

near a speculation. In science we find that science never attempts to touch on these basic questions - our origin, our present purpose, and our eternal destiny. Coming to the evolution - and one of the points of discussion is the theory of evolution - and it is because of the theory of evolution that doubts have been cast on the teaching of the Scriptures and ~~XXXX~~ on all the views that (5.) and therefore we want to see this evolution itself.

~~XXXX~~ Now just to give a brief survey of the philosophy of evolution, I would like to say that this whole cause begins at Lincea back in, oh I don't know, 1600 or something, in a

And this man, he looked into the nature, a naturalist, probably he must have studied Bible too. And then he gave an account and he called it something like this - he wrote a book and the name of that book is SYSTEMA NATURA (??) - I think that's Latin. And he had to say something like this - all the different kinds that you see - the animals, plants, and the human beings - in the nature, they are a special creation. And all these kinds follow a principle of constancy within them; that is, the plants will continue to be plants, human beings will continue to be human beings, and animals will continue to be animals. And he gave this - and I think this part very much agrees with the first chapter of Genesis. But later on his followers came and they could not find this principle of constancy working. But then they did not give any reasons that did not prove it, that the principle of constancy doesn't work. And without any rational justification, they abandoned this principle of constancy in 1751 A.D. and they substituted something else. In the Later part we find that LeMarche when he introduced his own principles of inheritance of characteristics and the influence of all this surrounding things that has (7.5) and he says that is

how the evolution works. No principle of constancy, no principle of special creation, but everything is the product of evolution. All right - then this man said that there are no hard and fast lines that you can draw between species. They are not definite things. And yet he went on to argue that ~~XXXX~~ these species change - one species changes to another. He does not have a specific concept of species. And yet those changes (8.) we have tried to argue. Sometimes we have failed to prove what they were saying, sometimes they simply changed it because they wanted to, to suit their own ideas, to suit their own opinion. But even in this, if we were to characterize this kind of thinking to be the first part, our first theory in the history of evolution, here also we do not find that they answer any of