

olding record of what *Homo*
is planet during the past ten
olocene period).
universe that surrounds us.
aps more aptly, *not* known
of *Homo sapiens* prior to the

nts the picture has changed
the Huxley/Haeckel heyday
ssity from a limited *terrestrial*
early man—scientists rigidly
ms that still hold sway.
ears ago a vicious battle,
aged in Rome to prevent the
ith of the masses might be
pagans” had wrought such

d by more broad-minded
bited solely by wild animals
nae, to the astonishment of
whose credo taught that
ng anything of importance,
of legend.

discoveries taking place all
hout new key facts added to
ble to remain any longer
nian concept of prehistoric
m caves and bogs and two
main straitjacketed even in
arwinian illusion deemed so
restrial evolution.

d us, there is today not the
xley described as the “abyss
o sapiens has proved he can
at the sun is only one of 100
, and that the Milky Way is
verse.

Observatory some years ago
public, by announcing that
ere probably 100 million

inhabited planets in the universe—on two-thirds of which, based on the ages of other stars, there are probably intelligent beings more advanced than ourselves—he was talking about one one-thousandth of one percent of the estimated number of planets in the universe.

And when the equally distinguished astronomer Otto Struve expressed the belief that there may be one billion inhabited planets in the Milky Way alone, he was still talking about only one percent of the estimated total.

Only an extremely hard-backed traditionalist would deny that our present knowledge of the universe adds at least some potential new dimension to the question of *Homo sapiens*' origin and ancestry, certainly as compared to a century ago.

One can only speculate, for example, on the reactions if at that momentous Linnaean Society meeting in 1858 when Charles Darwin presented his preliminary paper on the origin of species he had spoken the following sentences:

Any civilization capable of communicating with earth from another planet would unquestionably be older than man's. It would have long since mastered the problems that now plague the earth; pollution, overpopulation, and the ever-present threat of war would surely be a part of its past. And if it had learned to control the awesome power of the technology that it surely must possess, perhaps it would teach that secret of survival to man.

Although “survival” was Darwin's principal topic that evening, on such terms it would have been totally incomprehensible to both the speaker and his distinguished audience. Yet, when these sentences appeared in *Time* magazine's cover story, “Looking For Life Out There” (December 13, 1971), they were understood and accepted as logical by thousands of readers who had been conditioned to them by fourteen years of man's ventures beyond the environs of the earth, as well as by our rapidly expanding knowledge of the universe.

Is it mere coincidence that, couched in old-fashioned, pre-Darwinian language, *Time*'s observations in essence add up to the following statement: “Salvation may come to those living in this vale of tears through the intervention of wiser beings who dwell in heaven”? Is there an indication that when the Genesis version of Creation was (quite rightly) discarded in favor of the theory of evolution, man's ancient knowledge of the true state of affairs in the world around us