Dickinson College Archives & Special Collections

http://archives.dickinson.edu/

Documents Online

Title: "Evolution vs Special Creation," by Caleb E. Burchenal

Format: Commencement Oration

Date: June 6, 1900

Location: Orations-1900-B947e

Contact:

Archives & Special Collections Waidner-Spahr Library Dickinson College P.O. Box 1773 Carlisle, PA 17013

717-245-1399

archives@dickinson.edu

Evolution Vs Spicial Cereations.

6. 6. Burchenal.

Evolution is a Theory, not a law and as pcientific investigation is attempting to make it polos ets problem of creation, et is our duty, as searchers In the truth, to be very careful in its acceptation of many of ets far reaching conclusions. It's do not demy that evolution of developement es peen in nature. Sut is this the pame evolution of which the scientist treats? Is it not merely common, natural, developement? Do ches few data Jurush grounds upon which to establish el elaborato eleory of evolution? These are pour of the questions which confront us.

It acknowledge that there are many things which we cannot explain, ih explaination is with God alow. Seed on the other hand the beautiful hypothesis of evolution does not effetain all things and, rug believe does not even demolish a few arguments which are derectly contradictory of the evolutionists Javorche theory. Many of his deductions are based repos the similarity in the physical, emotional, and mental structure of els animal world. Sel does elies proos any relationship other chan a common creator? On infentely wise

creator would proceed animals as To adapt chen in the best possible way to their environments, and as man and all the animal world have much of the pour physical environment - as they all ar amenable to ele law of gravitations; all are nourished, in pour from, by ih earth; all depend upon the ofygen or other gases of the air or water for the support of life then it Jollows that the most perfect adaptation In both man and beast to this common environment - ele most economical and God-like plan of creation must of necessity have som marks

in common. The emotional nature depends largely upon the physical and would cherefore, show some marks of similarity. But mental capacity which depends least upon physical environments, we find it most wedly differentiated. Therefore part of this similarity in the annual creation may be efplained on other grounds that it assumption, that all annual life developed Jose a common ancestry. If all created life is the result of a process of development from a primition protoplaning cell, then why has that wonderful process of growth ceased to

operati? Turn the pages of history for the last five or pix thousand years and we do not find on record g pingle motance of a monkey, suddenly or gradually, developing ento a mais. No, he is a monkey and he remains a monkey. If a process of natural peliction is applied to develop him into other than a monkey, it is found that he becomes more of a monkey or, in other words, a more perfect monkey; his monkey, not his man characteristics, as held by the evolutionist, are more highly developed. How take forms of life

whose duration is phort - animals of puch natures that it life of our man can writness it berth and death of a thousand generations - we should expect to see some plight change and purely several generations of men could find the verefication for this great law of evolution. But no change, after diligent search, has been discovered. The beetle remains a beethe and assolutely refuses to support evolutions by developing ento pome tregher from of lefe. The most essential Jacker of a law of evolution must be differentiation as it postulates

lef. first existing in our simple forms and Joon these simple protoplasming particles, whether created by spontaneous generation, by meaningless chance, or by the creative power of an allfowipe God - Joon thes primition life germs - all of it many forms of life how sprung, and being the very law of nature we naturally look for this differentiation of animal Jornes to continue but this is not the cast. The species are continually on the gecreass. Dones guthorities hold that there were formerly thirty or fourty times as many species as at the present - that many from are gradually becoming estimat.

This is exactly what we should expect from an act of special creation and efactly contradictory of creation by evolution. One great damaging fact which confoots the Evolutionist is Ih missing link". This is the Ferm used by scientists to bridge the chasen between man and the very highest form of ap-life. Without it ils evolutionist can not establish his complete chain of development, and yet this missing link", ele neft in order of creations to man, continues to Thwart all attempts to supply it. The geologist has unearthed

many interesting facto, its remains of animals long since extent have been uncovered, but nowher - reither in its infields of its horth, nor on the parched plains of Osia, not en ele deux jungles of Offica nowhere in whatever derection the deligent search of man has extended, in no crevice, cave, of claft has one from o even a ringle suggestions of this missing link" been Jourd. Het ever existed, how could et disappearance be so complete? Until the missing link is found evolution is nothing mon than a crude trypolhers demanding glow our admiration.

according to the laws of a material world, by which ih evolutionist orgues, materiality count come into existence of etself- something court come out of nothing. Therefore he must admit the interventions of God; first in the creation of the world and pecoudly, in the creations of left, as spontaneous generation of life is deemed impossible by its greatest thinkers. In the third place if he believes that was has g poul, then, unless he holds that the first primitions cell, that the lettle Jungus plant, that the penseless jelly-Jish, all have souls,

then he must admit the creature act of God again und order to give man his immortal soul. If the evolutionist admits that God created it universe and life and the poul by special acts of creations they surely one caused be counted equorant and unreasonable to pay that God created man by special creation. Soch schools must admit of special creation. The only difference is as to its times and the results of about special acts. Covolution may be true. It's admit ets possibility but we think et lighly improbable. Science has

has been proven woong many times. With nearly every age many scientific elievies have been effeloded and we have found a Jew objections to this theory of the creation of man by evolutions. But what is opposed to the creating of man by a special act of God? If Fod placed material in space and they so enterfered with that great rebulous choos as to mould this earth; if God breathed upon enorganic matter and organic left sprang into existence - all by special acts of his creation well their why not also from man from

the dust, instantaneously, and breaths into his norticles the breath of lefe and of He's immortal spirit thus orgain employing his creation power for a special purpos: And why would It not do it? If Its performed two or three acts of special creation their why not perform our mon? namely create may. There is no reason. Therefor let hims who desires to consider knusely the result of evolutional development from 9 ting, shapeless cell dops and him who gleseres to believe that his first parent was a great and good God hold to that belief also, In the theory of evolutions has many

mysteries yet Li polus, many arguments yet to meet before it can firmly establish etsely un il minds of all min. It of know that as certain special acts of creations were necessary that in holding to the special creation of man the probability is that we are not very far from et twich. C. C. Burchenal. may 12, 1900.

Commencement Oration of Caleb E. Burchenal, Class of 1900
Transcribed by Meg MacAvoy, September 2008
Edited by Krista Gray, September 2008

Evolution vs Special Creation

Evolution is a theory, not a law and as scientific investigation is attempting to make it solve the problem of creation, it is our duty, as searchers for the truth, to be very careful in the acceptation of many of its far reaching conclusions. We do not deny that evolution [as?] developement is seen in nature. But is this the same evolution of which the scientist treats? Is it not common, natural, developement? Do these few data furnish grounds upon which to establish the elaborate theory of evolution? These are some of the questions which confront us.

We acknowledge that there are many things which we cannot explain, the explaination is with God alone. But on the other hand the beautiful hypothesis of evolution does not explain all things and, we believe does not even demolish a few arguments which are directly contradictory of the evolutionists' favorite theory.

Many of his deductions are based upon the similarity in the physical, emotional, and mental structure of the animal world. But does this prove any relationship other than a common creator? An infinitely wise

creator would so create animals as to adapt them in the best possible way to their environment, and as man and all the animal world have much of the same physical environment—as they all are amenable to the law of gravitation; all are nourished, in some form, by the earth; all depend upon the oxygen or other gases of the air or water for the support of life—then it follows that the most perfect adaptation in both man and beast to this common environment—the most economical and God-like plan of creation—must be of necessity have some marks

in common. The emotional nature depends largely upon the physical and would therefore, show some marks of similarity. But mental capacity which depends least upon physical environments, we find it most widely differentiated. Therefore part of this similarity in the animal creation may be explained on other grounds than the assumption that all animal life developed from a common ancestry.

If all created life is the result of a process of development from a primitive protoplasmic cell, then why has that wonderful process of growth ceased to

operate? Turn the pages of history for the last five or six thousand years and we do not find on record a single instance of a monkey, suddenly or gradually, developing into a man. No, he is a monkey and he remains a monkey. If a process of natural selection is applied to develop him into other than a monkey, it is found that he becomes more of a monkey or, in other words, a more perfect monkey; his monkey, not his man characteristics, as held by the evolutionist, are more highly developed.

If we take forms of life

whose duration is short—animals of such natures that the life of one man can witness the birth and death of a thousand generations—we should expect to see some slight change and surely several generations of men could find the verification for this great law of evolution. But no change, after diligent research, has been discovered. The beetle remains a beetle and absolutely refuses to support evolution by developing into some higher form of life.

The most essential factor of a law of evolution must be differentiation as it postulates

life first existing in one simple form and from these simple protoplasmic particles, whether created by spontaneous generation, by meaningless chance, or by the creative power of an allpowerful God—from these primitive life germs—all of the many forms of life have sprung, and being the very law of nature, we naturally look for this differentiation of animal forms to continue but this is not the case. The species are continually on the decrease. Some authorities hold that there were formerly thirty of fourty times as many species as at the present—that many forms are gradually becoming extinct.

This is exactly what we should expect from an act of special creation and exactly contradictory of creation by evolution.

One great discouraging fact which confronts the evolutionist is the "missing link." This is the term used by scientists to bridge the chasm between man and the very highest form of ape-life. Without it the evolutionist can not establish his complete chain of development, and yet this "missing link," the next in order of creation to man, continues to thwart all attempts to supply it. The geologist has unearthed

many interesting facts, the remains of animals long since extinct have been uncovered, but nowhere—neither in the ice fields of the North, nor on the parched plains of Asia, nor in the dense jungles of Africa—nowhere in whatever direction the diligent search of man has extended, in no crevice, cave, or cleft, has one fossil or even a single suggestion of this "missing link" been

found. If it ever existed, how could its disappearance be so complete? Until the "missing link" is found evolution is nothing more than a crude hypothesis demanding alone our admiration.

According to the laws of a material world, by which the evolutionist argues, materiality cannot come into existence of itself—something cannot come out of nothing. Therefore he must admit the intervention of God; first in the creation of the world and secondly, in the creation of life, as spontaneous generation of life is deemed impossible by the greatest thinkers. In the third place if he believes that man has a soul, then, unless he holds that the first primitive cell, that the little fungus plant, that the senseless jelly-fish, all have souls,

then he must admit the creative act of God again in order to give man his immortal soul. If the evolutionist admits that God created the universe and life and the soul by special acts of creation then surely one cannot be counted ignorant and unreasonable to say that God created man by special creation. Both schools must admit of special creation. The only difference is as to the times and the results of those special acts.

Evolution may be true. We admit its possibility but we think it highly improbable. Science has

has been proven wrong many times. With nearly every age many scientific theories have been exploded and we have found a few objections to this theory of the creation of man by evolution. But what is opposed to the creation of man by a special act of God? If God placed material in space and then so interfered with that great nebulous chaos as to mould this earth; if God breathed upon inorganic matter and organic life sprang into existence—all by special acts of his creative will then why not also form man from

the dust, instantaneously, and breathe into his nostrils the breath of life and of His immortal spirit thus again employing his creative power for a special purpose? And why would He not do it? If He performed two or three acts of special creation then why not perform one more? namely create man. There is no reason. Therefore let him who desires to consider himself the result of evolutional development from a tiny, shapeless cell do so and him who desires to believe that his first parent was a great and good God hold to that believe also, for the theory of evolution has many

mysteries yet to solve, many arguments yet to meet before it can firmly establish itself in the minds of all men. We do know that as certain special acts of creation were necessary that in holding to the special creation of man the probability is that we are not very far from the truth.