

But so far as the argument from design is concerned, I have only admitted the truth of the Theist's premises, to show their absurdity. We deny that the *fitness* and *adaptation* in Nature prove intelligent design at all, much less an omniscient designer. Design, if it exists in Nature at all, must be universal—not a portion of the phenomena designed, and the rest "at loose ends," undersigned. But does nature, as a whole, show intelligent design, or benevolent design? Is Nature perfect? Is she not rather filled with abortions, monstrosities, waste, "struggle for life," and "survival of the fittest?" When Paley showed the savage his watch, to make him understand that as the watch had a maker, the world must have had a maker, the savage, after noting the regularity of the ticking, etc., said, "Pale face wrong; pale face make watch, but Great Chief no make Earth, for Earth no compare with watch. Watch, he go right—but Earth, he no go right. Pale face rob red man—kill red man; red man starve when game is scarce; bear kill red man; storm come, blow down red man's tent; cold come, freeze red man's squaw—kill red man's papoose! Watch, he go right—Earth, no go right! Earth, no compare with watch!" This homely reasoning of the unlettered savage was too much for the theological metaphysics of Mr. Paley. If there is intelligent, benevolent design at the helm of this wonderful Universe, why should these things be? If all species of animals and men were designed and created by a good God, why should they not all be fitted to live and survive without eating and exterminating each other? Why the fierce struggle for life—not only between beast and beast, but between man and man? Was it designed that beast should devour beast, and man eat man? Has a benevolent God fitted and adapted them so to act, or has Nature done it? The jaws of the lion and tiger are nicely fitted and adapted to tear an innocent child to pieces, and eat it; but does this fitness prove a good designer? The potato bugs are nicely fitted and adapted to feed and live upon our potato vines; the weevil, to consume our wheat and peas; but it is, of course, all designed! The numerous human parasites, external and internal, are nicely adapted to feed and thrive upon living *human* bodies, and I suppose we ought not to object to the arrangement, or attempt to dislodge them—for have they not all been intelligently and tenderly designed to feed upon us? And when hundreds of human beings are consumed alive, in one grand holocaust, in a church or theatre; or a tornado sweeps a whole district; or an earthquake swallows up a whole city; or pestilence and famine depopulate a country, we must resign ourselves, for it is all designed!

But perhaps the most conclusive evidence of all against the idea of special creation and design in nature is to be found in the useless and *purposeless rudimentary structures* throughout the animal and vegetable kingdoms. There are numerous rudimentary organs, such as eyes, legs, lungs, mammary glands, muscles, teeth, wings, pistils, stamens, etc., to be found both in animal and vegetable bodies, having no functions whatever, and wholly without utility. Were these designed? If so was the design intelligent? There are animals that live in the dark, with eyes that do not see,