Creating Tomorrow’s Entrepreneurs

by Justin Kao

This week’s Watson Lecture was presented on Wednesday by Kenneth A. Pickar, J. Stanford Johnson Visiting Professor of Mechanical Engineering. Speaking on entrepreneurship at Caltech, he discussed its causes and essence, Caltech’s entrepreneurial alumni, what Caltech’s Director of the Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation thought the places where people and knowledge make a company valuable, not production of physical goods. This change is affecting every aspect of business, as well as creating opportunities for all the Internet startups that have begun in the last few years.

What makes an entrepreneur? Says Pickar, entrepreneurs are “single-minded visionaries,” “driven, high energy,” “original,” and “very persevering.” Comparing this to Caltech admissions’ statement of what they’re looking for (“You have a passion for math and science… your main focus is to be in the best academic environment”), Pickar asked how Caltech managed to produce so many entrepreneurs without a business school.

It turns out there are some positives in Caltech’s favor: leading edge research, resources at JPL, access to faculty, students with integrity, and perhaps most importantly, “[Caltech students] are used to Internet time” — an adjustment students at other universities have yet to make.

Pickar went on to talk about past Caltech entrepreneurs, ranging from the recent sale of Ortel Corporation to Lucent for $3 billion, to the founder of Caltech, Amos Throop, who moved to California at the age of 69 and bought orchards and dealt in real estate.

New Associate Dean/Director of Minority Student Affairs appointed

by John Oh

Since March 1, Caltech has had a new Associate Dean/Director of the Office of Minority Student Affairs, Sue Borrego, who has worked at Caltech for the past eight years as the Ethnic Studies Program Director. At the time, she has become a full-time member of the student Affairs. This is not the first time Ms. Borrego has worked for the Office of Minority Student Affairs; she worked for the office four years ago. Ms. Borrego completed her undergraduate degree in Higher Education and Social Justice at Claremont Graduate School and her dissertation is on the “Implications of Socioeconomic Class in the Academy.” Ms. Borrego has been an interim associate dean since this summer. She will hold the official position for at least two and a half years. Her new duties will include working with undergraduate and graduate students of under-represented minority origins to support them in their academic and other pursuits.

Core under criticism

by Dana Sadava

A second look at core curriculum requirements has been initiated with the formation of the Student Curriculum Advisory Committee. Composed of mostly freshmen undergraduates and headed by Deans Ravel and Green, the committee seeks to identify common frustrations with the first two years of academic life at Caltech. So far, many complaints and suggestions have been offered. At a recent meeting, a major topic of discussion was the requirement of all students to take Chemistry 3A, a general chemistry laboratory course.

Abel Bourgeois, SCAC Representative for Ruddock House, said, “Many students claimed that Chemistry 3A is underranked, and that a student can pass the class without learning much.”

Variation in the quality of Chemistry 1b was also targeted. More variety in freshmen humanities course was requested. Committee members questioned the value of the ombuds system.

A Faculty Curriculum Committee headed by Professor Harvey Newman is working closely with the SCAC to realize revisions.
Huang Talks About Women in Academia

BY ELIZABETH ADAMS

"You're too young to worry about a glass ceiling," So Dr. Alice Huang informed the room full of undergraduates, grad students, and other women (and a few men) who went to the Atheneum Monday for her luncheon.

Following a rather stereotypical small lunch, (women’s lunch... chicken caesar salad...) Dr. Huang spoke for about an hour on her own experiences as a woman in academia and addressed the general concerns facing all women who want to juggle independent careers and families.

Although many Caltech students simply know her as President Baltimore’s wife, Dr. Huang has never been content to rest upon his credentials. It was while she was a post doc at MIT in the late sixties and early seventies that she first fully realized why it was so important for women to have their own separate academic identity. Huang related the story of a world-renowned female research associate whose mentor left the institute after many years. Suddenly, because she was without an official faculty sponsor, the research associate was unable to get grants or otherwise carry out her work as she had. Disturbed by this dependence on males sponsors, and determined not to fall into a similar situation if something happened to her husband (she was working in his lab at the time), she approached Harvard about becoming an associate professor. They recommended that she become a research associate so that she “not have the pressure of tenure” if she were to have children. She responded that the full professors she had seen in the past seemed to have more control over their lives than research associates, and that that was really what she wanted. Relented, and she became a member of the Harvard faculty, where she stayed for 20 years.

Her own life experiences illustrate some of the other problems facing women. When she had her daughter, she was unprepared for the sudden onslaught of hormones and the effect they had on her; as she put, “natur has done something terrible.” Later, when she was affiliated with New York University, she worked three days in New York and commuted back to Boston to spend the rest of the week with her husband.

Huang is currently serving on a commission investigating some of the important questions about women in the academic world. How can the number of women at each stage of academic be increased, and why do so many leave? How can the academic environment be made more receptive to women?

She offered some things women pursuing careers in academia could do to make their lives easier. Mentors are important, male as well as female, although it is a good idea to be sensitive to the wives of male mentors; speaking as someone who has been on both sides, Huang suggested trying to cultivate good rapport with the wife, which will allievate concerns she might have about the close intellectual relationship that develops between women and their mentors.

Her closing words of advice were: “Whatever job you do, do it well.”

ASSOCIATE DEAN:
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effective in supporting under-represented minorities. She hopes to find additional opportunities and to develop cohesiveness among minority students. Ms. Borrego also has concerns about the ability of the Office of Minority Student Affairs. The office is scheduled to relocate to Reck Graduate House, near other Student Affairs offices, in hopes that it will allow students easier access to the office’s services. She stresses the importance of student affairs offices, noting that many students choose not to come to Caltech because it lacks the broad social diversity that are present in other universities.
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"You're too young to worry about a glass ceiling," So Dr. Alice Huang informed the room

full of undergraduates, grad students, and other women (and a few men) who went to the

Atheneum Monday for her luncheon.

Following a rather stereotypical small lunch, (women’s lunch... chicken caesar salad...) Dr.

Huang spoke for about an hour on her own experiences as a woman in academia and

addressed the general concerns facing all women who want to juggle independent careers

and families.

Although many Caltech students simply know her as President Baltimore’s wife, Dr.

Huang has never been content to rest upon his credentials. It was while she was a post doc

at MIT in the late sixties and early seventies that she first fully realized why it was so

important for women to have their own separate academic identity. Huang related the

story of a world-renowned female research associate whose mentor left the institute after

many years. Suddenly, because she was without an official faculty sponsor, the research

associate was unable to get grants or otherwise carry out her work as she had.

Disturbed by this dependence on males sponsors, and determined not to fall into a similar

situation if something happened to her husband (she was working in his lab at the time),
she approached Harvard about becoming an associate professor. They recommended

that she become a research associate so that she “not have the pressure of tenure” if she

were to have children. She responded that the full professors she had seen in the past

seemed to have more control over their lives than research associates, and that that

was really what she wanted. Relented, and she became a member of the Harvard faculty,

where she stayed for 20 years.

Her own life experiences illustrate some of the other problems facing women. When

she had her daughter, she was unprepared for the sudden onslaught of hormones and the
effect they had on her; as she put, “natur has done something terrible.” Later, when she was
affiliated with New York University, she worked three days in New York and commuted
back to Boston to spend the rest of the week with her husband.

Huang is currently serving on a commission investigating some of the important
questions about women in the academic world. How can the number of women at each
stage of academic be increased, and why do so many leave? How can the academic
environment be made more receptive to women?

She offered some things women pursuing careers in academia could do to make their lives
easier. Mentors are important, male as well as female, although it is a good idea to be
sensitive to the wives of male mentors; speaking as someone who has been on both
sides, Huang suggested trying to cultivate good rapport with the wife, which will
allievate concerns she might have about the close intellectual relationship that
develops between women and their mentors.

Her closing words of advice were: “Whatever job you do, do it well.”
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effective in supporting under-represented minorities. She hopes to find additional
opportunities and to develop cohesiveness among minority students. Ms. Borrego also
has concerns about the ability of the Office of Minority Student Affairs. The office is scheduled
to relocate to Reck Graduate House, near other Student Affairs offices, in hopes that it will
allow students easier access to the office’s services. She stresses the importance of student
affairs offices, noting that many students choose not to come to Caltech because it lacks the
broad social diversity that are present in other universities.
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Recent developments in the area of human rights have shown a marked increase in the number of cases involving rights violations. These cases have been brought to the attention of the international community through various channels, including the United Nations, human rights organizations, and the media. The worsening situation in Burma has been particularly concerni

By Claudeine Chou

and Emily Brodsky

Rich in mineral wealth and natural resources, such as oil and virgin teak forests, Burma also once boasted to be Asia’s rice bowl. How, then, could this once-wealthy nation fall to the ranks of the world’s Ten Least Developed countries, where people starve and fear for their lives? Louisa Craig, co-founder of Caltech Forum and a veteran Burmese activist, highlighted the interrelationship between human rights abuses and destructive environmental practices in Burma in a talk sponsored by Caltech Environmental Task Force and the Caltech/Pasadena chapter of Amnesty International on Tuesday, February 29. As documented by Amnesty International’s recent report, forced labor is being used to build an oil pipeline through the rainforest, which is only the most recent in a string of human rights violations.

Human tragedy

A former British colony, Burma gained independence in 1948. There was promise of a federal democracy, but the government that came to power was weak, and in 1962, General Ne Win staged a coup, putting the army in control. The military then worked to undermine the people’s security. They nationalized most private businesses and devastated people’s savings in banks. A student demonstration against the government in July 1962 resulted in government troops surrounding the school; the student union, with students inside seeking refuge, was blown up. In 1968, millions poured into the streets for peaceful demonstrations led by students and monks. What resulted was a massacre. Trucks piled high with the dead and the living wounded kept the crematorium burning for four days. The military maintains its numbers because families are poor that the young men enlist in the military to be able to make a living. The military then forces young recruits to abuse villagers, making them targets of harassment, leaving them no alternative but to stay in the relative safety of the military.

Environmental damage

The cost on the environment and human lives from the greed of the oppressive military dictatorship is well portrayed in the building of a pipeline from the Burmese coast to Thailand, funded by Unocal and Total, a French oil company. The army is charged with protecting the pipeline, which cuts through the natural habitat of many animals. Lower level officials impose on villagers, forcing them to provide food and lodging and to work on the pipeline as slave labor, using their own tools. The government has also sold logging rights of the virgin hardwood forests in eastern Burma to Thai loggers, who were banned from clear cutting in Thailand because of resultant landslides and loss of life. Logging roads make the forests and the people hiding in them more accessible to the military and their assault on ethnic minorities. The military sweeps through, killing over half the villagers and raping the women. Villagers are used as slave labor to carry the army’s loads for months at a time.

As long as foreign investment brings money to the government, there will be little encouragement to change. Louisa Craig is a Burmese national who has been an activist both in and on behalf of her native country. She fled Burma in 1962 after her husband, headman of the Karen minority ethnic group, was assassinated during peace talks with the newly established military regime. In 1986, Ms. Craig co-founded the Burma Forum, an advocacy group based in LA. Among the group’s successes is a selective contract campaign that has convinced municipalities like the city of Los Angeles to refuse contracts to companies that do business in Burma. This strategy of applying economic pressure helped reform South Africa and it is hoped that it will have a similar effect in Burma. More information can be found at the Burma Forum webpage, (www.burmaforum.orgl) which includes a list of companies in and out of Burma. Unocal and Total are among many corporations targeted by the boycott. Among the companies that have recently withdrawn from Burma are ARCO and Texaco.

We can do our part by pressuring the city of Pasadena and Caltech to adopt selective purchasing. To get involved in local events, please attend the club meetings of Amnesty (the fourth Thursday of the month at 7:30 PM in the GSC office on the top floor of 1052 Del Mar), or contact CETF at rectors@caltech.edu.
**Minutes of the ASCIT BoD Meeting (2/28/00)**

Present: New BoD; Guests: Andrea McColl, Dave Guskin, Tasha Vanessian, Angie Han, Augusto Callejas, Dana Sadava.

Meeting called to order at 10:05 pm.

Melinda brings in snacks—cinnamon rolls and chocolate chip cookies "hot and fresh from the oven." The members of the BoD are distracted for the rest of the meeting.

Guests

The BoD conducts second round interviews for the ASCIT appointed office of little t editor, with the help of current editors Angie Han and Augusto Callejas. The two candidates for the position are Andrea McColl and Dave Guskin. The editors and the BoD asks each candidate about his/her publishing experience, obligations over the summer, ideas for themes, and willingness for work if not appointed. The BoD then excuses the candidates and grills Angie and Augusto with questions so they wouldn't feel left out. (Aside: The current little t has an Edward Gorey theme!) We thank them for their input then move on to the interview for Tech business manager.

The only candidate for Tech business manager is Tasha Vanessian. The BoD interviews her with the help of one of the current Tech editors, Dana Sadava. (Aside: Tasha, Emma, and Martha-Helene all have the same favorite color—purple.) The BoD thanks both guests for attending.

New ASCIT Appointed Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tech Business Manager</td>
<td>Tasha Vanessian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Editor</td>
<td>Dave Guskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little t Business Manager</td>
<td>Nathanial Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big T Editor</td>
<td>Jacob West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big T Business Manager</td>
<td>Don Thap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolem Editors</td>
<td>Helen Claudia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Chair</td>
<td>Michael Schoen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Chair</td>
<td>Wesley McCallough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Meeting**

The BoD closes the doors to appoint the offices. All of the interviews, with the exception of the ones tonight, were held over the weekend. All of the offices, with the exception of Movie Chair and little t Editor, have one person running uncontested. The BoD's decisions for the remaining two offices take up much of the meeting.

The meeting continues. Eric reports that he has four to five people from different houses lined up for his Executive Committee. He may need to call an emergency ASCIT meeting (or send an emergency ASCIT email) to get the BoD's approval by the end of this week.

Next, the update on the ASCIT BoD Retreat at Capra Ranch. Melinda's been calling Capra all week without getting an answer. (But looking into the future, by Wednesday, Melinda will have made reservations from the evening of Friday, March 31st to Sunday, April 2.) The BoD is planning on inviting some of the publications staff.

Eric passes out the club survey that he and Jason made last week. It contains a list of clubs (mostly the ones funded by ASCIT last year) and allows ASCIT members to indicate their interest in each one. The survey also asks if undergrads would like a joint ASCIT/GSC Formal this year. Lower cost, more people. If there is support for a joint formal, Melinda says that hotels might be too small so she will look into country clubs.

Eric lists the information he would like Martha-Helene to put on the advertising posters for the third term Budget Meeting. All clubs that need funding (and those who wish to be recognized by ASCIT) must submit a proposal. The posters will include the web page where club leaders can go to download the club questionnaire cover sheet.

Sean gives his treasurer's report on ASCIT's financial situation. According to his records, ASCIT has much more than was previously thought, though there may be some unascussed checks still out there. He has also set us up with online banking.

Meeting adjourns at 11:46 pm. Respectfully submitted, Jason C. Cardema

---

**ASCIT Minutes/Outside World**

LONDON, ENGLAND — Former Chilean dictator Gen. Augusto Pinochet has been medically unfit to stand trial and has left the U.K. Home Secretary Jack Straw indicated that the 84 year old general had suffered "severe brain damage" and could not understand complicated phrases nor clearly express himself. Pinochet was placed under house arrest 16 months ago while receiving medical treatment in England, in response to the request of Spanish Judge Baltasar Garzon, who wanted him deported to face charges of human rights abuse during his reign.

MOZAMBIQUE - Massive flooding of three major rivers continues to devastate settlements across Mozambique. An estimated one million people have been relocated by the water. The South African military has been running helicopters nonprofit for six days to rescue people stranded by the floods, including those taking refuge on tree tops for days. International aid is beginning to pour in, but President Joaquim Chissano estimates that $250 million may be required for Mozambique to recover.

UNITED STATES - Texas Gov. George W. Bush won an important GOP presidential primaries last Tuesday in Virginia, Washington state, and North Dakota. This gives him the edge, however temporary, over his chief rival, Arizona Sen. John McCain. Some supporters of Bush indicated that they were particularly upset by a recent McCain speech, where he attacked the religious extreme right wing of the GOP. The third contender for the nomination, Alan Keyes, has yet to win any primaries. The next major round of primaries is on March 7th, "Super Tuesday," when 16 states including California will make their choices.

**The Outside World**

by Nicholas Brenn
Proposition 21: danger of further degrading a flawed system

by Sonali Kothari

Proposition 21 is the “Gang Violence and Juvenile Crime Prevention Initiative” on the ballot for California this March. This 25-page initiative details new laws that are all aimed at California teen-agers between the ages of 14-16, specifically to allow teenagers charged with crimes to be treated as adults within the legal system. It also expands the targeting of “gangs” and increases penalties for felonies. Despite its “tough on crime” appeal to Californians, Proposition 21 is a dangerous initiative which would further degrade a flawed justice system.

Top 10 Reasons Why YOU Should Vote NO on Proposition 21

1. Proposition 21 could increase your taxes. The California Department of Corrections estimated that this initiative requires 22,000 new prison spaces over the next 30 years at a cost of nearly a billion dollars. The Initiative provides no resources to pay for these prisons, and the burden will ultimately be borne by tax payers.

2. Proposition 21 has been undemocratic from its inception. This initiative has NOT been the result of grass-roots campaigning. Rather it has been bankrolled and sponsored by former Governor Pete Wilson who spent $1 million (from a remaining presidential campaign fund) on professional signature gatherers to qualify this initiative after the state legislature rejected his initial juvenile crime package.

3. Proposition 21 pledges more jails than schools. Twenty years ago California pledged to be a leader in public education but today it is ranked 41st out of 50 states in education spending. Since 1984, the state has added 21 prisons and only one university campus, and is the #1 state in prison spending in the country.

4. Proposition 21 strengthens an out-of-control incarceration rampage. In February 2000, the prison population of the United States reached 2 million (more than any country in the world). While US prisoners comprise 25% of the world’s prison population, Americans comprise only 4.5% of the world. Proposition 21 is in the spirit of California’s existing draconian Three Strikes law which requires citizens to serve life sentences upon their third conviction, most of which are non-violent offenses, better addressed by rehabilitation.

5. Proposition 21 will strengthen the corporate-sponsored prison labor industry. In addition to state-owned enterprises, private corporations have begun taking advantage of the low-production costs of prison labor. “Currently more than 90,000 state and federal convicts work in a variety of public and private enterprises while serving time.” (Washington Times, April 96). Those private corporations include Boeing, Microsoft, Eddie Bauer, Planet Hollywood, etc., who hire a non-unionized work force for a tiny fraction of normal wages. It is no surprise then that more than half of the sources of funding for Proposition 21 include corporations like Chevron, Union Oil, Transamerica, etc. (California Online Voter Guide) in whose interests it is to expand cost-cutting prison labor by increasing the prison population.

6. Proposition 21 will destroy the lives of convicted California youth. If Proposition 21 passes, 14-year-olds will be tried as adults subjected to the death penalty and sentenced to adult prisons where youth are 5 times more likely to be raped and 8 times more likely to commit suicide than adults. Proposition 21 will eradicate due process for juveniles and weaken confidentiality rules making it more difficult for reformed juveniles to acquire jobs after serving prison sentences.

7. Proposition 21 gives police more power. Proposition 21 requires youth to be tried in adult courts if the prosecutor charges the youngster with certain crimes and prosecutors will rely on the police to determine those charges. Proposition 21 will extend the Three Strikes law, grossly expand wiretapping rights, and allow police units such as the corruption-ridden LAPD CRASH unit to identify any group of youth from the same ethnic background and wearing similar clothing to be labeled a “gang” (This definition will not extend to mostly white college campuses such as Caltech).

8. Proposition 21 will support an already racist justice system. Two thirds of the 2 million imprisoned Americans are black or Latino Americans who comprise less than one fourth of the US population. It is not enough evidence that the justice system has a racist bias, a recent Color of Justice study in California shows that after transfer to the adult system, black youth are 18.4 times more likely, Asian youth are 4.5 times more likely, and Latino youth are 7.3 times more likely to be sentenced by an adult court for the same crime.

9. Proposition 21 just isn’t necessary despite current fears of crime. Crimes by minors in California declined 30% over the last decade and 7% in 1998 alone, while adult offenses dropped by 6% in 1998. Yet news reporting of crime stories has steadily gone up. For example, while homicides declined by 13% between 1990 and 1995, on the network news during the same period, coverage of murders increased by 326% (% (Center for Media and Public Affairs).

10. Pete Wilson is relying on Californians to blindly vote yes. The Proposition 21 initiative is one of the longest ever proposed. Its framers are confident that Californians will not read through the tedious details and will vote yes. Exercise your democratic powers and send a message to the likes of ex-governor Wilson that you don’t believe in creating a future of hopelessness to California’s youth. Vote NO on Proposition 21!

This week in Caltech sports

Baseball: Fri., March 3, Claremont-Mudd-Scripps, 2:30 p.m.
Sat., March 4, Claremont-Mudd-Scripps, 11 a.m.
Men’s Fencing: Sat., March 11, NCAA Western Regionals, 10 a.m.
Women’s Fencing: Sat., March 11, NCAA Western Regionals, 10 a.m.
Men’s Golf: Mon., March 6, at Claremont-Mudd-Scripps, 12:30 p.m.
Men’s Tennis: Sat., March 4, Whittier, 9:30 a.m.
Women’s Tennis: Sat., March 4, at Whittier, 9:30 a.m.
Men’s Track and Field: Sat., March 4, at SCIAC Four-Way Meet, Pomona-Pitzer, 11 a.m.
Women’s Track and Field: Sat., March 4, at SCIAC Four-Way Meet, Pomona-Pitzer, 11 a.m.

For more information, visit our website at:
haas.berkeley.edu/Undergrad/base.html
or contact us via email at: BASE@haas.berkeley.edu

The Haas School of Business
at the University of California Berkeley
Summer BASE Program IS FOR YOU!
July 5 - August 11, 2000

Learn the fundamentals of:
Accounting • Marketing
Finance • Organizational Behavior
Hands-on market & financial research
Business related computer applications
Effective communication & presentation skills
Prepare for the corporate recruiting process

Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors will benefit from this rigorous, six-week summer curriculum that will include lectures, case studies, company visits, guest speakers and student presentations.

If you are a non-business major and you want to improve your marketability,
Protection of marriage

BY JARED UPHOFF

Proposition 22 only makes a two-word change to the existing statute, adding the words "or recognized," changing the statute to: "Only a man and a woman is to be recognized as the union of man and woman, and a woman and a man is valid or recognized in California." Taken out of context, such a short phrase can be misconstrued to mean something much bigger: homophobia, hatred, and elitism.

Note that the statute as it stands already says "a man and a woman." Those who support the No side of the Proposition would be hard pressed to eliminate those five words, or to add, "a man and a woman, or a woman and a man, or other (specify)" and other (specify).

Antagonists of the Proposition therefore attack supporters as "religious" bigots, close minded, etc., in an attempt to gain political sympathy. They believe that the phrase "a man and a woman" is being added — which is not the case. In this way they are gaining political advantage by portraying themselves on the Pro- tection of Marriage campaign having without going to the process of making modifications to the statute on their own, run- ning the risk of meeting large amounts of opposition in the process.

The Proposition hopes to pre- vent another state’s acquisition of a same-sex marriage-acceptance law from forcing California to recognize same-sex marriages as legally binding in this state, thereby forcing a change in the definition of mar- riage. The implications of a funda- mental change in the definition of marriage in a state like California are far-reaching, as one of the most populous and influential states in the Union.

I have concluded that the protection of the marriage are the marriage and sexual relationships of an "alternate life-style" — America is a beautiful country because it has personal rights of freedom, and I believe, does, extend to protect the expression of love between two people who truly love each other. If my argument were di- rectly towards that expression of love, or the life-style and intimations of a group labeled as "dif- ferent" by the populace at large, my beliefs would encourage me to attack sends that are intimate or outside of the bonds of marriage as well as homosexuality itself.

But I make no attempt to do ei- ther, nor do I plan on convincing anyone to change their personal beliefs or behaviors. I believe there are many—for I have met some—wonderful, interesting, and often spectacular people who consider themselves homosexual. I would not consider myself a bigot or homophobe, and I would hate to have to make the basis that I acted, wrote, or thought that way. On the issue of gay rights I would even go so far as to consider myself a supporter, when it came to protecting those rights inalienable to everyone— freedom from fear of violence and hatred, fear of rejection, fear of the lack of freedom to breathe in a culture already closing in on us from so many sides.

But on the issue of extending the "right" of marriage to two people of the same gender, I prefer the following definition: "American law of marriage arises in another state, and there are at least three new bills (AB1990, AB2047, and AB2211) currently in the state legislature that would significantly expand these rights even further.

So, if Prop 22 is not about the endangerment of civil rights, what is the real issue? The only point of consideration at hand is how Californians think marriage should be defined. From both a historical and a cultural standpoint, this definition has almost unanimously been defined as the union of one man and one woman. The Kentucky Supreme Court acknowledged this in the case Jones v. Hallahan: "Marriage was a custom long before the state commenced to issue li- censes for that purpose. In all cases, marriage has always been considered as the union of a man and a woman, and we have been presented with no authority to the contrary." Due to recent na- tionwide developments, Califor- nia has an opportunity to affirm this definition. Prop 22 finds its origins in the "full faith and credit" clause of Article IV of the United States Constitution, which al- lows Congress to prescribe the manner in which contracts from one state ought to be recognized in another. Congress took this constitutional prerogative in 1996 by passing the Federal De- fense of Marriage Act in a land- slide vote that crossed party lines. It established a provision that no state would be required to recognize a same-sex marriage arising in another state. Since that date, 30 states have instituted measures in response to the Defense of Marriage Act affirming marriage as between a man and a woman. Prop 22 is California’s response, passed in March, with the signatures of over 700,000 registered voters.

Prop 22 stands out, both for its simplicity and the innovative way in which it uses legal means to remove from the existing rights of same-sex couples or any group for discrimination. There is nothing in the language or intent of Prop 22 that could be used to remove the current rights of any Califor- nian, heterosexual and homo- sexual alike. Prop 22 merely closes a current loophole in California law, as set forth by Congress and the U.S. Constitution, hence forcing California to recognize same-sex marriages originating in other states, even though such marriages are not legally recognized in California.

Prop 22 is not about discrimi- nation or prejudice, it’s about marriage, and what marriage is and always has been. What Prop 22 sets out to do, and the only thing it sets out to do is resolve, once and for all, that the state of California recognizes and affirms marriage as it has always been, as the union of a man and woman as husband and wife.

Pro on 22: A simple definition of marriage

BY BROCK BEAUCHAMP AND AARON ROBINSON

“Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.” These 14 words are all that Prop. 22 would add to the law, officially defining marriage. Only marriage between a man and a woman may be valid and wonder- ing, is it really that simple? Before we begin the discussion of the proposition itself, we would like to make one thing clear. It is our firm belief that every human being is to be equally accorded the respect and dignity they deserve. While we may disagree with the views ex- pressed by others, it is certainly not our wish to denigrate anyone in the process. If we believed that Prop. 22 was discriminatory or unfair, we would be among the first to speak out against it. However, we believe that Prop. 22 has been carefully crafted so that it is, and that we believe the pro- nunciation of marriage—no more, no less. Most groups that oppose Prop. 22 cite somewhat similar laws in Virginia, Illinois and Florida, where some groups associated with domestic partner- nes were retraceted. How- ever, these laws are far more complex than the 14-word proposition at issue here in California.

For example, the Florida law (HB 147, 1997) contains a provision barring state agencies from giving "effect to any public act, record, or judicial proceeding or claim arising from [an organized] marriage or relationship." The 27 states that passed straightforward definitions of marriage like Prop. 22 have seen no change in domestic partner- ship benefits whatsoever.

Another allegation made against Prop. 22 is that it will be used to deny hospital visitation rights. However, these rights are spelled out very clearly in the California Code of Regulations, section 70707, and could not be overturned by the passage of the proposition. The code allows a "person to make an advance directive that provides for the care of the patient’s personal needs without the involvement of a court." Furthermore, every hospital is obliged to consider the wishes of the patient and may refuse to provide care if the patient lacks decision-making capacity. At a minimum, the hospital shall include any directive made by the patient. California currently has one of the most extensive series of laws protecting the rights of same-sex domestic partners in the nation, and there are at least three new bills (AB1990, AB2047, and AB2211) currently in the state legislature that would significantly expand these rights even further.

Proposed Law: Section 1. This act may be cited as the "California Defense of Marriage Act." Section 2. A section of 308.5 is added to the Family Code to read: 308.5. Only marriage between a man and a woman is recognized in California.
No on Prop 22: Take a stand against discrimination

Proposition 22 is only 14 words long - "Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California" - and its stated goal is to single out same-sex couples, to deny them the right of civil marriage. Although no state (including California) currently allows or recognizes same-sex marriages -- and this is not likely to change in the near future -- Prop 22 would be a preemptive strike, in the event that any other state were to begin recognizing same-sex marriages.

Supporters of Prop 22 would have you believe that the measure is simple common sense, that it is somehow necessary to "protect" marriage, and that it won't be used to deny basic civil rights to gays and lesbians and their families. But the truth is, this initiative is complicated on both a moral and civil level, and it will hurt many Californians and their families.

In California, there are over 1,800 rights and responsibilities bestowed by the state upon a couple when their relationship is legally recognized in marriage. The right to visit one's loved ones in the hospital, the responsibilities of both parents to provide financially for their children, the rights of all children to be protected by Social Security should one of their parents die, and the rights of an American to live with his or her spouse even if he or she is from another country are just a few examples.

Proposition 22 seeks to permanently deny committed gay and lesbian couples and their children these legal rights, responsibilities, and protections.

But that's not all. If Prop 22 passes, it will be used as a weapon against lesbian and gay equality on all fronts, not just "marriage." Supporters of Prop 22 deny that this is a possibility, yet in states where anti-marriage laws similar to Prop 22 have passed, anti-gay forces are using those laws to attack existing domestic partner benefits, the right to adopt a child, and basic civil rights such as antidiscrimination statutes. This has already happened in Idaho, Florida, Illinois, Virginia, and Washington.

In Washington state, an Appeals Court ruled a few weeks ago that a law similar to California's Prop 22 was a sufficient basis to deny basic inheritance rights to the surviving partner of a same-sex couple --specifically, the court ruled that the surviving partner had no rights to property in the deceased partner's name, even though they had lived together for nearly 30 years, because their relationship could not be recognized legally -- a direct consequence of the anti-marriage law.

And elsewhere in the country, the University of Pittsburgh is currently arguing that Pennsylvania's anti-marriage law precludes compliance with local antidiscrimination ordinances, where the local ordinances have been used as grounds for obtaining equal treatment of gay and heterosexual employees in the area of dependent health care benefits.

There are currently at least 400,000 same-sex couples living together in California. In fact, the percentage of gay men and lesbians living with partners is the same as the percentage of heterosexual adults living with partners, approximately 60%. Many of these families have children. Studies show that relationships of same-sex couples function in ways that are similar to those of opposite-sex couples, and same-sex couples have the same mix of reasons for wanting to marry as opposite-sex couples. They nurture one another in sickness and health, often providing critical support in periods of major illness, benefiting not just the individuals involved but society as a whole. Recognition of these relationships would contribute to their stability.

But Prop 22 would be harmful to both the adults and children in these families. It would create great uncertainty for both the couple and those who deal with them regarding their legal status, and the legal relationship between the non-biological parent and any children could be deemed invalid. If Prop 22 passes, California will be taking a giant step back toward the days of discrimination. The authors of Prop 22 knew when they wrote the proposition, even well aware of how similar legislation is being used in other states, and that is what they want for California!

Regardless of their feelings about same-sex marriage, millions of Californians have come together in agreement that Prop 22 -- officially named the "Limit on Marriages" initiative -- is discriminatory and wrong for California.

From a religious perspective, this has been a highly sensitive issue. Religious communities are divided over the question of whether or not their clergy should bless the lifelong commitment of gay and lesbian couples. Clergy representing more liberal denominations have opined at gay and lesbian commitment ceremonies for years, while more conservative religious denominations have remained adamantly opposed. These are decisions which are appropriately left to each faith to debate and decide. However, secular legal rights should not be curtailed for one group of citizens because of the religious preferences of another.

Should Prop 22 pass, it will, in effect, impose the Mormon, Catholic, and Baptist view of marriage on us all. The separation of church and state is an important principle which should not be casually cast aside.

You don't have to support same-gender marriage to oppose Prop 22. You just have to believe in a few basic values -- keeping government out of our personal lives, respecting each other's privacy, and not singling out one group for discrimination or for special rights. Prop 22 will do nothing to "protect" marriage, but it will endanger the civil rights of gay and lesbian Californians.

WE URGE YOU TO take a stand against discrimination, to take a stand against divisive wedge-issues politics, and to VOTE NO on PROP 22!

Thank you,
Aron J. Melitzer, Undergrad/Geology
No on 22: Preserve the freedom

BY STEPHEN SHIFFER

The arguments for and against Proposition 22 should be fairly familiar by now, and in many ways they appear intractable. To many Californians, the risk that Prop 22 will be used to discriminate against homosexuals is balanced by the risk that failure to pass Prop 22 will jeopardize cherished family values. These people don’t support discrimination, by and large, but believe that marriage has a religious role that transcends modern politicking: Marriage is an institution, they claim, that is defined and sanctified by God, that unites one man and one woman together as a family.

As a gay man and a proponent of religious freedom, I face a similar quandary. I do not endorse discrimination based on sexual orientation, but neither do I support antagonizing a religious group or infringing upon their holy beliefs. I oppose Prop 22 because I believe neither religious principals nor sexual orientation are grounds for discrimination.

While many conservative Christian groups are opposed to same-sex marriage, not all religious organizations have the same position. The Episcopal Church has announced that it is not ready, as a national body, to take a position on the morality of gay marriage—individual congregations are left to decide their own positions on the issue. The Presbyterian Church (USA) and the Council of Churches acknowledge the distinction between civil and ceremonial marriage; and believe same-sex marriage should be legalized as a civil right. The Conference of American Rabbinic Groups, California Council of Churches, Church of Religious Science, Pacific Congress of Quakers, Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association, Unitarian Universalist Association, Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches, and other religious denominations actively support the legalization same-sex unions. Clearly, there is no consensus, even within the religious community, on the morality of same-sex marriage.

In light of the different religious (and secular) views on same-sex marriage, it is unfair to impose the moral views of specific groups on society as a whole.

Prop 22 is not about protecting the religious institution of marriage, no matter what the authors may allege. The function of civil law is to provide a context for all cultural and religious traditions, while endorsing none. Legal recognition under California law is not a moral statement, nor is it a religious doctrine or dogma to which any California citizen must oblige. It is simply legal recognition.

There have been secular arguments against same-sex marriage. Opponents of same sex marriage have argued that homosexuals are inherently abnormal, promiscuous, and inadequate parental figures. These arguments have found ample evidence of biological predispositions of sexual orientation, and mainstream medical organizations consider homosexuality a normal (if minority) manifestation of human sexuality. Homosexuals are about as likely as heterosexuals to be in a committed relationship, and 10% of these couples have children under the age of 15 (US Census 1998 Current Population Report, after Wald 1999). Children raised by gay parents are as likely as those raised by straight parents to be emotionally and intellectually healthy (American Psychological Association 1995).

Without valid biological or social arguments against same-sex marriage, the moral controversy is the only remaining justification available to Prop 22’s supporters.

Many proponents of Prop 22 believe they are defending their morality and religious convictions from government intrusion. It is my belief, however, that Prop 22 is an attack on religious freedom rather than a defense. Prop 22 singles out a specific subset of religious and secular unions and denies them the legal status provided to other couples: Marriage.

Marriage is one of the most central aspects of the spiritual lives of many people. The peoples of the Earth have a great variety of marital customs, but all—or very nearly all—recognize and sanctify family unions in some manner. In any community that values pluralism and individual freedom, individuals should be able to pursure their own cultural and religious convictions when finding a spouse.

Already, California—and the rest of America—recognizes legal proceedings that are not universally supported by all Christian denominations, much less all spiritual individuals. For example, many religious groups, notably the Catholic Church, disapprove of divorce and do not permit remarriage. That California and the US do recognize remarriage after divorce in civil law does not mean that either the US or California affirm the morality of remarriage, nor does it force the Catholic Church to change its teachings regarding remarriage.

Similarly, interfaith and interracial marriages are legally recognized through the United States, though various religious organizations have decreed these immoral and profane at various time periods. Some still do not recognize these marriages. Nonetheless, I think most reasonable people would agree that individuals have the right to follow their own heart in these matters. The issue of same-sex marriage is not substantially different from the above cases.

Congregations of many religious denominations have united in opposition to Prop 22, including Catholic, Community, Congregationalist, Episcopal, Interfaith, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, Reform, Reconstructionist, Unitarian, Unity, and independent Jewish, Christian, and Buddhist groups among others.

To publicly and legally commit to share one’s life with another person is one of the most central aspects of the human experience. The freedom of two loving individuals to marry is one that I cherish very deeply. Voting NO in Prop 22 will preserve this freedom, and will not diminish or threaten the freedom of religions to bestow their blessings as they choose. Protecting marriage and protecting civil rights are not mutually exclusive. Vote NO on Proposition 22.
The text of Proposition 22 is as follows:
SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "California Defense of Marriage Act."
SECTION 2. Section 308.5 is added to the Family Code, to read:
308.5. Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.

That's it. What this has to do with "defense of marriage:" I have no idea, but the title's pretty catchy, huh? Sounds so noble, almost chivalrous. In reality, this has nothing at all to do with marriage, but something very different: hate. Yes, hate—that age-old friend to millions of bigots and idiots; hate—that's been around since the first sentient monkey beat the hell out of his enemy with his bare hands; hate—that'll be around until it kills us all with our own stupidly.

What exactly is the point of a law that specifically disallows two people (who are not a couple comprising a man and a woman) to marry and be protected under the laws governing such a union except to persecute such people? This doesn't seem to add anything to current marriage laws, it doesn't add any new protections to traditional families or marriages, it simply will strip those living as nontraditional couples from any rights associated with their union that may arise in the future (currently gay couples are not recognized in any states). How does this defend marriage in any way, or benefit anyone, for that matter, other than to gratify the hatred of those who wish to persecute others not like themselves? The answer is it doesn't.

This proposition seems to have no redefining value other than to take rights away from those who are already suffering under the heel of ridiculous societal and legal oppression. Clearly, this is simply a ploy to make it very difficult to grant homosexual couples the same rights as married people, as well as a way to stop them from having legal marriages at any time in the future.

Ah, but hate only goes so far. Hatred has a partner in these nasty schemes: Religion. For some strange reason, Christianity is the most popular religion in this country has a grudge against homosexuals. Religions, bigoted, non-rational people feel that they need to dictate not only morality but laws for the rest of us! (Now, I'm not saying that all religious people are like this, and I've met some very nice and logical people of faith, but there's certainly a positive correlation, and I'm not talking about the nice ones.) I'm not one of these "relative ethics" people who thinks everyone should have their own personal view of right and wrong, but I do think that people who calibrate their moral compass with fantasy books written thousands of years ago are just plain wrong.

My reasoning on the issue of gay marriage seems as logical perspective: what the hell is wrong with it? Nothing! Does it hurt me in any way if these people get married? No. Does it hurt anyone else? No. Then why not let them marry? Why not give them the same rights as everyone else? If it doesn’t hurt anyone, what’s the problem? Because you think your silly book of verse tells you it’s wrong? That’s just plain ignorance and illogical thought.

I'm not done yet. California (and many other states) follows the principle of "popular sovereignty," which gives the masses the power to decide on certain issues. That's the idea of a Proposition: it's a referendum. In my opinion, this is a very stupid idea. As I just outlined in the above paragraph there are some very ill-willed people out there who justify their hatred with established firmaments of society. I don't think these people should be deciding important issues of state!

The masses just aren't smart enough to deal with these matters; they should be left to people who can and do understand what's best for the common wealth, not some schmuck (or rather, a group of them) who thinks his bigotry should be state law!

This brings me back to my basic tenet of human existence: most people are stupid. I don't want stupid people deciding laws for me, do you? When such issues are decided by taking data from the entire populace, the voices of reason and right can be very easily drown out by those of ignorance and hatred.

The "average person" is pretty dim, easily convinced by false arguments, and often swayed by hatred or ill-reasoned morality. And half the people in this world are dumber than him! The idea of putting issues of importance to the will of the masses is perhaps the worst idea in statecraft ever!

I'd rather see a dictator than popular rule any day. At least you can kick out a bad dictator; it's far more difficult to increase the intelligency of the entire populace in any reasonable amount of time. Why do I think all this? Well, take Prop. 22 as an example. There are lots of people who think this is a great idea! And there are even more who will vote for it "to protect marriage" without even knowing what the damn thing says. I don't want these people making decisions. They shouldn't be allowed to shop for groceries, let alone decide laws for an entire state!

On the issue of the Proposition itself, usually it's critics mildly admonish it by saying "it's unnecessary" because California marriage laws are already specific to heterosexual couples. I'd go way farther: it's just plain evil. It's bigotry and hatred in the name of legislation, complete with a positive-sounding title to fool the stupid. I encourage anyone with the ability to vote in California to do so on March 7 and strike down this ridiculous piece of legislation.

Bioscience Education and Careers in a Post-Genomic World

Professor David Galas
Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Sciences

Wednesday, March 8th Student Activities Center Room 13 4 - 6 pm

The rapid growth and cross-disciplinary nature of bioscience industries are creating new career opportunities for students with biological and chemical sciences, mathematicians, engineering, and computer science backgrounds. Dr. Galas will discuss the dramatic developments occurring in bioscience research, and their implications for the creation of newproducts and applications.

David Galas, chief academic officer at Keck Graduate Institute of the Claremont Colleges, led the US Department of Energy's Human Genome Project and was president and chief scientific officer of Seattle-based Chiroscience. None of the first biotechnology companies to assemble a full gene-to-drug discovery program.

Keck Graduate Institute (KGI) is a pioneering new graduate school focusing exclusively on the development of applications in the biosciences, and on the education of leaders for bioscience industries.

KGI is accepting applications for its inaugural Professional Master of Bioscience (MBS) degree program beginning August 2000. All successful applicants will receive full-tuition fellowships, along with the possibility of a stipend. Admission and financial information will be available at the presentation.

*Refreshments will be served.

www.KGI.edu

BOOMEROCK Australian Hot Rocks Grill
“Great food, just the way you like it”

We would like to extend our gratitude for helping us become “Pasadena’s Best New Restaurant 1999”

For all Cal Tech Staff & Student

We are now offering 30% off on our regular lunch & dinner menu Monday through Thursday

This offer is valid from January to April 2000 Just bring your I.D. card or badge with you and we will be glad to discount your lunch or dinner

BOOMEROCK 61 N. Raymond Ave. at Union Pasadena 626-440-0088

March 3, 2000
I am not telling any of you anything new when I say it has been pouring, just pouring cats and dogs, in the last few weeks. Ingrates that we are, we now lament the rain when, before the New Year, we fervently hoped for some. There is obviously no way to please us humans. So we complain, but can you imagine where all this water leaves those who blamed last fall’s “drought” or La Niña conditions? Maybe the jet stream has been dipping just a few hundred miles further south than expected, that could do it. But I hear, yet am hard put to believe, that in fact we have not yet reached the normal “year up to date” rainfall.

Be all that as it is, I know of one great impact of the rains—the effect it has on wildlife, to wit, the ants which live next to the house. They have decided to come inside, where it is warm and dry. Hoards march bravely through the tinest of openings and invade the kitchen. My wife and I fight back, wipping out thousands at once. Perpendicularly, even though I exterminate them, I find them fun to watch, with their characteristic hurry-and-stop manners, pause-wait-continue behavior. Their pheromone trails all confused by the unexpected deluge that hit them, the ants run in haphazard directions. Here came one, heading straight towards a water puddle, hitting it and taking off. I have never seen such a reaction, a back-and-forth of several inches, full tilt. This repeated itself over and over, with ants bumping into water and bouncing back in a straight line as fast as they could. It was an astounding sight. Not just backing up a few steps and then starting off in a new direction. No, no, they executed a long panicked run backwards. I had not realized that ants could run, really run, in reverse, in a straighter line than they go forward and at a speed greater than their usual forward gait. Now, ants don’t like water, that’s why they come into the house in the first place. For small creatures like them, surface tension, which is not a hazard we have to worry about, presents a fierce trap. But in this instance it must have been something in the water as they say, something from the counter top, so utterly distasteful to the ants that they hastened to bat a retreat, not even taking the time to turn around. At the end of their run, far enough to feel out of danger, they stopped and cleaned their antennae with their front legs, apparently trying to remove the horrible taste. I now wish I had taken a sample of the water to find out what was so repellent.

Printed with my ant-counters, I find reference to them everywhere I look. For example, in the March issue of Scientific American, Eric Bonabeau and Guy Theraulaz speak of “Swarm Smarts.” “Using ants and other social insects as models,” they explain, “computer scientists have created software agents to solve complex problems, such as the rerouting of traffic in a busy telecom network.” I guess the ants have things to teach us even in high tech pursuits. While each ants as an individual, as a group they carry out activities which seem to be directed by a knowing mind, carefully planning the next move. As ants move along they know a trail of pheromones which their companions will follow. The more ants go down one particular pathway, the more they are attracted to the same path. The two Antologists (my editors?) describe an experiment in which ants were presented with a bridge with two branches, one twice as long as the other, directing them to a food source. The ants very rapidly selected the shortest path. Imagine two ants, one following the short, the other the long path. First one, then the other, discovers the food and rushes back to tell its friends still in the rest of its good fortune. The trail that had selected the short path arrives back home first and for a time, its trail has a double pheromone dose (one laid down while going, the other while coming back). That is the track that other ants will follow in preference. Pretty nifty way to pick up the shortest way to food!

The same article also talks about “anthropic” (I guess it should have said, Myrmidonomorphic) robots, programmed with very few simple instructions yet capable of complex, seemingly cooperative behavior, such as working “together” to push a puck towards a light. These ant-like robots brought to mind the 4 wheeled crawdads which whiz about campuses. The day excursions of these vehicles driven by their owners are the legitimate ones. They deserve no more attention than a sneeze, you know, a Day Achoo so to say. It is the clandestine excursions in the dark of the night, revealed later on the Security door or perceived as a dark shadow lurking by, those I worry about. Please take a minute to read my recent email. I guess one way or the other misuse of the cats would be to have a “brick” installed on each vehicle. Not in any especially cost effective solution, but I already have some other suggestions and I would gladly get more. One of you, smartest of the smart, could come up with something effective and affordable! Maybe something as simple as the realization that using someone else’s property without permission is not acceptable?

Don’t ask me about details, but while idly dreaming about vehicular ants I discovered the images taken from the shuttle radar mapping mission which just ended. Look up image PIA02718 at http://photojournal.jpl.nasa.gov/submit/Zowie kazooma!! There is the 210 freeway and Mount Liberty and the golf course around the Rose Bowl, P.I., and Lake street too, is that Lake street? Campus seems just of the picture. But I think that PIA02734 shows Beckman Auditorium from space, too bad that part of the image is so fuzzy. Methinks I am going to propose we trace cats from the Shuttle!! A Blument!
Mints@tech.caltech.edu is experiencing problems, please send all mints to tech@juggles.caltech.edu

Mark Your Calendars! Admission's Weekend will be held Thurs- Sat, March 16-18, 2000. For more information email dona@admissions.caltech.edu or ryan@admissions.caltech.edu

Quiz Bowl intramurals are coming early this year. If you want to make the jump-off, this year’s jeopardy!-style competition for teams of up to four students. This competition is open to undergraduates, graduates, and faculty alike. To sign up, go to www.cs.caltech.edu/qb or follow the link from the club site at http://www.its.caltech.edu/~quizbowl. For more information, contact Kevin Costello at kevin@its.caltech.edu

The Disbursement Audit Office will relocate from the first floor of Keck Spalding Building (Business Services), Room 307, to 363 South Hill Street. Internal auditors and clerks will occupy the first floor of the main hill House, but eventually move to the new space after completion of the Hill House. The telephone numbers and fax (626) 257-0745 will remain the same. The Disbursement Audit Office Audit 2-7 will be. Only minor disruption in the morning on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The new location will be in the shade. We regret any inconvenience this may cause.

Spring Term Offering: Behringer, An Exploration of the Composer's Life and Work, Mu 123, MW 12:30-1:30 pm Santa Barbara, Monday 2/14, Wednesday 2/16

Some proficiency at reading of musical scores - MU 127 or equivalent ability - is assumed. Permission of instructor required. Ludwig van Beethoven is arguably the most influential and important composer in the annals of music. This course will explore his life and work, using Maynard Solomon's landmark biography and musical examples from the major genres (symphony, concerto, string quartet, piano sonatas etc.). Lectures will be supplemented by performances, listening and video presentations. Field trips to. Off campus will be offered. No one can understand Beethoven because of the nature of the course (i.e. some musical analysis), students must have some proficiency in reading music.

Ride your bicycle to Caltech! Imagination and bicycles go well together, with Caltech's CYLOCOMMUTERS. Website: http://www.its.caltech.edu/~cyccom on/ Get involved - ride around campus and make a large environmental difference. Monthly random drawing for a $30.00 gift certificate to a local bike store and four free riders will receive a Free Day, on May 19th! If you are a distance rider, log in your miles for an extra entry to win additional prizes every 6 months.

H & S Division offers the following selected Topic Courses for spring term 2000: 11001: R.E.F. and Ethnicity in Modern China, 16101: Women and Family in the US before 1900, Lit 180: British Fiction of the 20th Century, Lit 180 American Fiction of the 20th Cen-tury, Hist 18: European Civilization, Ec 101 Experimental Economics in Principal Practice, Psy 101b Sensation in Cognition, SS 200 Social Choice Theory: Consistency, Strategy and Dynamics. Note: Contrary to the course register, the Sociology and Anthropology Department will be offered in the spring by Professor Kevelson T7:30 pm in 128 Bar. Copies of ISS course schedules are available in 228 Baxter.

Beginning American Viennese Waltz offered by the Caltech Ballroom Dance Club, 7:30-9:00 p.m. for four successive Mon starting Feb. 14 [bought with a professional ball dance class, $24.00 or equal to $16.00 to Caltech under-gra-duates] in Winnon Lounge on the Caltech Campus. No partner required. Refreshments and free dance practice time are provided after each class. For more information go to www.its.caltech.edu/ballroom or call Don 626/791-3103.

International Folk Dancing, Tuesday night in Dubey Hall, Lesson 7:50 p.m., dancing 8:30 p.m.

Be a part of the earthquake team. Are you ready? (Emergency Referendum is completing a project containing the current members, the site is completed, the quak e is not over. The project is now looking for new members. The last two members added have much success. The members have many years of experience, many of whom have completed one or more of the subsequent sessions. For more information, contact Prof. Labelle, x3605, or Barbara Estrada, x3609.

The Jewish Loan Association is offering an interest-free student loan to qualified students for tuition, books, and living expenses. Applicants must have completed a minimum of two years of undergraduate study and have a 2.5 GPA or above. For further information, please contact the Jewish Loan Association at 213-761-8350 or 818-464-3331.

The American Meteorological Society is pleased to invite applications for the 2000-01 AMS/Industry Under-graduate Research Award. This award recognizes atmospheric and oceanic research. Applications are due on April 6.

The Caltech Y has tickets for Stomp, Sat, Mar. 4, 5:00 p.m., at the Pasadena Civic Auditorium. Tickets are $18.00 each, limited to two per person.

Dreams of Martha Stewart, Berkeley Atrium on Sat, Mar. 4, 9:00 p.m. Sally Bonton performs Sally Pamela Parker’s one-woman play about the life and career of Martha Stewart. All tickets $22, $15, and $14; youths 12 and under receive $4 discount; student and senior pass tickets may be purchased for $10. For more information call 1-888-2CALTECH.

Gary Schocker, Rutte, and Jason Vieaux, guitar, will perform at Dubey Lounge, Sun, Mar. 5, 3:30 p.m. The performances will include works by Bach, Giuliani, and Schocker. Call 1-888-2CALTECH for more information.

Caltech Science Education Club presents "Can Distance Learning Over the Internet Work? What are the Implications for School Education?" Mon., Mar. 6 at CAPS House, 287 S. Hill, 5:15 to 7:15 p.m. A panel of Caltech faculty and student experts will discuss the issue. Pizza will be served. For reservations contact Jane Sanders, 395-1297, or js@caltech.edu.

Earthquake preparation/training will be offered by the Pasadena Fire Department through the Safety Training Office. Training is held Fridays 6:00 to 12:00 noon or call the Office at 404-4000 to make an appointment. The orientation will be held at the Melrose Hall on Sat. Mar. 9. Learn what to do before, during, and after an earthquake. The session is free and open to the public. At the end of the program, the participants will be encouraged to contact the Red Cross to complete the preparation for an earthquake.

The Tailbons Women's Scholarship Fund will award five $1,000 and fifty $500 scholarships for undergraduate women in the fall of 2000. Applicants must be graduates or undergraduates in the United States who plan to return to an accredited four-year college or university to complete their undergraduate education. Scholarships are intended to provide a limited amount of financial aid for needy Jewish students who are legal and permanent residents of Los Angeles County. No applicant are required to be full-time at an accredited educational institution and have a 2.5 GPA or above. Recipients are also eligible to apply to the Los Angeles Undergraduate Scholarship Fund and the Becker Graduate Student Loan Fund of the Jewish Free Loan Association. For further information you may contact Jewish Vocational Service, 5700 W. Sunset Blvd., Suite #2303, Los Angeles, CA 90026, or phone 321-761-8888, extension 122 or 121, or via email at jvsa@jvsa.org. Entries must be submitted by April 15, 2000.

The P.L.A.T.O. Education Loan Program is offering students a chance to receive up to $18,000 in scholarship for college. Any student enrolled in an accredited two-year college or university eligible to apply. Scholars are merited-based and applicants must have a grade point average of 2.5 or higher (on a 4.0 scale). Winners will be chosen by Citizen's Schol-arship Committee. Applicants must be citizens of the United States, or a resident of an independent third party, and scholarships will be awarded August 2000. The loan must be used for educational purposes of $1,000 or more. Loan material can be accessed, 24 hours a day, at www.pila.loan. Applications must be submitted online by April 30, 2000.

The John Gyles Education Fund is offering a $2,000 scholarship for the 2000-01 academic year. Applicants must be Canadian or U.S. citizens, or permanent residents of Canada, who are going to pursue undergraduate or graduate degree in any scientific, natural, and demonstrate financial need. Criteria other than academic achievement and financial need are considered in the selection process. To request an application, send self-addressed, stamped envelope to: The John Gyles Education Fund, Attn: The Secretary, P.O. Box 4808, 712 Riverside Dr. Federation, Nevs Brunswick, Canada E1G 5S0. Filing dates for mailing documents in 2000 are Jan 1, June 1, and November 15.

The Department of Defense hosts three student internship programs at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. These include Internships in Terascale Simulation Technology (www.llnl.gov/its), Artificial Simulated Computing Initiative (ASC) Pipeline Program (www.llnl.gov/acs) and Graduate Interns in Nuclear Waste (www.llnl.gov/lw). Housing and salary are at competitive rates. For more information, contact Barry Goldman, 925-422-5177, or goldman@llnl.gov.

To submit an entry for the Mints, contact tech@juggles.caltech.edu or mail to the student address, 12240 Caltech 40-58 Atts. Mints: Submissions should be brief and concise. Email is preferred. The best entries will be published and abridge all material. Deadline is noon Wednesday. Unless specified, all mints will run for two weeks.

The California Tech
Caltech 40-58
Pasadena, CA 91125