

on the mainland of South America, but not identical. There were sufficient differences to lead him to believe that they were different species, but yet sufficient similarity to suggest strongly that they must have been originally related. This suggested the probability that a few birds had made the long trip from the mainland to the various islands and there, being isolated, their descendants had gradually changed, and that thus new species had come into existence.

It is no part of our present purpose to discuss the relation of different species. We have noted that there is no reason to say that Linnaeus' idea of a species and the "kinds" mentioned in Genesis are identical. We do not know how large the "kinds" were. Certainly change and development have occurred. All humanity comes from one original source, but there is tremendous variety among human beings in various parts of the world. The people in each particular area, if cut off for a long time from other areas, tend to develop characteristics that are easily distinguished from those of men who have lived in other relatively isolated areas. It is not at all strange that the same thing should occur among animals. There is great possibility of divergence within a "kind." There is no evidence that one "kind" has developed into or out of another "kind."

There have been many books written on biogeography, or distribution of animals and plants, and it is often listed as an argument for evolution. Actually all that it proves is that various changes have occurred as animals have become more or less isolated and that animals have not simply remained in one place, but that they have spread over the face of the earth from various distribution points. This does not prove development of any one major type of animal from another.

It must also be mentioned that there are a number of very difficult problems in biogeography, from whatever viewpoint it is examined. Thus, there are a