

term for this theory. Actually there are only two ways in which the great multitude of varying types of plants and animals could have come into existence. They were produced either by the intelligent choices of a wise Creator or by an accidental effect of unintelligent forces. The word "evolution" can easily give an entirely false idea of what is meant, for it suggests that the important factor is merely change or development. It would have prevented a great deal of confusion if the theory had been designated by a more correct description, "the theory of accidental origin."

Once I heard a young man say: "How can you doubt evolution? Anyone can see the evolution of a boy into a man. It is perfectly obvious."

This statement was not as absurd as it might seem. Change is a common fact of life. It would be difficult to imagine a greater metamorphosis than the change of a caterpillar, that crawls on the ground and chews leaves, into a butterfly or moth, that hovers in the air and takes in liquid food sucked from flowers. Such a complete change in the life of a single organism would be hardly believable if it were not a frequently observed phenomenon. If these creatures were known to us only from fossils no one would be apt to guess that a caterpillar that had died young and a beautiful butterfly, both preserved as fossils, were related at all. This illustrates the difficulty of making definite statements about the relationship of ~~different~~ creatures, ~~if~~ known ~~to us~~ only through fossils.

Anyone who looks about him is bound to see that change is constantly going on. If one returns to any part of the world after an absence of a few years he is apt to find that great physical changes have occurred. He may be shocked to see the effects of upheavals or catastrophes. He is sure to find many results of slow and gradual change. In every phase of life changes of