

evolution, since to doubt evolution is to doubt science, and science is only another name for truth." Now, natural science is only one of a large sisterhood of sciences among which are to be found psychology, metaphysics, ethics, and theology. Natural science has no monopoly of the truth, neither does it possess any divine right to contradict and dictate to its sisters. It is not even the oldest. It is indebted to the same source as they all for its first truths. It is only a human device for systematizing the facts and relations of nature, just as theology is a human device for giving the orderly relations of the facts of religion. Neither is infallible.

It is not difficult for an amateur to discern in some of the positions of evolution, as generally understood, an extravagance, an assumption, an inconsistency, an inconclusiveness, that must soon or late discredit it, and restrict its sphere to a smaller domain than it now claims. For example: Argument by analogy as used in embryology seems lamentably inconclusive. Resemblances cannot constitute an analogy which rests on a similarity of relations in the things compared. Supposed similarity of appearances which supposes similarity of relations in the genealogy of the individual and of the race, supposes too much, and proves no identity. Again, sequence, or relation in time, does not in itself prove that mysterious relation of cause and effect. A Milesian emigrant landed at Halifax. As the sun retired behind the curtains of the west, the signal gun upon Citadel Hill was fired. "What's that?" queried the new arrival. "That's sundown," explained the Haligonian. "Arra sure, an' does the sun go down with a bang out here?" If not as grotesque, quite as unreasonable is the casual relation which is sometimes applied to sequent phenomena. A recognition of the casual relation is due in any case, rather to insight than to observation. Take a geological table and place side by side with it the plant and animal life as it has left its traces in each period. Is the law of continuity sustained? Is not development along parallel lines quite as frequent as along a projected line? Have not some of the lowest forms perpetuated themselves from the beginning? Do not some of the highest forms that have appeared deteriorate in all the succeeding periods?