

this continuous process of splitting itself, or to speak scientifically, by this process of unceasing *fission*, it '*developed*,' and became an ascidian, or something like that; by-and-by a simian ape, and by-and-by a man, who stood, and gazing at himself in rapture, cried out from the depths of his amazement, 'Behold, I am a man!' This is all so simple, so natural, and clear, and in every way so 'rational,' that, of course, it puts all notion of design entirely out of court. Ordinary people, not versed in the wonders of scientific logic, might think that this manner of working in the protoplasm was no argument at all against design, but merely a disclosure of the way in which the designer carries out his purposes. But, 'Oh dear no,' says science. 'No such thing. By no means.' 'I immediately grant,' says she, 'that if you see a completely finished watch for example, all in good trim and beautiful running order, you may have some fair enough excuse for supposing that a designer has had some hand in the manufacture. But if you see the various little parts of which the watch is composed lying separate from one another, and gradually one little part being added to another little part, then just as certainly have you no right to think of a designer at all.' If science objects to this way of putting it, and claims that she still admits design, and a designer, even when the watchmaker is seen busily at work putting the parts together, will she then kindly locate the design and the designer? We see neither it nor him, nor do we smell them, nor taste them, nor touch them—how then does science know they exist? If design may be invisible, and yet none the less really existent in the case of the construction of a watch, how does science *know* that there is not some design in the construction of the watchmaker himself, just as invisible, yet no less real? Is the designer, which science admits to be engaged in the construction of the watch, a personal or an

impersonal one? If she is not prepared to speak positively on this point, perhaps she will tell us whether the mind of any one of her votaries who is busy with the *design* of proving that there is *no* design, is a personal or an impersonal one? If she still refuses to give us a definite answer she will surely at least let us know how she comes to be so positive on some other points—the brute ancestry of man, for example. Surely the spirit of a man that is in him is highly worthy of attention, and any man of science should be able to speak with at least *as much* authority on that point as on what occurred so long before he was born.

But if science gets rid of the difficulty by categorically denying the existence of any design whatsoever, then the whole universe, the human part of it at least, is reduced to a state of idiocy, and the scientist who attempts to change the established order of nature is the greatest idiot of all, because he is going directly in the face of his own opinions, at least of what *ought* to be his opinions, if he is consistent and endeavouring to change what must have been potent in 'that atom' during the twilight of eternity, and which has been self-evolved thereby, according to the immutable 'laws' of fate.

But if science acknowledges that there is personality involved in the invisible design engaged in the construction of a watch, how does she *know*—not conjecture—she must leave that to religion—but how does she *know*, and how will she prove, that there is no personality involved in the equally invisible design of constructing a watchmaker or a universe? And if there may be design, and invisible design, and an invisible designer, engaged in the construction of the ascidians and the echinoderms, and the watchmakers and the naturalistic scientists, etc., how does science *know* that this invisible personality may not be able to carry out his purposes *with*.