

Letters to the Editor

• Brief letters—one or two pages, double-spaced—are more likely to be printed than are long ones, which may have to be cut.

For Responsive, Relevant Resolutions

The call is out: Denver, 1970. But what of Philadelphia, 1969? Were the take-home values of that convention such as to suggest that our time will be well invested in Denver?

In retrospect, yes—an overwhelming yes. Those meetings provided an outstanding variety of opportunities, which ranged from the specific to the general through both plants and animals and, in a third dimension, from research to philosophy. And all of this without losing us in the confusion of an academic smorgasbord. Yes, by all means: Denver in 1970.

But one problem gnaws at me and the pain increases with time. Many readers will recall the several fine panel discussions dealing with various aspects of the social implications of biology. All of these speakers were well received and considerable discussion was generated. Then, on the final day of the meetings, we were confronted with a move to translate what seemed to be the mood of the convention into one or more resolutions. This attempt met with an official “thumbed nose,” which could only be characterized as dismal. I might have wished for a presentation that separated the issue of war from the issues that had brought us together; but the fact is, the real world is not that way. Nor does an initial lack of agreement on the primacy of issues justify the simplistic and autocratic putdown that occurred.

It may be that the machinery of the NABT was not ready for resolutions. It may be that resolutions should have come up by another route. Other circumstances may have prevented the full consideration of resolutions, but the NABT should be capable of implementing one of the basic tenets of modern teaching: be opportunistic; take advantage of the situation which confronts you.

By failing to provide support on the national level we missed a dandy opportunity to be of assistance to the individual biology teacher, who is now being asked to assist in dealing with the environmental crisis. New crises will arise, possibly in Denver. My hope is that channels of communication will be opened, so that we won't fall flat on our corporate nose as we did in Philadelphia.

Paul H. Monson

Division of Science and Mathematics
University of Minnesota, Duluth 55812

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS

STYLE. *American Biology Teacher* would rather receive an ill-written article containing worthwhile ideas than a stylistic masterpiece that says little: our editors can mend bad writing in a good cause. However, we do hope for clear terse prose, free of jargon. Sensible advice for writers will be found in the Conference of Biological Editors' *Style Manual for Biological Journals*, 2nd ed., published by the American Institute of Biological Sciences; and *How to Write Scientific and Technical Papers*, by Sam F. Trelease.

In matters of punctuation, enumeration, and the like we follow generally the above-mentioned C.B.E. manual and the University of Chicago *Manual of Style*. Our spellings are usually those preferred by *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (G. & C. Merriam Co., 1965) and its abridgments.

Technical measurements are in metric, not English, units.

Avoid footnotes of any kind. References to the literature are made on-line (not by means of superscripts) within the text. If only one, two, or three works are cited, each is given in full, in the form "A. B. Smith, 1969: *Elements of Biology*, 4th ed., Jones Publishing Co., New York" for a book and "W. X. White and Y. Z. Green, 1965: 'The Inquiry Process,' *Journal of Pedagogy* 7 (2): 53-56" for an article. If four or more works are cited, they are presented at the end of the article as a bibliography arranged alphabetically by (principal) authors' last names, in the following forms for books and journals.

SMITH, A. B. 1969. *Elements of biology*, 4th ed. Jones Publishing Co., New York.

WHITE, W. X., and Y. Z. GREEN. 1965. The inquiry process. *Journal of Pedagogy* 7 (2): 53-56.

(Note that publishers' names and addresses are given and that names of periodicals are not abbreviated.) Reference to the bibliography from the text takes the parenthetical form "(Smith, 1969)"; if the same title is cited a second time this short form is repeated or, better, the reference is recast as, for example, "Smith also says. . . ." The aim is to disburden the text of apparatus—*ibid.* and its relatives. Within text or bibliography a reference may be made precise by adding, for example, "pp. 123-145" or "ch. 8." Responsibility for exact quotation lies with the writer, not the editor.

MANUSCRIPT. Double-space on one side only of standard (8½-by-11-inch) bond paper, allowing 1½-inch margins all around. Avoid line-end division of words.

ILLUSTRATIONS, ETC. Photos should be glossy prints not less than 5 inches wide. Other kinds of illustrations should be rendered in black ink on heavy paper, preferably with labeling done expertly on a transparent overlay. Key each illustration, on the back, to its legend ("caption") written on a separate sheet—being sure to mention credits, including "photo by author." Tabular material, too, must be presented on separate sheets—regardless of length. Within the body of the manuscript simply indicate relevance at the proper place, as, "see fig. 1" or "see table."

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. The editor welcomes letters of inquiry describing, in some detail, articles he may wish to see. Manuscripts that arrive unannounced may be considered, but will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

We acknowledge receipt of manuscript immediately. During preparation of articles for the press we expect authors to answer queries promptly and to observe deadlines rigorously. Authors will be given two opportunities to make changes: substantially on a copy of the manuscript as edited, minimally on galley proofs.

Offprints may be purchased at rates that will be quoted by the printer.