familiar are the effects of its transformations on matter. There are lessons to be learned from thinking about live and dead seeds and "live" and "dead" batteries. Without relying on observable material changes, there is no way to distinguish between the live and the dead. And in contrast to unbridled freedom to investigate energy, to recognize and utilize its properties for myriad purposes, life has always been shielded by forces that protect it from comparable scrutiny.

Which raises awesome questions. What would be the outcome if teachers of the life sciences and their colleagues in the physical sciences were to treat life and energy as being comparable entities? Would the gap in the rates of evolution of the social and materialistic phases of our society begin to diminish? Questions such as these pose a unique dilemma for teachers. Outside the classroom such questions can be merely academic. But not inside. Teachers bring their answers into play even without verbalizing the questions. In this, there are unique opportunities laden with distinctive responsibilities. The classroom provides opportunities for young people to wrestle with issues and points of view no matter how unconventional they may be. Equally vital is maintaining a level playing field where the pros and cons of efforts to explain the dimly seen receive appropriate attention.

Acknowledgment

Ronald F. Fox, Georgia Institute of Technology, by way of personal correspondence helped to phrase the physical-chemical view of the nature of life.

John Woodburn
woodburn@uscyber.net