

number of animals and plants that are found both in South America and in Africa or Madagascar that have no counterparts farther north. It is hard to see just how either of them would have come from the other. The same is true of certain animals found both in South America and in Australia.

There is no doubt that great changes have taken place upon the earth's surface as plants and animals have spread from one place to another, and as some have died out in areas to which they were not suited. This, however, is very far from proving that all of life has developed from one simple source.

A FALSE DILEMMA

If a scientist expresses disbelief in evolution, it is quite common for other scientists to ask him, "What alternative theory do you suggest?" The statement is sometimes made that if a person cannot propose a better explanation of some phenomenon of nature he then has no alternative but to accept the evolutionary explanation.

A few years ago a leading biologist carefully investigated most of the suggested evidences for the idea that evolution has occurred through a succession of small changes, and found that such evidence is almost totally lacking. However, since he would not accept what he called "the outmoded idea of special creation," he concluded that it was necessary for him to propose an alternative theory. To accept the theory that he proposed would require far more faith than to believe the Biblical teaching that God created everything that exists.

Such questions proceed from the erroneous idea that before a man can reject something as unproven he must be able to present an acceptable substitute. This idea is quite wrong.

It is established law that before a man can be convicted of a crime his guilt must be proved beyond any reasonable doubt. It is not necessary for the defense to prove someone else guilty, but only to show that there is not sufficient evidence to convict the one who has been accused.