This document is for release when it has become completely a part of the court record. It is accepted by newspapers and correspondents with the condition and explicit understanding that it is not to be published or any of its contents referred to in any way until it is definitely released. It may be amended or changed before such release. In the court record, it is not to be altered.

STATEMENT BY DR. WINTERTON C. CURTIS,
(Zoologist, University of Missouri.)

(Biography.--- Dr. Winterton C. Curtis received the degree of Ph. D. at Johns Hopkins in 1901. He has served the University of Missouri since the latter date, and is now chairman of the Department of Zoology in this institution. He has also been associated with the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, Mass., for many years, being at the present time one of its trustees. At various times he has acted as an investigator for the United States Fisheries Bureau, notably in studies upon the pearl-button mussels. His numerous technical papers have been along the general lines of invertebrate zoology, regeneration, and parasitology. His recent work entitled "Science and Human Affairs" undertakes a discussion, from the standpoint of biological science, of the relationships between the advancement of scientific knowledge and our civilization. Dr. Curtis is particularly qualified to speak in the matters under consideration, because in this volume he has emphasized the spiritual rather than the material influences of science. He is a member and past secretary of the American Society of Zoologists, of the American Society of Ecologists, the American Naturaligists, and a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

NATURE AND CURRENT ASPECTS OF THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION.

Definitions are wearisome. But we may ask ourselves, by way of limitation, what is <u>evolution</u> in general and <u>organic evolution</u> in particular. The answer can best be given by means of illustrations. The term evolution, as to-day used in science, means <u>the historical process of change</u>. When we speak of the evolution of man-made products, like automobiles and steam-engines, of social institutions like democratic government, of the crust of our earth, of solar systems, of animals and plants, we mean a <u>gradual</u> coming into existence of

what is now before us, in contrast to this sudden and miraculous creation. Such an idea is of recent origin. Our intellectual forbears of a few centuries ago thought in terms of a world created in its present form. The evolutionary point of view marked an advance from the concept of a static universe to one that is dynamic. In the phraseology of the street, the world is a going concern, historically as well as in its present aspects.

Evolution is, therefore, the doctrine of how things have changed in the past and how they are changing in the present. It may be naturally divided into its Cosmic, Geologic, and Organic aspects, as represented by the sciences of Astronomy, Geology and Biology.

COSMIC EVOLUTION.

Cosmic Evolution really includes all other forms, for by the cosmic we mean the entire visible universe, our very bodies, as well as the farthest star. But in practice, one thinks of the cosmos as remote. And what we have in mind under cosmic evolution is the changes that are postulated by the science of astronomy. It is believed by astronomers that our solar system with its central sun, its planets and lesser bodies, has not always possessed its present form, although it has been in existence from a remote period of time. Our earth seems to have been once molten, and before that perhaps gaseous. Although the famous Nebular Hypothesis of La Place has been in part replaced by other theories, the belief of modern astronomers is that our solar system and perhaps countless others have arisen by an evolutionary process whose extent is infinite in both time and space. I take it that few will combat the concepts of astronomy regarding the nature of our sun and its planets. Even when some of us were children the ideas of cosmic evolution, as set forth by the Nebular Hypothesis, the planetesimal hypothesis, or the like is correct, but that the astronomer regards the heavenly bodies as having reached their present state by an evolutionary stage continuous through an

unfathomable past and presumably to be continued into a limitless future. There is no longer talk among intelligent or educated men --- or there should not be--- of "heaven and earth, center and circumference, created all together, in the same instant, and clouds full of water, om October 23, in the year 4004 B. C., at nine o'clock in the morning," as was determined by the chronology of Dr. John Lightfoot in the seventeenth century. The astronomical evidence for the development of such a dynamic universe in space and time is of course limited. But it all points in the direction of evolution.

GEOLOGIC EVOLUTION.

Geologic Evolution overlaps with cosmic, since the geologist takes the evolutionary problem where the astronomer leaves it. Geology deals with the history of our earth, how it originated and how it has assumed its present form. Astronomy deals with the origin of the earth as a planet of our solar system. Geology finds evidence that the earth was once a molten mass which has since been cooler. What may be called the "countenance" of the earth is the subject matter of geology, how the land lies at the present day, how rocks and soil are being produced, and what these facts imply regarding historical origins. The evolutionary evidence of astronomy is vague and remote, although generally accepted by the layman. The evidence from geology is written in the ground beneath our feet. The geologist's belief in a vast lapse of time and stupendous cha changes rests upon evidence that is everywhere at hand. Leonardo da Vinci, in the fifteenth century, grasped the significance of important geological facts, when he wrote concerning the saltness of the sea and the marine shells found as fossils in the high mountains. Since the publication of James Hutt-

tom's "Theory of the Earth" in 1795, it has been the cardinal principle of geological science that past changes of the earth's surface are explicable in terms of changes now in operation. For example, such a vast chasm as the Grand Canyon is explained not as produced by miraculous creation or by sudden catastrophe, but by running water acting upon the rocks throughout innumerable centuries. The process may be observed in minature in the wash of the soil in Tennessee fields. The weathering of rock into soil, erosion with its transportation of the products of weathering, deposition of the material in the oceans or im large bodies of fresh water, uplift of the oceam's floors and its hardening into rock may all be seen in slow but certain progress in various parts of the world at the present day, and their occurrence in the past is recorded in the rocks. The sub-title of Charles Lyell's famous book, the "Principles of Geology," published in 1830, runs as follows: "An attempt to explain the former changes of the earth's surface by reference to causes now in operation." Lyell established the idea of evolution as the only reasonable interpretation of geological facts and his elaboration of Hutton's doctrines still constitutes the very foundation of geologic science. To-day, geology without an evolution of the earth's surface, from a molten mass to its present form, and extending over millions of years, would be on a par with a science of geography postulating a flat earth. The conclusions of modern astronomy and geology, therefore, point to an evolutionary process involving many millions of years and still in progress -- to am earth hoary with age and still growing old.

Astronomy and geology despite their practical importance are remote from human concern, in so far as their evolutionary doctrines are concerned. To borrow from the phraseology of a distinguished anti-evolutionist, the Age of the Rocks is of no

particular consequence in so far as the Rock of Ages is concerned. Cosmis evolution and geologic evolution are readily accepted by the laity on the authority of science, because they do not seriously interfere with dictrines that are deemed vital. But the evolution of plant and animal life, and hence human evolution, is inseparable from that of inorgamic matter as described by astronomy and geology, because of the fossils in the rocks.

ORGANIC EVOLUTION.

Organic Evolution resembles the cosmic and geologic evolution above described, since it concludes that the living bodies, which are the objects of its investigation, have not always existed as they are to-day, but have undergone a process of change. As with the evidence of geologic change, the evidence for an evolution of animals and plants rests upon facts that are immediately before us, for example, the structure and development of animals, their distribution over the earth, the fossils in the rocks. Our time will permit of only enumeration and brief characterization of the recognized lines of evidence for organic evolution, which are as follows:

1. Evidence from Structure is derived from:

   Comparative Anatomy

   Comparative Embryology

   Classification.

2. Evidence from Distribution past and present, is derived from:

   Palaeontology

   Zoogeography

3. Evidence from Physiology is derived from:

   Fundamental Resemblances in Vital Processes

   Specific Chemical Resemblances of closely re-

lated forms, e. g., Blood Tests.

4. Evidence from Experimentation rests upon:

Unconscious Experimentation upon Animals and Plants since their Domestication

Conscious Experimentation of Breeders and of Scientific Investigators

The nature of these lines of evidence may now be indicated.

Evidence from Comparative Anatomy: In the animal kingdom as a whole and in every group of animals whether large or small, we find facts that may be interpreted most reasonably in terms of evolution. The vertebrates or backboned animals will serve as an illustration. We find here a certain plan of structure, for example, backbone, two pairs of limbs, body, head, and various internal organs, all laid down according to a similar general plan, but with endless modifications to suit the mode of life. The flipper of a whale, the wing of a bird or a bat, the fore foot of a horse, the arm of a man, and the like, all show the same plan of structure. One of the pre-Darwin ideas was that each animal, while created separately, was nevertheless formed in accordance with a certain ideal type that the Creator had in mind, hence the resemblance. Such an idea is a theoretical possibility, provided there is any evidence to show that animals were created all at once and separately. But there is not a shred of such evidence that will appeal to one who approaches the matter with an open mind and uninfluenced by preconceived notions.

On the other hand, the biological explanation of this anatomical resemblance is that the present vertebrates (fishes, amphibia, reptiles, birds and mammals) have all descended from a primitive race, somewhat like the present fishes. All vertebrates are now alike, because they have never lost the underlying plan of structure inherited from their common an-

... more honestly and naturally by their

present organization.

The Evidence from Fossils (Paleontology) interlocks with the above, since the first vertebrates known to appear were primitive fish-like forms. These were succeeded by Amphibians, Reptiles, Mammals and Birds in the order named, the last two having connecting links with the reptiles. The invertebrate groups tell a similar story.

Turning to the facts of Comparative Embryology: The kind of evidence everywhere discoverable may be illustrated by the gill-slits in the embryos of higher vertebrates like reptiles, birds and mammals. All these forms exhibit in their early stages of development a fish-like plan of structure, particularly in the neck region where the gill-slits are located. The reasonable interpretation of the existence of such structures in the embryo of a human being, or any land-living vertebrate, is that we have never lost these tell tale evidences of our ancestry. The later stages of our development are modified so that they lead to the adult human body. The earlier stages still show the primitive conditions of a fish-like like organization. Modern fishes have survived to the present day without a fundamentaldeparture from the ancestral condition. Modern Amphibia (frogs, toads and salamanders) have survived in the half-way state between an aquatic and a terrestrial existemce, through which higher vertebrates have passed as indicated by the fossil record and by the above fish-like stages in their development.

The facts of Classification are commonly cited as evidence for evolution. Since classification is based on structure (anatomy), this is but an aspect of the general evidence from comparative anatomy and embryology. While the facts cannot be detailed here, they are striking and bear out the doctrine.

Another line of evidence is that of Geological and Geographical Distrubution: The facts in this connection are utterly senseless and insulting to an intelligent Creator, if viewed as a result of special creation. One can simply say, "God did it," and not ask why. But such explanations do not satisfy modern minds. On the other hand, their explanation in terms of evolution give reasonableness and consistency to a large body of facts. The fossils appear in such an order in time as to constitute evidence for evolution. Existing animals are distributed over the surface of the earth in a manner that confirms their geological origins.

The facts of Physiology tell a similar story. Life and the living stuff is the same sort of thing wherever we find it, thus lending support to the idea that it has all descended from the same primitive source from which it has inherited its resemblances. A more striking line of physiological evidence is the recently discovered chemical resemblance between the blood of animals previously supposed to be closely related on grounds of their anatomical silitarities, for example, apes and monkeys, birds and reptiles, and the like. Two entirely ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ independent lines of evidence are here found to interlock to such an extent that evolution is the one reasonable interpretation.

Finally there is the evidence from Experimentation: Evolution has taken place before the eyes of men, during the period since animals and plants were first domesticated. The changes have not been profound, because the ten or twenty thousand years since the first animals and plants seem to have been brought under domestication is a brief span of time for evolutionary modification. But it is clear that such modification has occurred and is to-day occurring under the direction of skillful breeders. The modern science of genetics

is beginning to solve the problem of how evolution takes place, although this question is one of extreme difficulty.

The foregoing summary of the various lines of evidence is hopelessly inadequate, since books could be written on each. The point to be appreciated is that all the multitudinous facts of biology hang together in a consistent fashion when viewed in terms of evolution, while they are meaningless when considered as the arbitrary acts of a Creator who brought them into existence all at once a few thousand years in the past. Modern biology has developed around two major generalizations, the Cell Dictrine, and the Doctrine of Organic Evolution. Modern Evolutionism dates not from Darwin's "Origin of Species," published in 1859, but from the Historie Naturelle" of Buffon, the first volume of which appeared in 1749, and from the work of the other philosopher-naturalists of the eighteenth century. It is a sad comment upon the state of popular information that the practical facts of biological science are everywhere acknowledged, while the status of its greatest philosophical generalization remains so commonly unknown. In view of its implications and applications, the doctrine of evolution is second to none other in modern thought. It has been established by a gradual but irristible accumulation of facts.

THE FACT, THE COURSE, AND THE CAUSES OF ORGANIC EVOLUTION.

At this point we may examine a commom misunderstanding with reference to evolution and the work of Charles Darwin. Suppose we begin with an analogy, illustrating what may be termed the Fact, the Course, and the Causes in a progressive series of events. A ship leaves a European port and sails across the Atlantic to New York harbor. We may distinguish

between: (1) the Fact that the ship actually crossed the ocean, instead of being "created" in the harbor of New York; (2) The Course the ship may have pursued, whether direct or indirect, and the like; and (3) the Causes that made the ship go, whether an internal propelling force like steam or electricity, an external force like wind or current or even direction by wireless. Compared with the dictrine of evolution, we have; (1) the Fact of Evolution, as representing the historical series of events; (2) the Course followed in evolution, for instance, whether the land vertebrates arose from the fish-like ancestors, birds from reptiles, or the like; amd (3) the Causes of Evolution or what made and makes it happen. These three aspects, like those in the voyage of a ship, are separate through related items. They must be constantly distinguished, if there is to be any clear thinking on this matter by one who is not a scientist.

It is now possible to explain the misunderstanding above cited. The historical Fact of evolution seems attested by overwhelming evidence. Science has nothing to conceal, it stands "strong in the strength of demonstrable facts," and invites you to view the evidence. The Course pursued by evolution is known broadly in many instances, but in the nature of the case the evidence is limited and many of the steps will always remain uncertain, without, however, a calling in question of the historic fact. The Causes of evolution present the most difficult problem of all and the one regarding which we know the least. The recent strictures of Professor Batespn, which have been exploited by anti-evolutionists, were directly wholly at current explanations of evolutionary causation and the course of evolution. He affirmed his belief in the historic fact when he said "our faith in evolution is unshaken" -- meaming by "faith", of course,

a reasonable belief resting upon evidence."

That such an interpretion of Professor Bateson's views is the correct one, appears from the following communication:

"11 December 1922

The Manor House,
Merton
London, S. W. 20.

"Dear Professor Curtis:

"The papers you have sent me relating to the case of Mr. _____ give a curious picture of life under democracy. We may count ourselves happy if we are not all hanged ~~by the~~ like the Clerk of Chatham, with our pens and ink horns about our necks!

"I have looked through my Toronto address again. I see nothing in it which can be construed as expressing doubt as to the main fact of Evolution. In the last paragraph (copy enclosed) you will find a statement in the most explicit words I could find, giving the opinion which appears to me forced upon us by the facts -- an opinion shared, I suppose, by every man of science in the world.

"At Toronto I was addressing an audience, mainly professional. I took occasion to call the attention of my colleagues to the loose thinking and unproven assumptions which pass current as to the actual processes of evolution. We do know that the plants and animals, including most certainly man, have been evolved from other and very different forms of life. As to the nature of this process of evolution, we have many conjectures, but little positive knowledge. That is as much of the matter as can be made clear without special study, as you and I very well know.

"The campaign against the teaching of evolution is a

terrible example of the wayin which truth can be perverted by the ignorant. You may use as much of this letter as you like, and I hope it may be of service.

Very truly,

W. BATESON."

The paragraph to which Professor Bateson refers above is the concluding one of his address and runs as follows:

"I have put before you very frankly the considerations which have made us agnostic as to the actual mode and processes of evolution. When such confessions are made the enemies of science see their chance. If we can not declare ~~here~~ here and now how species arose, they will obligingly offer us the solutions with which obscurantism is satisfied. Let us then proclaim in precise and unmistakable language that our faith in evolution is unshaken. Every available line of argument converges on this inevitable conclusion. The obscurantist has nothing to suggest which is worth a moment's attention. The difficulties which weigh upon the professional biologist need not trouble the layman. Our doubts are not as to the reality or truth of evolution, but as to the origin of <u>species</u>, a technical, almost domestic, problem. Any day that mystery may be solved. The discoveries of the last twenty-five years enable us for the first time to discuss these questions intelligently and on a basis of fact. That synthesis will follow on an analysis, we do n not and can not doubt."

With this distiction between Fact, Course and Causes clearly in mind, the significance of Darwin's work in the history of biological thought can be understood. Darwin's accomplishment was two-fold. In the first place, he ~~establishe~~ established Organic Evolution as the only reasonable explanation of the past history of living things. Secondly, he offer-

ed, in Natural Selection, what then appeared an adequate explanation for the origin of species and hence for the causes of evolution. Darwin's evolutionary argument in his "Origin of Species" was that one species could give rise to another "by means", as he believed, "of Natural Selection or the preservation of favored races in the struggle for life." If one species could be shown to give rise to another, the same process could be continued. No limit could be set. The types thus produced could depart indefinitely from the parent form. Once the mutability of species be admitted, the only reasonable conclusion is that evolution has taken place. His argument was supported by an immense collection of facts along observational and experimental lines. The total result was overwhelming, coming as it did more than one hundred years after the original promulgation of the theory of transmutation and its repeated rejection by the main body of naturalists. Evolution was accepted so quickly by scientists that the world was startled. This sudden conversion gave rise to the impression even among scientific workers, that no serious contribution to evolutionary theory had been made before the work of Darwin. Such an impression does not represent the facts and it does grave injustice to the pioneer thinkers of the eighteenth century to whom we have alluded.

Darwin's secone accomplishment, Natural Selection, was accepted by science as a causo-mechanical explanation of evolutionary change. The cogent statement and the simplicity of the principle of selection were of great importance for its acceptance as the cause of evolution, along with the broader theory of evolution as the historic fact. Extended exposition of the selection process will not be attempted. It may be found in numerous elementary reference books, and in the early

chapters of the "Origin of Species." The tabulation known as Wallace's Chart, which is an admirable outline of the argument, may be cited in this connection:

WALLACE'S CHART OF NATURAL SELECTION.

Proved Facts	Consequences
A Rapid Increase of Numbers	Struggle for Existence
B Total numbers Stationary	
C Struggle for Existence	Survival of the Fittist (Natural Selection)
D Variation and Heredity	
E Survival of the Fittest	Structural Modifications
F Change of Environment.	

The importance of Darwin's work in the history of scientific thought is that it convinced science of the truth of organic evolution and proposed a then plausable theory of evolutionary causation. Since Darwin's time, evolution as the historic fact has received confirmation on every hand. It is now regarded by competent scientists as the only rational explanation of an overwhelming mass of facts. Its strength lies in the extent to which it gives meaning to so many phenomena that would be meaningless without such an hypothesis.

But the case of natural selection is far different. Of recent years, this theory of the causes of evolution has suffered a decline. No other hypothesis, however, has completely displaced it. It remains the most satisfactory explanation of the origin of adaptations, although its all-sufficiency is no longer accepted. The initial step in evolution is the appearance of individual variations which are perpetuated by heredity, rather than the selection of variations after they have appeared. The interest of investigators has shifted to poblems of variation and heredity, as exem-

plified by the rise of the science of genetics.

As a result of this situation, there has been much discussion among scientists regarding the adequacy of what is often referred to as the Darwinian Theory, meaning Natural Selection. In condemning selection as an inadequate explanation of the problem, biologists have often seemed to condemn evolution itself. It is not strange that the layman, for whom Darwinism and evolution are synonymous terms, believes that evolution has been rejected when he hears that belief in Darwinism is on the wane. He does not understand that whatis thus meant by Darwinism is not the historic fact of evolution, but the proposed cause of evolution -- natural selection. This point may not seem vital, but those interested in biological science frequently find the situation used to support claims that the entire concept of organic evolution has fallen into disrepute. There are many, even to-day, who rejoice at anything that appears to weaken this major generalization of biology.

Such then is the more strictly scientific status of the Doctrine of Evolution as a whole. The origin, by evolution, of the heavenly bodies and of our earth is evidenced by facts of astronomy and geology as set forth in any elementary treatise on these sciences. Inorganic Evolution or the modification of non-living matter is thus supported by science and does not find serious opposition in the public mind. Organic Evolution or the origin of animal and plant life receives a similar support from the facts of biology. If the origin of man were not involved, there would be presumably little serious opposition from non-scientific sources at the present day.

But with the evolution of all other living things, both animal and plant, overwhelmingly attested by the facts, it is not only impossible but puerile to separate man from the general course of events. Moreover, the evidence for man's origin is becoming clearer year by year. Comparative Anatomy, Embryology, Classification, Physiology, Geographical Distribution, Fossils, and the existing races of Mankind tell the same story for man as for the rest of the animal world.

Huxley's essay, entitled "Man's Place in Nature," presents in a masterful manner the anatomical evidence for our kinship with the four species of tailless apes -- the Gibbon, Gorilla, Orang and Chimpanzee --and his most significant conclusions are even more strongly established at the present day. If creation occurred"at 9:00 A. M., on October 23, of the year 4004 B. C." as part of the Divine Plan, it is amazing that such success should have dogged the steps of the students of human skeletal and cultural remains during t e last half century. The skeletons in part or in whole are known for a number of sub-human races and a vast array of implements and other remains, all showing a progressive advancement. By another fifty years, it seems safe to expect that much more of the story will be unveiled. It is further amazing that investigations in Egypt show the existence of a flourishing civilization in the Nile Valley as early as 5000 B. C., and back of this a gradual development from the barbarism of the stone age.

On man's intellectual side, psychology is making increasingly evident the essentially animal foundation of human intelligence. Man's claim to importance in the universe revealed by science lies not in the pretense that this planet was created for his convenience, but in the claim that he

transcends the material universe in so far as he comprehemds it. And the method of such comprehension that dominates modern thought is the method of science, not that of theology.

The question of human beginnings is one that is opem to investigation like any other historic or pre-historic event. In this connection a quotation from a famous essay by Herbert Spencer, published in 1852, is appropriate: "those who cavalierly reject the Theory of Evolution," writes Spencer, "as not adequately supported by facts, seem quite to forget that their own theory is supported by no facts at all. Like the majority of men who are born to a given belief, they demand the most rigorous proof of any adverse belief, but assume that their own needs none. Here we find, scattered over the globe, vegetable and animal organisms numbering, of the one kind (according to Humboldt) some 320,000 species, and of the other some 2,000,000 species (see Carpenter); and if to these we add the numbers of animal and vegetable species that have become extinct, we may safely estimate the number of species that have existed, and are existing, on the earth, at not less than ten millions. Well, which is the most rational theory about these ten million of species? Is it most likely that there have been ten millions of special creations? Or is it most likely that by continual modifications, due to change of circumstances, ten millions of varieties have been produced, as varieties are being produced still?"

And, one might add, if the evidence indicates that all other species have arisen bybevolution, it is probable that man, whose bodily structure and functions are so nearly identical with those of the mamalia and particularly the primates -- that man arose in a different fashion. We have, moreover, as above indicated, the positive evidence to support this general presumption.

Having outlined the evidence for human evolution and stated the presumption in its favor, let us turn to the evidence for special creation, as found in Genesis. Science and common sense alike inquire regarding the nature and sources of this account, if it be regarded as a true statement of the facts. Science faces the matter squarely, desiring only the right to investigate and draw unprejudiced conclusions. The results of such investigations are not in doubt. It appears that the races about the eastern Mediterranean, like other primitive peoples, had their traditions of the origin of the world. The story in Genesis apparently descended to the early Hebrews and to their neighbors in Mesopotamia from a source far antedating the appearance of the Jews as a people and their sacred writings. Archeology and ethnology most reasonably indicate that in its origin this Hebrew-Babylonian tradition may be compared with the stories of many other primitive peoples. We take the story in Genesis seriously as an account of pre-historical facts, because it is <u>our</u> story of creation passed down by tradition from <u>our</u> fathers. It is and will remain sacred and interesting, because it has been woven into the thought of western culture for almost two thousand years and because of its intrinsic literary and moral qualities.

But the past history of events, whether of human or animal origins, is subject matter for scientific inquiry, and the answer of science is Evolution. The very great antiquity of Man, the existence at an earlier period of beings, man-like, but intermediate between man and ither primates, together with the facts of man's anatomy, his embryology, his physiological reactions, even his mentality, all point to his bodily kinship with the rest of living nature. It is not that men came

from monkeys, but that men, monkeys and apes all came from a common mammalian ancestry millions of years in the past.

It is more reasonable to believe that the Bible is a homan document, representing the history of an advance from the concept of a barbarous and vengeful Jehovah of the earlier ~~New~~Old Testament, through the God of righteousness and justice of the later prophets, and culminating in the concept of a Father as preached by Jesus of Nazareth.

In the foregoing statement we havw considered the intellectual aspects of the doctrine of Orgamic Evolution. There remain its social aspects. Evolution is one of the basic concepts in modern thought. Suppression of a doctrine established by such overwhelming evidence is a serious matter. From the standpoint of the teacher the situation has more than academic interest.

Evolution has been generally accepted by the intellectually competent who have taken the trouble to inform themselves with an open mind. The following letter was written in response to a request to state his position, it having been alleged that he was not a believer in organic evolution:

"Washington, D. C.
29th August 1922

"My dear Professor Curtis:

"May it not suffice for me to say, in reply to your letter of August twenty-fifth, that of course like every other man of intelligence and education I do believe in Organic Evolution. It surprises me that at this late date such questions should be raised.

Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON

Professor W. C. Curtis,

Columbia, Missouri.

In view of all the facts, may we not say that the present storm against organic evolution is but an expression of malign influences of prejudice and ignorance, hostile to what we may envision as the high destiny of our western world.