

DESIGN

by Luther Blackmon

Everywhere we see evidence of design, planning, contrivance. Even in the animal world about us we see this. For example, there are some fowls, like the chicken, which have a crop (crow) where food is ground or prepared for preliminary maceration. These eat mostly grain and seeds of various kinds. Then there are those like the hawk, eagle, kite, etc. which eat meat. These have a stomach or digestive system entirely different from those like the chicken. Along with this stomach these birds must also have claws on their feet with which to catch the rabbit, mouse, or whatever kind of meat is available. He must also have a hooked bill with which to tear the meat after he catches the prey. Can't you just see what would result if a bird was hatched with the hooked bill and stomach for eating meat but with feet like a duck? Or vice versa, if he had the feet with the talon, the stomach for meat and a bill for a goose?

But not only must the various organs of his body conform in this manner, but his surroundings must also be in conformity. The peculiar bill and tongue and claws of the woodpecker determine that he search for his food behind the bark of decayed trees where there are insects lodged. If there were no trees with worms in them his special bill, feet and tongue would be of no use.

According to the theory of evolution, the various characteristics of these fowls were developed out of necessity as a result of their surroundings. So the woodpecker developed his *tongue with the barb on the end*, so he could reach into the hole he had made with *his unique bill* while he was hanging onto the tree with his *unusual feet* and spear *his worm* which chance and fate had stored in that tree for him.

Now this all comes natural to the 20th century woodpecker. He has been that way all his life. But how about that woodpecker before evolution developed him all these wonderful accessories. Remember, it takes "millions of years" for these changes to become apparent. The old timers must have had it tough. I can't help wondering also why the worm didn't develop some sort of escape mechanism for himself while Mr. Woodpecker was accumulating all these features. The worm doesn't seem to have much going for him, but he is still around.

Then you take the rabbit. Everything that eats meat seems to like rabbit. Not only that, but the poor rabbit has no defense but his color and his speed. Yet after all these years that he has been the victim of all kinds of cats and dogs and wolves and men, there are more rabbits than there are cats and dogs and wolves. Why, I would ride a mule bareback with a blind bridle and slick bit twenty miles to hear some champion of the theory of organic evolution explain how the early rabbits managed to step up the production to stay ahead of the enemy like they have. It won't do to say that the rabbits

with the longest legs ran the fastest and got away so rabbits naturally developed longer legs, unless he can explain why the dogs and wolves didn't also develop longer legs so they could catch him. They had an interest in this business too, you know, and they had as much time to do it in as the rabbit. Not only that, but the rabbits still get caught and eaten. So the only explanation, as I see it, is in the production. The rabbits just had to step up production.

There is a wasp that stings the grasshopper in just the right place to paralyze him but not kill him. This preserves him alive. Then she puts him in a hole, lays her eggs in that hole and covers both the eggs and the grasshopper. When the eggs hatch, the little wasps have food from the grasshopper until they are big enough to make other arrangements. How did the wasp find out just where to sting this fellow without killing him? Instinct, of course. But what is instinct, and how did it begin? Where did he get it? There is no creator, no intelligence behind all this you know! It just happened this way. Such words as "time" and "instinct" cover a multitude of assumptions.

When the exponent of evolution is pressed for an answer to some of these things, he either "passes," or takes refuge in his favorite mantle, "given enough time." Reminds me of the doctor who didn't know what was wrong with his patient. The patient pressed for a diagnosis. The doctor asked— "Have you ever had this before?" "Yes, once," the patient replied. "Well," said the physician, "you've got the same thing again."