

variety of physical and mental characteristics. There has been much descent with modification, and much development, yet it is universally recognized that all human beings are part of the same species. To take the fact that changes occur as proof that the area of change is absolutely unlimited and that all types of life have developed from one original source involves a great many unwarranted logical jumps.

DO SIMILARITIES PROVE EVOLUTION?

Much of the evidence adduced in some of these fields is simply an effort to show similarities among the various types of plants or animals. Hundreds of pages of material on comparative anatomy have been devoted to pointing out such similarities. This is a valuable and important study but it does not really prove an evolutionary relationship. It would be absurd to think that the Creator would have to make an entirely new pattern for everything that He created.

By evidence from systematics, or taxonomy, evolutionists refer to the fact that animals can be classified according to a definite system, with large groups subdivided into smaller groups. They assert that this is an indication that these groups were differentiated from one another through descent with modification. Early in the modern period there came into wide acceptance what was described as "the chain of being." This was the idea that all of nature could be arranged in an ascending scale from the lowest mineral up through the whole list of plants and then of animals, to man. Evolutionists felt that a great step was taken in the direction of acceptance of their theory by showing that plants and animals should instead be classified by arranging the different types on the analogy of a tree, with the simpler ones at the bottom, and the more complex groups branching out. Such a diagram surely fits the facts better, but it does not necessarily imply hereditary relationship or evolutionary development. In recent years evolutionists are coming more and more to feel that the tree idea is inadequate and that actually a shrub would be a better figure since, according to their present theories, the large groups would seem to have been differentiated extremely early. This rearrangement of the classification makes even