

Call for Manuscript Reviewers for *The American Biology Teacher*

If you are interested in becoming a manuscript reviewer for *ABT*, please send the information below to Bill Leonard at leonard@clemson.edu. We especially need K-12 teachers. Thank you in advance for your contribution to biology education.

Name, position, institution, postal address, and e-mail address.

Also, please identify the areas listed below in which you are comfortable reviewing manuscripts:

- **Grade Levels:** elementary and middle, high school, two-year college, or four-year college
- **Teaching Strategies:** inquiry, lab, field, reading, media, computer, discussion, and group.
- **Content Areas:** such as botany, microbiology, invertebrates, vertebrates, entomology, health & medicine, A & P, parasitology, aquatic biology, genetics, biotechnology, marine biology, cell biology, evolution, biodiversity, systematics, ecology, environmental biology, population biology, behavior, nature of science, ethics, equity, STS or technology. Please be as specific as possible.

For at least two reasons, the excellent exercise presented by Phil Senter (*ABT* 72:70–76, February 2010) will not convince a creationist that “Lucy” is any indication that *Homo sapiens* evolved from an ape-like species. First, the existence of a form with intermediate characteristics or mixed characteristics between an ape-like form and humans does not necessarily indicate that this form was on or near an evolutionary line from that ape-like form to humans. Because the condition of the ancestor is unknown (or at least unstated in the article), this intermediate form might just as well be on the line of evolution from a human-like ancestor to an ape such as a chimpanzee.

Second, creationists generally do not claim that an intermediate organism cannot exist. Rather, their claim is that *Homo sapiens* was created separately and did not arise by descent from such an intermediate ancestor. The following analogy will make the distinction clearer. Suppose we found three models of cars produced by the same company, one a 2000 model, one from 2005, and one from 2010. The 2005 model would have some features found in both the 2000 and the 2010 models but not in cars of other manufacturers. Examples might be a logo or a hood ornament. The existence of the car with features found in both the earlier and later models does not demonstrate that the newest car evolved from the older model, merely that the designers and builders (i.e., the creators) of the 2010 car used some ideas already present in the earlier models.

To beat the sophistry of the creationists requires a high degree of cleverness indeed.

Werner G. Heim
Professor Emeritus of Biology
Colorado College
14 East Cache La Poudre Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
wheim@coloradocollege.edu

DOI: 10.1525/abt.2010.72.6.2