Oscar awards gone by? Defining features of winners? Speech algorithms to develop or clothes’ heuristics to implement? Perhaps even a computational models that takes into account the ludicrous money spent on advertising? With such things in mind, and in the true spirit of induction, I thought I might look at the award data from the recent past and attempt to make some predictions about this year’s winners.

The most obvious place to start is the Best Actor Category because it is this category that most often rewards a particular kind of portrayal. Let me give you a hint at what I’m talking about. Starting in 1988, the winners in this category were Dustin Hoffman (autistic), Daniel Day-Lewis (cerebral palsy), Jeremy Irons (alleged murderer but altogether cold and damn scary), Anthony Hopkins (think Fava beans), Al Pacino (blind), Tom Hanks X 2 (AIDS, learning disabled), Nicolas Cage (alcoholic), Geoffrey Rush (who knows, but clearly one condition short of a counterbalanced study), Jack Nicholson (xenophobic), Roberto Benigni (exhibitionist), and Kevin Spacey (dysfunctional middle-aged middle-classed teenager). The one exception to this rule is last year’s winner, Russell Crowe. Quite why he won isn’t clear, though I could easily put him in the “has a fantasy of ruling the known world” category. Nonetheless, in light of the trend so strongly suggested from 1988 to 2000, let’s consider this year’s contenders. Certainly, Tom Wilkinson and Will Smith don’t have a chance (though if Ali had covered his Parkinson’s years, who knows?). Sean Penn, in I am Sam, is a little too obvious, and Denzel Washington in Training Day is truly psychotic but one could argue he brought it on himself. This leaves the inevitable winner - Russell Crowe, for his excellent (though distorted) portrayal of John Nash. Crowe fits the bill so well not only because he was convincingly lost in a world of his own but because we felt a huge amount of unsentimental sympathy for him. He’ll win. I’ll bet my summer salary on it.

The other categories aren’t so easy to call. The Best Actress Category generally goes to roles that combine a strong character with a troubled one (think Jodie Foster in Silence of the Lambs, Helen Hunt in As Good as it Gets, Holly Hunter in The Piano, or (gulp) Kathy Bates in Misery). But if there’s one rule that is always followed it’s that a winner cannot be too good looking (think Jodie Foster in Silence of the Lambs, Helen Hunt in As Good as it Gets…). This last rule presumably counts out Nicole Kidman for Moulin-Rouge and Renee Zellwegger for Bridget Jones’ Diary. Halle Berry was excellent in Monster’s Ball and could sneak it, but though she tried hard to disguise her beauty, she failed. This leaves Judy Dench, sorry Dame Judy Dench, and I can’t believe they’ll give her another Oscar after her Best Supporting Actress award for 10 onscreen minutes in Shakespeare in Love. So, I’m left with Sissy Spacek for her role in “In the Bedroom”. Spacek plays an intelligent, likeable, quietly forceful character whose life is shattered by tragic events. Perfect.

Finally, there’s the Best Picture Category. If there are some necessary (though perhaps not sufficient) features for a movie to win this category, they include “big” (read: expensive) such as Dances with Wolves, Braveheart, Schindler’s List, Titanic, and Gladiator, and “beautiful” (read: schmaltzy/touching) such as American Beauty, Forrest Gump, Rain Man, Shakespeare in Love, and The English Patient. Following these criteria, it’s a split between Lord of the Rings (very big and very long) and Beautiful Mind. Somehow I can’t see the academy giving the award to a movie that involves anything or anyone with big hairy-toes, so my money is on Beautiful Mind. Irrespective of its name, it certainly scores on the “beautiful” side of things, and it was probably the most fully-rounded movie of the year with, as they say, something for the whole family. In case you’re interested, my other predictions include Shrek, Memento, Amelie, Jon Voigt, and Jennifer Connolly, but I’m staying well clear of the Best Director category because it’s a mess (though I’ve got a soft spot for David Lynch and Ridley Scott).

So, there are some rules to make your Oscar picks. There are other patterns that I leave you to discover if you chose to look closely at previous winners. But, if there’s a lesson to be learned from Beautiful Mind, you shouldn’t look too closely. Right Charlie?
You may not have seen these youthful, smiling faces since they started graduate school, but see if you can guess who's who in these baby pictures!

Anthony Cate
Jon Fincham
Joy Geng
Julie Eyer
Ken Kwok
Phil Pavlik
Rachel Diana
Sarah Novak
Sarah Pressman

Answers will be posted in the lounge next week.
HAVE FUN!
This periodical is not peer reviewed and as such, the editorial board takes absolutely no responsibility for its contents! This is an invitation to you. Submit us your stunning artwork (or doodles), your embarrassing departmental photographs, your biting satire, and your humorous stories. We'll publish them here without the benefit of review!

Submit what you wish to Rochelle Croom at rmcroom@andrew.cmu.edu or use the anonymous drop box in the 336B Lounge.

Where’s Waldo? Can you find one of our current faculty members listening to a talk by Jean Piaget at the 21st International Congress of Psychology, Paris?

First to reply gets a striped t-shirt!