

Comparison of the Evolution and
Creation Theories.

by

F. A. Dawley,
Class of '95.

Outline

Introduction - - - -	#	1.
Synopsis of Evolution Theory		2-3.
" " Creation " "		3-7.
Conclusion.		8.

Some one has said, "If the Evolutionists theory of the origin of the universe is true the Creation theory must surely fall." This is a statement that is generally believed by those that have not thoroughly investigated both theories, and it is even believed by some of our brightest minds.

It is my purpose to examine the available evidence on both sides, and so far as I can show the true relation existing between these two apparently diametrically opposed theories.

I will endeavor to present a limited amount of evidence in favor of each theory, and where it is possible to show that the two theories coincide, and where it is not possible to reconcile the two, I shall follow what appears to me to be the most reasonable and the most reliable theory.

The evolutionist believes that the present condition of things has been evolved, by means of natural laws now in existence from a single "cell" or "a microscopic body of protoplasm, possessing sufficient individuality to have a life's history." This theory seems to be borne out by the nebular Hypothesis, but it neither attempts to account for the original cell,

or the great natural laws that govern the movements of the planets, as well as the development of the egg, which they take as a typical example of evolution.

In studying Darwin's "Origin of Species" and "Descent of Man" or Spencers "Theory of Natural Selection" or Haeckels "History of Creation" we seem to have conclusive evidence that man has ~~been~~ evolved by natural processes from some very low form of life. Darwin briefly traces him as follows. "Man is descended from a hairy quadruped furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arboreal in habits, and an inhabitant of the Old World. This creature, if its whole structure had been examined by a naturalist, would have been classed amongst the quadramans, as surely as would the common, and still more ancient, progenitor of the Old and New World monkeys. The quadrumana and all the higher mammals are probably derived from an ancient marsupial animal; and this, through a long line of diversified forms, either from some reptile-like or amphibian-like creature, and this again from some fish-like animal. In the dim obscurity of the past we can see that the early progenitor of all the vertebrata must

have been an aquatic animal, provided with branchiae, with the two sexes united in the same individual, and with the most important organs of the body (such as the brain & heart) imperfectly developed. This animal seems to have been more like the larvae of our existing marine ascidians or "Sea squirts." This in brief is the history of the development of man; and are we to accept it along with the other histories of evolution? or can we not find something in the Creation theory that is more encouraging as well as more natural?

This theory has been thoroughly investigated by some of our best naturalists, among whom we find "Joseph Le Conte", Arnold Guyot, Boardman, Prof. Drummond and others.

The theory is based upon the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, and Mr Guyot has explained it in a beautiful & concise manner in his little book entitled "Creation." It opens with these words, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, let there be light, and there

was light." Guyot divides his little book into seven parts corresponding to the seven creative days spoken of in Genesis. The above represents the work done in the first day or age, and it is argued by the creation advocates that the heavens and the earth were then in a gaseous state, and that the creator set the laws of chemical action into operation, and from this action heat was produced and as it became more intense light resulted and a rotary motion was set up. A nucleus of molten matter gradually accumulated and from this point on we have the Nebular Hypothesis verified.

On the second day God said "Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together in one place, and let the dry land appear". This shows that the universe has begun to form and that the earth had been thrown off from the main revolving mass and was beginning to cool. We find that that the water spoken of did not mean the same as today, but that it was probably the molten mass, while the dry land was the portions of the earths

crust that was forming at that time. Genesis says further that in the latter part of this same age plants sprung up and grew. This statement has been verified by geological research, and there are many places ~~that~~ ^{where} even the amateur geologist can study this age.

On the third day we seem to find a great break in the nebular Hypothesis or evolution theory, for on this day the Bible says that God set the sun, moon and stars in the heavens to govern the day and night. This may, at first sight seem to be wholly imaginary, but when we look at our sister planet Mars, and study her character we find that it is all very plain. Mars is now self-illuminating and has no use for the sun's heat. This seems to correspond to the earth's condition in the third day. Science tells us that the earth was at one time surrounded by a luminous photosphere, and about this time it was being dispelled, and thus the mysterious appearance of the sun, moon and stars can be easily accounted for. From that time

unto this the earth has received its light and heat from the sun.

In the next age we find that God created living animals and enjoined them to be fruitful and replenish the earth. We find evidences of these early animals way down in the igneous and archian rocks, and they were of a very low type. This is the second special creation spoken about in Genesis, and it is just here that the evolutionist finds his greatest trouble. He cannot bridge over the great chasm that separates the senseless plant from the living animal. We find the higher types of animals gradually appearing as we study the great history written in the rocks of the earth. We find that this development from the lower to higher types of animals does not contradict the bible as some people believe, for that good book only says that the higher animals appeared, which could all the evidence we have goes to show that they have evolved during the many ages to their present condition. All that is necessary is that there should be a beginning + creation provides for this.

The last and most excellent work of the Creator was the creation of man in his own image. To carry out the materialistic and natural way, God formed man out of the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.

If we accept this as the true history of the beginning of man instead of searching for time immemorial for the link that binds man to the lower animals we shall have cleared up a great mystery. Why should we not accept it? When we look into the blue heavens set with sparkling diamonds, or behold the billowy ocean breaking into spray on the beach. Look too at the grand old snow-capped mountains, with its treasure of hidden minerals beneath, and the forest extending far up its side, then turn and look into the valley beneath and behold the fields of ripening grain, the orchards laden with luscious fruit, the cattle grazing peacefully on the green grass. Look where you may, can you see anything that seems to show that there is not a God that governs the universe; and ~~that~~ or can

you see in the works of nature the hand of an all wise God that makes everything beautiful?

We cannot and would not have you believe that we would discard evolution for it is surely verified to a certain extent in Botany, Zoology, Geology & the other kindred sciences. The conclusion that we will have to draw is, that there was a beginning, which is accounted for by the Creation Theory; and that there has been a gradual development which evolution writers explain. From this we can honestly say that we believe that the two theories should go hand in hand.