

over into another sense. A young man said to me once, Why of course we believe in evolution; anybody can see the evolution of a body into a man! You can't you. You can see how a boy develops into a man. Better yet, go into the fields and see how a caterpillar develops into a butterfly. What a tremendous change takes place. If you want to call development by the world evolution, we all believe in it. There's development constantly. If we are not developing, we're going back.

When you use the word evolution in the sense of development of course we all believe in it in that sense. But if that's what we're talking about, why not say development? Why say evolution. The word evolution, though originally it simply means development, and is very often used in that sense, has come to mean as Chambers said in the book that appeared a dozen years before Darwin's book --this paragraph I read to you, that the simplest and most primitive type of life, gradually developed into something more complex and something more complex, etc and thus by a gradual process everything on earth has developed has developed from one simple source.

That's altogether different, isn't it? That's not saying there is development. That's saying everything has developed by natural process from one simple source. If you're going to say that, how are you going to prove a thing like that? You'd have to have been here for millions of years. You'd have to see all those developments. You'd have to trace them. How else would you prove it?

You can advance different arguments. But will the arguments prove anything? Talk about a missing link-- you would have to show a million links to prove that everything has developed from one simple source. Actually to prove evolution in this extreme sense in which sense unfortunately a great many use the term, would be actually impossible. It becomes a theory, a belief, it becomes something which is impossible to prove when you take it in that sense.

I think it's important we distinguish between them. There is another thing where we get ourselves in an unfortunate situation. There was a Swedish botanist about 200 yrs. ago named Linaeus who was a believer in the Bible, and a great student of nature. He classified plants and animals and worked out a very excellent system of classification. Substantially his system is still used today. Linaeus thought that the smallest division of life was a species. That's just an old Latin word meaning kind. But

(The tape was broken here and it seems to begin with another subject after the break

Yesterday morning on the broadcast I gave a very interesting illustration from Daniel. How many here heard it yesterday? Only 3 or 4. I think I'm going to give that one again. I feel it is such an outstanding illustration and worth hearing twice. It is in Daniel 5. There we have an account which deals with people not known otherwise until comparatively recently.