

such as Czolbe, that organic forms are eternal; while yet others hold that all are the product of the fortuitous course of atoms; and the belief of the Darwinians is, that species are generated by the survival of the fittest. The writer of the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* rightly says that evolution "included all theories respecting the origin and order of the world," of course excepting creationism. This is hopeful, and eminently conducive to concise expression and definite teaching. But Herbert Spencer is the man who puts the confusion in the clearest light. He defines evolution to be "the integration of matter and the concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent heterogeneity, to a definite, coherent homogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation"; or, as he himself puts it in its simplest form, "the integration of matter and the concomitant dissipation of motion." This is clear enough, but it strikes one as being more like involution than evolution. And Spencer confirms this, for he says, "Evolution has other meanings, some of which are incongruous with, and some are even directly opposed to, the meaning here given to it. The evolution of a gas is literally an absorption of motion and disintegration of matter, which is exactly the reverse of what we here call evolution. To evolve, as ordinarily understood, is to unfold, to open, to expand; whereas, as we understand it, it is to contract." Where are we now? We do not wonder that astronomers feel themselves at liberty to call any possible process in space "the evolution of stellar worlds." Sometimes it is the clashing of meteorites into gas, sometimes it is the condensation of gas into meteorites, sometimes it is both; but whichever it be, it is this chameleon evolution. If we are to take into account the origin of the word, it would appear as though the Theist were the only one who had a right to the term, for he believes it to be the unfolding of predestined order. Nothing can be unfolded where there is nothing to unfold; and in any non-Theistic theory there is not anything to unfold. The better generic term for these non-Theistic