

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

Special Creation.

C. E. Purchena.

Evolution is a Theory, not a law and as scientific investigation is attempting to make it solve its 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 or development is seen in nature. But is this the same evolution of which the scientist treats? Is it not merely common, natural, development? No these few data furnish grounds upon which to establish the elaborate theory of evolution? These are some of the questions which confront us.

It is acknowledged that there are many things which we cannot explain, the explanation 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 for both man
and beast to this common
environment - the most economical
and God-like plan of creation -
must 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

operati^on? 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 our
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 search, 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

4
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
or forty 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 damaging 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 apes-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

5
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 only 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,

6

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 creation will then why not also form man from

7
the dust, instantaneously, and
breaths 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 evolutionary development from
a tiny, shapeless cell soup and him
who desires to believe that his
first parent was a great and good
God hold to that belief 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.

May 12, 1908. C. E. Purchesal.

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 acceptance 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 explanation 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 or forty 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 evolutionary 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.