

Dragonfly Flight and The Designer

Dave Miller, Ph.D.

More proof of the existence of the Master Designer comes from research conducted by Z. Jane Wang, professor of theoretical and applied mechanics at Cornell University (Gold, 2006). Centering on flying systems and fluid dynamics, Dr. Wang notes that the best way to learn about flight is by first looking at what happens **naturally**. Interesting. In order for the complex human mind to comprehend the principles of flight, that mind must focus on the **natural** order—the Creation. So mind must learn from that which, according to evolutionists, came into being and developed **without any mind**. Intelligence is dependent on **non-intelligence**. Who can believe it?

Reporting her findings at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Wang observed that her research calls into question the conventional wisdom that ascribes to airplanes (human inventions) more flight efficiency than the flying creatures of the natural realm. Dragonflies, for example, are “a marvel of engineering” (Gold, 2006). “Marvel of engineering”—without an Engineer? So claims the evolutionist—despite the irrationality of such a conclusion.

Indeed, the dragonfly possesses four wings, instead of the standard two, enabling it to dash forward at speeds approaching 60 kph. Its unusual pitching stroke allows this amazing insect to hover and even shift into reverse. According to Wang: “Dragonflies have a very odd stroke. It’s an up-and-down stroke instead of a back-and-forth stroke.... Dragonflies are one of the most maneuverable insects, so if they’re doing that they’re probably doing it **for a reason**” (Gold, 2006, emp. added). “For a reason”? But doesn’t “a reason” imply a **reasonable** mind behind the reason that **thinks** and assigns a **logical rationale** to specific phenomena?

The more scientists study dragonflies the more they are impressed with these “marvels of flight engineering” (“How Do Things...,” n.d.). They appear to twist their wings on the downward stroke, creating a whirlwind of air that flows across the wings, facilitating the lift that keeps them flying. Even more amazing, one Australian scientist, Akiko Mizutani, of the Centre for Visual Science at the Australian National University, has studied dragonflies at length in the past few years. She observes that, while chasing its prey, dragonflies “shadow their enemies in complex manoeuvres that military fighter pilots can only dream of. Their tricks create the visual illusion that **they’re not moving**” (as quoted in “How Stealthy...,” 2003, 2398:26, emp. added). In fact, according to Dr. Javaan Chahl, the

quick aerial movements allow the dragonfly to disguise itself as a **motionless object** (“Military Looks to Mimic...,” 2003, emp. added). These insights are not lost on the military establishment. They recognize the incredible implications for technological development—from the ability of fighter aircraft to approach the enemy undetected, to greater maneuverability, to enhanced helicopter logistics. Indeed, “scientists believe the insect’s flight control could have applications in new planes and helicopters” (2003). Is it any wonder that one of the very first helicopters produced was named “Dragonfly” (“Sikorsky...,” 2003)? If no one considers the helicopter as the product of time and chance, why would any reasonable person believe that the insect to which scientists are looking for an understanding of principles of flight evolved from mindless, mechanistic forces of nature?

If the human mind, with all of its complexity and ingenious design, is necessary to engineer flight capability (e.g., airplanes), what must be said for the Mind behind the human mind? If scores of intelligent scientists must expend vast amounts of time, energy, intention, deliberation, knowledge, and thought in order to discover the secrets of the “efficient motions” of the dragonfly, what must have been required to create that dragonfly in the first place? Mindless, non-intelligent, unconscious, non-purposive “evolutionary forces”? Ridiculous! Time and chance **do not** and **cannot** account for the amazing design found in insects like the dragonfly. The only logical, plausible explanation is that dragonflies were designed by the God of the Bible, and they testify to His wisdom: “You are worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for You created all things, and by Your will they exist and were created” (Revelation 4:11).

REFERENCES

- Gold, Lauren (2006), “On the Wings of Dragonflies: Flapping Insect Uses Drag to Carry its Weight, Offering Insight into Intricacies of Flight,” *Cornell University Chronicle*, February 19, [On-line], URL: <http://www.news.cornell.edu/stories/Feb06/AAAS.dragonflies.lg.html>.
- “How Do Things Fly?” (no date), Boeing, [On-line], URL: http://www.boeing.com/compan_yoffices/aboutus/wonder_of_flight/dragon.html.
- “Military Looks to Mimic Dragonflies” (2003), *ABC News*, June 5, [On-line], URL: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/newsitems/200306/s872489.htm>.
- “How Stealthy Insects Outsmart Their Foe” (2003), *New Scientist*, 2398:26, June 7.
- “Sikorsky HO2S-1/HO3S-1G ‘Dragonfly’ ” (2003), USCG Homepage, [On-line], URL: http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-cp/history/WEBAIRCRAFT/AC_Sikorsky_HO3S.html.



Q What, exactly, is nothingness?

A That seems like a simple question. The Merriam-Webster on-line dictionary defines “nothing” as: “something that **does not exist** b: the **absence of all** magnitude or quantity” (“Nothing,” emp. added). To the average American mind, “nothing” is an understandable and understood concept. Yet those in the evolutionary community are attempting to redefine nothing. In a recent article about the theoretical branch of physics known as string physics or string theory, Dr. Michio Kaku suggested that string theory can explain the existence of the Universe. Dr. Kaku said that “a string is concentrated energy from which everything else is made. A string is so tiny that it can’t be seen with any of our instruments” (“In Tune...,” 2006, p. 30). Dr. Kaku also suggested that string theory could inform us about the events that allegedly happened before the Big Bang. These strings certainly seem to contain a wealth of potential.

In the article, he was asked, “if strings create everything, what created the antecedent space and time?” His response to this question was that “the probable answer is that space, time, and everything around us comes from *nothingness*” (p. 30, italics in orig.). Dr. Kaku was then asked, “Nothingness is actually filled with physical reality?” To which he matter-of-factly responded, “That’s right. We think nothingness is actually chock-full of interactions” (p. 30).

Observe the sleight of hand that took place in Dr. Kaku’s answers. If there ever were a time when nothing (zero matter or energy) existed, then nothing would currently exist. Knowing that, Dr. Kaku and many of his fellow string theorists say that the Universe came from nothing. Yet, when asked to define nothing, they simply say that nothing was actually filled with something. Let’s get this straight: the Universe came from nothing, but nothing is really something? One is reminded of Alice’s encounter with Humpty Dumpty in Wonderland in which Humpty stated: “When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.”

Simply changing the definition of nothing to something will not overcome the problem that atheists have for explaining the existence of matter. In truth, string theory, the Big Bang, and every other materialistic theory falls woefully short of explaining the existence of the Universe. The most accurate statement that has ever been made on the subject was written some 3,500 years ago: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1).

REFERENCES

“Nothing” (no date), *Merriam-Webster On-line Dictionary*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/nothing>.

“In Tune with ‘Strings’” (2006), *Advance*, Winter.

Kyle Butt

IN THE NEWS

Scientists from NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center and Columbia University have uncovered evidence that confirms there was once a massive flood in the northern hemisphere. According to their computer models, the flood occurred approximately 8,200 years ago and resulted in climate changes that decreased the temperature. Their report noted:

The last major abrupt climate change occurred at ~8.2 kiloyears before present (kyr) and is recorded in multiple proxy records across the Northern Hemisphere. Contemporaneously, glacial Lakes Agassiz and Ojibway catastrophically drained into the Hudson Bay, possibly delivering enough freshwater into the North Atlantic to affect the ocean circulation (LeGrande, et al., 2006, 103[4]:837).

Could this discovery be pointing back to the Noahic Flood?



Scientists had previously documented changes in isotope, aerosol, and methane levels—all of which pointed to a major cooling event. The group used a fully coupled atmosphere/ocean general circulation model

in an effort to determine what could have caused the climate changes. Their computer model used a flow of water that was equal to between 25 and 50 times the flow of the Amazon River in twelve model runs that took more than a year to complete. While none of the scientists involved in this study would suggest that this data supports the idea of the global Flood they did indicate that the effects of this event were “clearly expressed” in Greenland and Ammersee, Germany. The scientists suggested this catastrophic flood was caused by retreating glaciers. Interestingly, they documented significant decreases in temperature in the northern hemisphere—something that creationists have long suspected would have occurred after the global Flood. Multiple evidences demonstrate that the Earth’s climate has changed, and fossil records indicate that the Earth was once covered with water. The logical conclusion that incorporates all of the available evidence is the global Flood—as recorded in the book of Genesis.

REFERENCE

LeGrande, A.N., G.A. Schmidt, et al., (2006), “Consistent Simulations of Multiple Proxy Responses to an Abrupt Climate Change Event,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103[4]: 837-842.

Brad Harrub

R&R RESOURCES