

Dear Lynn,

I read "A Model of You." I must say you showed him a lot of patience! I'm going to read it again as soon as I get a chance to spend a couple of quiet hours with it. Even though I was involved in that contest with Lew—and much more could be said about that!—the perspective of seeing it through your dialog with my father was fascinating.

Since you were kind enough to post my Genesis One essay, I thought your readers might like this one too. It illustrates one of the points I was trying to make about the benefits of automation then goes on to add a little more to my Creation-as-Design argument and shows that the bedrock of what we call existence has to be the underlying METHOD.

All the best in Him

-Sonny Elam

## The Ball Cap Makers

It is supposed that three men set out (each independently of the others) to make their fortunes manufacturing 100,000 baseball caps. Somehow they were all inspired to do the same thing at the same time—thus becoming rivals—as sometimes happens.

The first man made each cap by hand—one cap per hour, 2,000 caps per year. He worked 50 years and retired.

The second man used a cap-making sewing machine. He set the design and size to fill each order manually and was able to

make ten caps per hour. He had to work only five years, and then he retired.

The third man spent six days creating a program and dictating it to a computer. The program was designed to take orders and run a cap-making sewing machine automatically. He retired after one week. The computer is still running after 50 years, having turned out over a million caps, during which time he has enjoyed delivering many of them personally.

When Genesis chapter one was written, people knew about designs: procedures for making something; procedures expressed in words. For example, God dictated the tabernacle: he told Moses how he wanted it done; Moses wrote down the instructions then parceled them out to the craftsmen—the instructions went out according to the instructions. This is the second-level programming principle: instructions producing more detailed instructions.

When Moses asked the Lord how long it took to make the world, he said it took six days. How did he do it? By his word: he gave the instructions.

It never occurred to Moses that some day there would be people wishing to distance themselves from the Giver of Life, people who would say that fruitful instructions can come into existence spontaneously. If Moses had foreseen Darwin and his army of disciples, he would have wanted to add something about intelligent design in order to prevent an evolutionary interpretation of the six days—six eons or however long mindless chance might need. Moses might have asked the Lord how long it took to design everything, but he would have received the same answer:

literally six days.

Designing can be seen as creating when that which the designer makes is what does the creating. The tabernacle exists permanently in the last six chapters of the book of Exodus. In other words, there is a higher level of creating where the maker's hand in shaping matter is a metaphor for the unfolding of the design in time. (Cap #10,000 made to order—your size, your color, and your logo—made especially for you by cap maker #3. And so it was: no one else other than cap maker #3 was responsible for doing it though his hand never touched it.) God created the tabernacle; Moses and the congregation of Israel merely followed instructions.

This principle is simple enough that the evolutionist can, with a wave of his hand, substitute for the intelligence of the Creator an impressive amount of time. "What is intelligence?" asks the philosopher. The Darwinist's answer reduces intelligence to an infinity of trial and error. That doctrine, which reason and imagination consistently reject, must be held in place by effort, which is the effort of rebel man to break his bond to Sovereignty.

Intelligence is precisely what is not trial and error. Intelligence may make use of trials, but whenever a trial is simply "trying something else" it is not an act of intelligence. Intelligence devises the method that eliminates many possibilities without a trial. To whatever extent the trial is "designed" by a method (a series of steps that can be mechanized), it is not an intelligent trial. The Darwinist points this out. There is an appearance of intelligence in naturalistic evolution, but it can all be reduced to a mechanism—never mind how much it depends on fortuitous happenings—

and therefore no intelligent creator is necessary in order to explain it.

We can afford to grant them that even. But there is no denying that the METHOD is a work of intelligence. The underpinnings of mathematics, physical laws, and fundamental procedures are the art of the master Creator: the divine Programmer.

Scientists have been accumulating evidence that, to one acquainted with the principle used every day by computer programmers, points to intelligently designed algorithms and methods. We need to accept their honest findings and hold them to the only sane interpretation rather than insisting that God's speaking everything into being is a metaphor for hands-on fashioning of every detail of his design; otherwise, we find ourselves in a position where we must explain why he did not want to appear to be as smart as they claim that their creator—time plus chance—is smart. Let us all marvel at the mechanisms that God has designed; there is no need to insist that such mechanisms do not exist. Let us agree with evolutionists that ball-cap makers #1 and #2 are fictions.

†