

Fax To: Ralph Winter

From: Becky Lewis

Dear Daddy -

I have received and read Ross's book and find it overall quite good. However, ~~see~~ if his intent is really to build solidarity among the Creationists and not create more friction it would be advisable for him to delete his quite-a-few specific ~~ref~~ negative references to certain well-known creationists - to disagree with their ideas is of course acceptable -- to call into question their scientific integrity or worse yet to "get revenge" by telling of negative personal encounters with them is not helpful to either his arguments or his cause. There is nothing wrong scientifically with making the hypothesis that the universe ~~is~~ or earth is relatively young (< 50,000 years), then trying to set up scientific experiments ~~to~~ that would substantiate that hypothesis, or find proof thereof, which is what I see most young-earth scientists as doing. Granted there are rabid know-nothings who will stick to 4004 BC and the King James Bible no matter what anyone says - I have even met some people who "don't believe" in dinosaurs!! But to call ^{into question} the scientific integrity of the young-earth scientists on the basis of these type of people is unwarranted - Ross betrays his own emotionally volatile stance by

referring to the young-earth perspective as a "dogma", "belief", pseudoscience etc. and contrasting it to scientific facts as if they have no facts on their side. It would be a shame indeed if no one even explored the possibility that the earth was quite young and that it was created in a short time. The young-earth scientists rightly believe that if they could prove this the very foundations of ^{the} atheistic evolutionary belief system would be destroyed.

What Ross could have emphasized more ~~or made~~ more clear, was his own belief (it seems) that God did create the species individually and did not merely control an evolutionary process (at some point putting a "soul" into an evolved primate etc). The scientific support for special creation of the species (and impossibility of evolution of life and ~~and~~ different species) is overwhelming and if it is a common ground between all creationists it should be emphasized as clearly as possible.

Also, Ross should be honest that the "Big Bang" theory still has one major problem to solve before it can be accepted as probable: i.e. the 90% of all the matter of the universe that is still undetected if the theory is to work - the "cold dark matter" that must be there (but has not yet been found) ~~in fact~~ to provide the gravity necessary for the galactic accumulations of stars.

God could have started with stars & galaxies - he did not have to start with a big Bang, just as he started with adult humans.

(See ~~Section~~ April 24, 1992 of the New York Times pg A16)

If you need me to be more specific about anything or want to call me — please do. I respect Rossé's attempt to bring an alternative Christian interpretation of Creation to the ~~the~~ Christian public and suspect he will be better received if he spends less time bashing the other side. Science by its very nature must be open minded and willing to respect those working on other hypotheses. The main reason non-Christians reject creationism is not because of the short time table of young-earthers, but because ^{some} people are trying to defend creationism without knowing what they are talking about ~~it~~, and because the introduction of an infinitely powerful intelligent agent makes anything possible — so it is "safer" and "more comfortable" to disregard any possibility of intervention. We will never prove to the public that God intervened or created anything. The best we can hope to do is continue to disprove their theories that would eliminate the need for God to intervene. Even BBC admitted recently that apart from "God" there is no current viable scientific theory for the beginnings of life. Hugh Ross is right that the actual age of the universe is inconsequential if we can demonstrate that life could not have evolved — why don't we all unite on that ground? Thanks for sending it.

Lots of love —

Becky
P.S. I personally still have a problem with death & disease preceding the fall.

Becky Lewis:

5:30 PM
Thurs
(Have to go to
pick up Tim)

Just saw your fax.

I'll type it up + send it to
Ross (+ Newspaper). Hope it
will do some good. Any changes
in your letter. Speak now!

— Ralph Winter

Fax to: Ralph Winter

From: Beeky Lewis

- Sorry - just got your fax sent after our office closed last night. My letter is ok as stands except you may want to change the phrase "betrays his own emotionally volatile stance" to "makes himself sound reactionary" or some other less offensive way of saying the same. If you already sent it, it is ok. Hope Tim arrived safely. We are all ok.

Love Beeky