

Since I wrote the article over a year ago, I have tested the approach against a commercial program in a university general biology course, with similar encouraging results. The next step is to make ED-style activities available commercially. Unfortunately, textbook publishers respond more to what is marketable than to what is educationally sound. Therefore, those of us interested in fostering ED and similar approaches in commercial curricula must make ourselves known. Letters such as yours provide a mechanism to provide such information to publishers. We need to encourage all other biology teachers to speak out also.

Smoking at the NABT Convention

I was appalled at the number of my colleagues at the NABT Convention held in Boston in October who disregarded the requests not to smoke during Convention sessions.

Certainly, all biologists are aware of the delicate nature of the respiratory tissues. To inflict smoke on one's own system is certainly a personal decision; to inflict smoke on others is unpardonable! (Smoke from pipes is just as irritating as cigarette smoke.)

Dorothy H. Reardon
5619 Haskell Avenue
Carmichael, California 95608

Controversy at NABT Conventions

In an otherwise high level, informative National Convention in Boston, I am compelled to note, in my opinion, a serious trough. I refer to the address on nuclear dangers by Dr. Helen Caldicott at Saturday's General Session.

Her approach to a serious, controversial topic—highly deserving of attention by biology educators—was more than wanting. It was riddled with the snide, punctuated with innuendo, and obvious in its omissions. (Parenthetically, I must empha-

size that I, myself, am not bland about the absolute safety of nuclear reactors.) Let me detail a few of the more glaring examples.

The overall approach was to link the *possible, suppositional, predicted* dangers from reactors with the *positive, actual, and demonstrated* destruction of nuclear armaments. In the former, the destruction would be an *accident*, in which all efforts of containment had failed. In the latter, the devastation is a *design goal* in which every effort for successful damage has been made. It is as if to say that a TNT charge used to dig a tunnel is no different from a charge set off by a madman in a school! This linkage is an overworked approach. It signifies either a wanton disregard of facts, or an unconscionable skewing of a point of view. If I am not mistaken, Dr. Caldicott, early on, referred to nuclear reactors as “bomb factories.” Surely she knows that the military could find easier ways to develop plutonium! It ill behooves a physician, trained in science, to transmit such hyperbole to a group of educators, also trained in the sciences.

Squat in the middle of her description of possible reactor accidents, she took the trouble to give a detailed and gruesome description of the violence caused at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Again, to put it kindly, this was out of context.

Her dire predictions of cancers resulting from Three Mile Island are totally at variance with those of the most reputable scientists in the world.

To a floor question on possible dangers from coal, she gave a glossy answer about radon. Never a mention of Black Lung. . .the carbon dioxide blanket. . .the acid rains. . .

Many times she alluded to her organization, *Physicians for Social Responsibility*. Are all other physicians irresponsible Dr. Strangeloves?

But now to a positive action: What should NABT do? In the future, when there's a scheduled speaker on a controversial topic way off in one corner, the Convention Committee

owes us another speaker—on the same platform. This year, the *ABT* Editor should actively solicit a reputable scientist to prepare a rebuttal. The reputable science journals, the respected and learned scientific societies, and renowned scientists know at least as much about this subject as Dr. Caldicott. Our readership deserves to hear it.

Joseph M. Oxenhorn
Pathways-on-Green River Hill
Hillsdale, New York 12529

Who Should We Believe?

Professor McReynold's Letter to the Editor in the September issue of *ABT*(42:363) raises the interesting question of the degree of reverence with which we should receive the opinions of those holding higher degrees in science.

The basis should not be a university degree a person holds but whether or not the person has the experience, background, and ability to make authoritative statements. No scientist can be an authority in more than a minute portion of science. I hold a Ph.D. degree in science—the highest earned degree that one can achieve, yet it would be ridiculous for me to attempt authoritative statements in Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Psychology, and related areas. In fact, even in Biology, there are few areas where I can speak with any authority.

Those who cite the opinions of scientists of the Creation Research Society should ask themselves this question: Are these the scientists who, on the basis of studying fossils and living organisms, have become authorities? Are they the people who publish in the scientific journals devoted to paleontology and evolutionary biology? Do they even present “scientific creationism” in a form that can be evaluated by the procedures of science?

(Continued on p. 224)

LEGISLATED LEARNING: THE BUREAUCRATIZATION OF THE AMERICAN CLASSROOM, by Arthur E. Wise. 1979. University of California Press, Berkeley. 219 p. \$10.95.

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE: AN INQUIRY INTO LIFE, 4th ed., by Biological Sciences Curriculum Study. 1980. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., New York. 754 p. Price not given.

WHALES, by E.J. Slijper. 1979. Cornell University Press, New York. 511 p. \$29.50.

A DICTIONARY OF BOTANY, by R. John Little and C. Eugene Jones. 1980. Von Nostrand Reinhold, New York. 400 p. \$18.50.

WEEDS, 2nd ed., by Peter A. Hyypio. 1980. Cornell University Press, New York. 585 p. \$29.50.

INTRODUCTORY MYCOLOGY, 3rd ed., by Constantine J. Alexopoulos and Charles W. Mims. 1979. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York. 632 p. Price not given.

BASIC MICROBIOLOGY, Volume 7: Introduction to Modern Mycology, by J.W. Deacon. 1980. Halsted Press, New York. 197 p. Price not given.

BASIC MICROBIOLOGY, Volume 2: Introduction to Modern Virology, by S.B. Primrose and N.J. Dimmock. 1980. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New Jersey. 250 p. \$19.95.

THE PURPOSIVE BRAIN, by Ragner Granit. 1980. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 244 p. \$5.95.

AMERICAN WILDLIFE LAW, by Thomas A. Lund. 1980. University of California Press, Berkeley. 188 p. \$12.95.

TEMPERATURE AND ANIMAL LIFE, 2nd ed., by Richard N. Hardy. 1980. University Park Press, Baltimore, Maryland. 83 p. \$5.95.

WORLD WITHIN A WORLD—PRIBILOFS, by Ted Lewin. 1980. Dodd Mead, New York. 76 p. \$7.95.

Letters

...from p. 207

Does Professor McReynolds realize that any major piece of verifiable information of the incompleteness or inaccuracy of the data of evolutionary biology would bring acclaim to the discoverer? (Remember the discovery of *Latimeria*?)

Evolutionary biology is not dogma supported by a priesthood of true believers but a constantly changing and expanding body of knowledge

PRIVATE SCHOOL POSITIONS Science Teachers in Demand

Exciting opportunities in leading elementary and secondary private schools throughout the USA. Teachers in all Science areas needed for mid-year and September '81 openings.

FEE PAID BY SCHOOLS

Robert M. Sandoe & Associates

29 Newbury Street,
Boston, MA 02116

757 Bay Street,

San Francisco, CA 94109

OR Call Toll-Free

800-225-7986

A MUST FOR SCIENCE TEACHERS



ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE • EARTH SCIENCE • BIOLOGY • CHEMISTRY • LIMNOLOGY • OCEANOGRAPHY • AGRICULTURE TEST EQUIPMENT FOR ANALYZING WATER POLLUTION • AIR POLLUTION • SOIL • PLANT TISSUE • GREENHOUSE SOILS • HYDROPONIC SOLUTIONS • AQUARIUM WATER • PONDS, LAKES AND STREAMS

REAGENT SYSTEMS • INSTRUMENTS • SCIENCE HANDBOOKS • SAMPLING APPARATUS • pH INDICATORS • COMPARATOR OUTFITS • TITRATION SETS • OVERHEAD PROJECTION DEMONSTRATIONS • TEST PAPERS • APPLICATIONS FROM ELEMENTARY GRADES TO COLLEGE LEVEL

LaMotte Chemical

Write for Free Catalog
THE LaMOTTE CHEMICAL PRODUCTS COMPANY
CHESTERTOWN, MARYLAND 21620
301-778-3100

Serving Science and Industry since 1919

that aids our understanding of the natural world.

The scientists of the Creation Research Society are not incompetent—though there is no evidence

that their competence includes evolutionary biology. But let me give them their due: I would feel much safer in an airplane or a rocket designed by the scientists of the CRS than in one designed by a committee of paleontologists.

John A. Moore

Professor of Biology

University of California

Riverside 92521

Call for a State Meeting

After the National Convention, I became cognizant of the necessity for a meeting of biologists in my state. To ensure the preservation of life on earth and the respect and dignity that all life forms deserve, we must not only become knowledgeable of the issues facing our society, but also develop strategies and a value system in the use of potentially beneficial and yet awesome discoveries, such as recombinant DNA and nuclear energy. We, as educators, are in a most opportune position to truly create an enlightened ethical citizenry. The pupils we educate are our future. They need and deserve our best teaching abilities.

I would appreciate replies from other people interested in such a meeting, and would welcome any assistance.

Denise "Chip" Black
941 Canal

Milford, Michigan 48042

Environmental Moderation

...from p. 210

siderations are incorporated into the real goal of Americans—the improvement of the quality of life for all humanity.

References

HARDIN, G. 1963. The cybernetics of competition: A biologist's view of society. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 7:1.

LEOPOLD, A. 1966. *A sand country almanac with essays on conservation from Round River*. New York: Sierra Club/Ballantine Books.