

Superhuman Engineer design the superior material and structure of our human bone system????

Is not ascribing these highly complex designs of pulley systems, wheel and axle, lubricating discs and bone structure in the human body to time, chance and environment an exercise in far-fetched reasoning?

Since analogous inventions in engineering have been developed by human minds with certain inventive powers, is it not more plausible to explain these precise working mechanical systems in the human body by the creative acts of an Intelligent Planner?

The great design in the human body is further evidence of a divine creation during some short unprecedented period of time and militates against belief in the philosophy of chance combination of molecules-to-man evolutionary development during some speculated long period of time.

References

- ¹Bell, C. H., D. P. Cuthbertson, and J. Orr. 1941. Strength and size of bone in relation to calcium intake, *Journal of Physiology* (London), 100:298-317.
²Clark, W. E. LeCross. 1971. The tissues of the body. Oxford, Clarendon Press, p. 102.

THE MAGNIFICENCE OF KINDS AS DEMONSTRATED BY CANIDS

HILBERT R. SIEGLER*

The author speculates about the degree of excellence with which the Creator first endowed the newly created kinds (MIN), and suggests that one manifestation of this past glory was the genetic variability with which each "kind" was endowed. The canids are used as an example to demonstrate this potential for variability.

The article proceeds to list the major categories of canids: 118 different breeds of domestic dogs and many types of mongrels, Pariah Dogs, Dingos, and seven true wild dogs; four different species of Jackals; five different species of wolves, among which the Gray Wolves and Coyotes are known to occur in a large variety of races; and at least 13 different species of Foxes. All four major categories of canids have been known to crossbreed.

While evolutionists consider these many varieties as results of evolutionary processes at work, the author argues that these varieties "devolved" from superior created canids, but within the boundaries of the MIN. He also suggests that creationists begin to use the term "baramin" when referring to "kind."

And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

—Genesis 1:31

One can only speculate as to the degree of excellence with which the universe was started, and how this excellence was embodied in plants and animals first placed upon the earth. There remain, today, many manifestations of this past glory. One of these must surely be the fantastic variety of plants and animals found on earth.

There is strong evidence that the Creator in the beginning of time endowed each kind (MIN) with attributes superior to those found in the individual species existing today.¹ One very important attribute was the genetic variability these kinds possessed. This is demonstrated to a marked degree by the carnivores in the Family Canidae.

Members of this Family are distributed worldwide and seem to be absent, according to Walker,² only from New Zealand, New Guinea, Melanesia, Polynesia, the Moluccas, Celebes, Formosa, Madagascar, the West Indies, and

several other oceanic islands. Walker³ lists the following 14 genera:

- (1) *Canis* (Domestic Dogs, Wolves, Dingos, Coyotes, Golden Jackals, Black-backed Jackals, and Side-striped Jackals);
- (2) *Alopex* (Arctic or Polar Foxes);
- (3) *Vulpes* (Red Foxes and Kit Foxes);
- (4) *Fennecus* (Fennecs);
- (5) *Urocyon* (Gray Foxes);
- (6) *Nyctereutes* (Raccoon Dogs);
- (7) *Dusicyon* (South American Foxes);
- (8) *Atelocynos* (Small-eared Dogs);
- (9) *Cerdocyon* (Crab-eating Foxes);
- (10) *Chrysocyon* (Maned Wolves);
- (11) *Speothos* (Bush Dogs);
- (12) *Cuon* (Indian Dholes);
- (13) *Lycan* (African Hunting Dogs);
- (14) *Otocyon* (Big-eared Foxes).

Again one can only speculate how many of present day known canids are derived or were embodied in one God-created "kind" (or "baramin," as proposed by Marsh⁴). Jones presented^{5, 6}

*Hilbert R. Siegler lives at Rt. 1, Concord, New Hampshire 03301.

a strong argument from which one might conclude that the entire Family Canidae could have developed from one created "kind."

The writer, on the other hand, has suggested that the oft repeated phrase in Genesis "after its kind" indicates that different MIN are genetically unrelated, which would imply that the offspring of a MIN are genetically related.⁷

It is possible that both Jones and the writer are not too far from the threshold of truth concerning the subject. It is, in fact, conceivable that the problem lies with those modern day taxonomists who have been prone to create an unnecessarily large number of generic categories within the different Family categories.

The writer has contended that all living organisms, plants or animals, that have been known to interbreed, cross-breed, or cross-fertilize should be placed in one genus.⁸ If this criterion were accepted then all members of the Canidae known to interbreed would be classified as one genus.

Crossbreeding has been demonstrated among the following: Domestic Dog, Wolf, Coyote, Dingo, Arctic Fox, Red Fox, Asiatic Jackal, and Crab-eating Fox. Thus it would seem that Walker's *Alopex*, *Vulpes*, and *Cerdocyon* should also be placed in the genus *Canis*.

In fact, this has been done by various taxonomists. Among them are the Fiennes⁹ who have reduced the 14 genera listed by Walker to 5, by placing all such carnivores in the *Canis* category with the exception of Dholes (*Cuon*), Bush Dogs (*Speothos*), African Hunting Dogs (*Lycaon*), and Big-eared Foxes (*Otocyon*).

While the possibility remains that all members of the Family Canidae can and would under certain circumstances crossbreed, a review of those groups known to crossbreed may make the reader aware of the vast potentials the Creator placed in just one created "kind."

Dogs

If genetic variability has ever been demonstrated, it is in *Canis familiaris*. The American Kennel Club,¹⁰ which maintains a catalogue of all breeds, lists dogs under the following six categories: Sporting Dogs (24 breeds), Hounds (19 breeds), Working Dogs (29 breeds), Terriers (20 breeds), Toys (17 breeds), and Non-sporting Dogs (9 breeds). The breeds vary in size from four pound Chihuahuas to some breeds which weigh as much as 180 pounds. However, non-breeds (or mongrels) probably show far greater variety in physical characteristics than the 118 listed breeds.

Along the eastern shores of the Atlantic through Africa, southern parts of the Balkan peninsula, the Caucasus and southern Asia, groups of dogs are found that differ from domestic dogs in that they are not attached to human masters. Many

live in and around human settlements where they scavenge for food. These dogs are collectively classed as Pariah Dogs.

Epstein¹¹ calls attention to two theories to account for their origin, namely, 1) that they represent a transitional stage between wild ancestors and domestic dogs; and 2) that they have descended from domestic dogs which have turned semiferal.

The Pariah Dogs also show a tremendous degree of variation from country to country. They vary in size from the fairly large Berber dogs to the Pomeranian sized Pariahs in Ethiopia. There is even a hairless variety in Africa.

In Australia and throughout the Indonesian Archipelago a semi-domesticated form of the Asian Wolf, called the Dingo, is found. It is believed that the dingos in Australia, where they turned feral, were originally brought there by aborigines from Asia.¹² This canid has not shown the marked tendency toward variety found in domestic and pariah dogs, although it does vary considerably in color.

There are also various species of truly wild dogs,¹³ among which are listed the following: Magellanic Dog (*Canis magellanicus*) in the forests and deserts of South America, Crab-eating Dog or Fox (*Canis cancrivorus*) in the forests and plains of South America, Small-eared Dog (*Canis microtis*) in Amazonia, Azara's Dog (*Canis azarae*) in the South American bush, Small-toothed Dog (*Canis parvidens*) in Brazil, Striped-tailed Dog (*Canis eurostictis*) in Brazil, and the so-called Gray Fox (*Canis virginianus*) in the United States and Central America. While the possibility exists that all may interbreed, it is known that the crab-eating dog has crossbred with domestic dogs.

Jackals

These canids have repeatedly been crossed with domestic dogs.¹⁴ The Golden Jackel (*Canis aureus*) occurs throughout southern Asia. The Gray Jackal (*Canis anthus*) ranges over much of North Africa. The Black-backed Jackal (*Canis mesomelas*) is widely spread over southern Africa, while the Side-striped Jackal (*Canis adustus*) is found in the Kilimanjaro area.

Jackals, particularly *Canis anthus*, occur in a variety of geographic races as evidenced in differences in body sizes, coat color, and skull measurements. These variations can be found in the Red Sea Jackal, East African Jackal, Egyptian Jackal, and the largest Egyptian wild dog not inferior in size to the wolf, the Nubian Jackal.

Wolves

Except for several breeds of dogs, some of the largest living canids are wolves. They apparently represent a vast reservoir of variability. In North

American taxonomists at one time recognized as many as 23 races of Gray Wolf (*Canis lupus*).¹⁵ Many scientists believe that the parent stock of the first domestic dogs were four major wolf groups.¹⁶ In addition, three varieties of Red Wolf (*Canis niger*) have been found in southern United States, the Maned Wolf of South America (*Canis jubatus*), the Abyssinian Wolf (*Canis simensis*), and the Coyote (*Canis latrans*), subdivided into at least eight different subspecies by Anthony.¹⁷

New strains are still appearing. In the early 1930's a type of wild canid hitherto unreported from New England was found. Intermediate in size between the Western Coyote (*Canis latrans*) and the Gray Wolf (*C. lupus*), it was variously identified as "brush wolf," "coyote," and "coydog."

After an eight year study, two game biologists from the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department, and a curator of mammals from the Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology, finally determined that, since the genetic structure of these animals had been established to the point where they breed true, and on the basis of various anatomical features, this new canid should be designated *Canis latrans* var., and called Eastern Coyote.¹⁸ The authors concluded that "these animals have evolved from coyotes with the introduction of some dog and/or wolf genes sufficiently long ago for the population to have become stabilized."

Foxes

Like wolves, foxes show a tremendous variability in pelage, size, and relative proportions of various parts of the body. The Red Fox (*Canis vulpes*), for instance, is listed by Anthony¹⁹ as appearing in the form of twelve different subspecies. Foxes can mate with dogs, resulting in fertile offspring.²⁰

The following different species of foxes, in addition to the Red Fox, are listed by the Fiennesses²¹: Kit Fox (*Canis velox*), Arctic Fox (*C. lagopus*), Corsac Fox (*C. corsac*), Tibetan Fox (*C. ferrilatus*), Desert Fox (*C. leucopus*), Bengal Fox (*C. bengalensis*), Hoary Fox (*C. canus*), Raccoon Fox (*C. procyonoides*), Asse Fox (*C. chania*), Pale Fox (*C. pallidus*), Ruppel's Fennec (*C. famelicus*), and True Fennec (*C. zerda*). Each of these shows considerable variation.

Discussion

Even a cursory review of this great variety of species, subspecies, geographic races, and breeds found among the canids, will produce varied reactions among biologists, depending on philosophical approach of each individual to the subject.

Evolutionists find in these many differences much support for so-called evolutionary proc-

esses. For this reason they continue to apply the term "evolved" to the many changes found. This term is used by Fiennesses, Epstein, and Silvers throughout their publications cited in this paper.

The writer believes that the term "evolved," with the generally accepted implications of change toward the more complex, is utterly unacceptable, since no increase in complexity can be shown in any of the many resulting varieties. One's imagination would be stretched seriously were someone to suppose that the present tremendous variety of canids could have "evolved" from a beagle, or a red fox, or a western coyote, or for that matter, from any of the other canid species known today.

However, it is not unreasonable to think of superior created canids having the inherent genetic capabilities to give rise to a great variety of canids with lesser genetic capabilities such as beagles, red foxes, or western coyotes. If this assumption is correct, it would follow that the term to describe such a process of change should be "devolve" rather than "evolve." Scientists should talk about "devolution" rather than "evolution."

Whether this assumption is correct or not, the fact remains that creationists must soon develop precise terms relevant to many of the processes now described by biology textbook authors in words with evolutionary connotations.

The creationist, for instance, contends that the Genesis kind (MIN) has strict boundaries beyond which change (or "evolution") is impossible. He also concedes the fact that many varieties of plant or animal life can develop within these boundaries.

Therefore, creationists should recognize the importance of firm adoption of a word that will precisely describe the word "kind" as derived from MIN. Dr. Frank L. Marsh has suggested^{22, 23} the word "baramin." Unless someone proposes a better term, is it not time for wide acceptance and use of that word? Also is it not time that creationists substitute for the words "evolution" and "evolve" the terms "devolution" and "devolve," respectively?

References

- ¹Siegler, Hilbert R. 1972. Evolution or degeneration— which? Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis.
- ²Walker, Ernest P., et al. 1968. Mammals of the world. Two vols. Second Edition. Revision for Second Edition by John L. Paradiso. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.
- ³*Ibid.*, pp. 1152-1168.
- ⁴Marsh, Frank L. 1947. Evolution, creation, and science. Second Edition. Review and Herald Publ. Assoc., p. 174.
- ⁵Jones, Arthur J. 1972. A general analysis of the Biblical kind (MIN), *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 9(1):53-57.

- ⁶Jones, Arthur J. 1972. Boundaries of the MIN: An analysis of the Mosaic lists of clean and unclean animals, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 9(2):114-123.
- ⁷Siegler, Hilbert R., *Op. cit.*, p. 39.
- ⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 38-40.
- ⁹Fiennes, Richard and Alice. 1970. The natural history of dogs. The Natural History Press, Garden City, N.Y., pp. 203-220.
- ¹⁰The American Kennel Club. 1972. The complete dog book. Howell Book House, 845 Third Ave., New York, N.Y., pp. 1-640.
- ¹¹Epstein, H. (and revised with I. L. Mason). 1971. The origin of the domestic animals of Africa. Two vols. Africana Publ. Corp., 101 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y., p. 110.
- ¹²Fiennes, Richard and Alice, *Op. cit.*, p. 29.
- ¹³*Ibid.*, pp. 210-213.
- ¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 208.
- ¹⁵Young, Stanley P. and Edward A. Goldman. 1944. The wolves of North America. The American Wildlife Institute, Washington, D. C., pp. 1-636.
- ¹⁶Fiennes, Richard and Alice, *Op. cit.*, p. 15.
- ¹⁷Anthony, H. E. 1928. Field book of North American mammals. G. P. Putman's Sons, New York, N.Y., pp. 151-152.
- ¹⁸Silver, Helenette and Walter T. 1969. Growth and behavior of the Coyote-like Canid of Northern New England with observations on Canid hybrids. Wildlife Monograph No. 17, The Wildlife Society.
- ¹⁹Anthony, H. E., *Op. cit.*, pp. 139-141.
- ²⁰Fiennes, Richard and Alice, *Op. cit.*, p. 214.
- ²¹*Ibid.*, pp. 213-218.
- ²²Marsh, Frank L., *Op. cit.*, p. 174.
- ²³Marsh, Frank L. 1964. The Genesis kinds in the modern world, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Annual Issue, pp. 30-38.

LEGENDARY EVIDENCE FOR THE CONFUSION OF TONGUES

JAMES E. STRICKLING*

Legends about a flood are about universal; this fact is strong evidence to show that the Noachian Flood was universal. Some investigation has been made to see whether legends of a confusion of tongues, such as that recorded in Scripture as having happened at the Tower of Babel, are also universal, or at least widespread. While such legends have not been found to be so common as flood legends, there are some about a confusion of tongues, and they are found in significantly separated parts of the world. Of course, belief in the truth of Scripture does not depend upon such legends, yet such corroboration is interesting and worthwhile.

(At one) time all the world spoke a single language and used the same words. As men journeyed in the east, they came upon a plain in the land of Shinar and settled there. They said to one another, "Come, let us make bricks and bake them hard"; they used bricks for stone and bitumen for mortar. "Come," they said, "let us build ourselves a city and a tower with its top in the heavens, and make a name for ourselves; or we shall be dispersed all over the earth." Then the Lord came down to see the city and tower which mortal men had built and he said, "Here they are, one people with a single language, and now they have started to do this; henceforward nothing they have a mind to do will be beyond their reach. Come, let us go down there and confuse their speech, so that they will not understand what they say to one another." So the Lord dispersed them from there all over the earth, and they left off building the city. That is why it is called Babel, because the Lord there made a babble of the language of all the world; from that place the Lord scattered men all over the face of the earth.

—Genesis 11:1-9 (New English Version)

Deluge. Why, then, are there so relatively few surviving accounts of the "Confusion"?

The confusion of tongues occurred only once, as did the Great Deluge. However, there was other widespread flooding during ancient times that depopulated great areas of the earth. Such catastrophes served to embellish and perpetuate the memory of the Great Deluge of Noah's day. Awareness of the confusion was not similarly strengthened.

Ancient Non-Biblical Account

The oldest non-Biblical account of this event is found on an ancient Assyrio-Babylonian tablet now housed in the British Museum. The tablet is not in very good condition, only a few lines

Introduction

Unlike the world-wide proliferation of flood legends, there is no great abundance of extant legends concerning the confusion of tongues. This dearth of accounts seems somewhat strange at first thought for two reasons. First, the Great Deluge is of greater antiquity than the confusion of tongues.

Furthermore, there were many people who experienced the "confusion," and members of each group could contribute to perpetuation of the memory of such an event; whereas the Bible emphasizes that only one family survived the Great

*James E. Strickling lives at 3309 DeKalb Lane, Norcross, Georgia 30071.