

DUCKWEEDS, PALMS AND ORCHIDS

By DR. GEORGE F. HOWE
Assistant Professor of Biology
Westmont College
Santa Barbara, California

Frequently in the writings of contemporary evolutionists, one finds some amazingly frank statements about the problems facing evolution theory. Dr. Corner, who himself seems to believe in an orthogenic evolution, makes the following statement:

Much evidence can be adduced in favour of the theory of evolution — from biology, biogeography and paleontology, but I still think that, to the unprejudiced, the fossil record of plants is in favour of special creation. If, however, another explanation could be found for this hierarchy of classification, it would be the knell; can you imagine how an orchid, a duckweed and a palm have come from the same ancestry, and have we any evidence for this assumption? The evolutionist must be prepared with an answer, but I think that most would break down before an inquisition.¹

Upon clear scrutiny, it can be seen why Dr. Corner winces at the very idea of palms, duckweeds, and orchids being related to some common ancestor of all monocotyledonous plants.

The duckweed is a minute herbaceous plant which floats upon the surface of ponds. Having no clear-cut stem or distinct leaves, its flat little body may

have threadlike roots. The flowers are without any sepals or petals and they bear only 1-2 stamens. Palms, on the other hand, are generally large columnar trees which may approach 100 feet in height. They bear a persistent tuft of leaves which are sometimes mistakenly called "branches." Palm flowers generally have a regular and symmetrical arrangement of three petals and three sepals. The sepals and petals join the stem below the insertion of the ovary (hypogynous flower parts). Finally, the orchid flower is quite different than the regular flowers of palm or the extremely simple ones of duckweed. Orchids bear strikingly irregular flower parts with one of the petals frequently forming a beautiful cup-like structure. Flower parts are borne on top of the ovary (epigynous flower parts).

It is not easy to imagine that these three diverse plant kinds have descended from a common ancestor. I agree with Dr. Corner that such a proposition stretches one's scientific imagination to the breaking point! I further propose that this problem facing evolution is simply another evidence demonstrating the superiority of Biblical creationism as a working hypothesis in botanical science.

¹MacLeod, Anna M. and L. S. Cobley. 1961. Contemporary Botanical Thought, (Chapter by E. J. H. Corner, Botany School, University of Cambridge) page 97. Quadrangle Books, Chicago.