

Schweigerdt / Poure Correspondence
A Critique of Hugh Ross'
Creation and Time: A Biblical and Scientific Perspective on the Creation-Date Controversy
(Modified for Internet, January 2009)

June 26, 1994
Dr. Ken Poure

Dear Ken:

It behooves us to be cautious, diligent, and forthright when it comes to the subject we discuss here. I have often felt that the only people who are qualified to deal with the issues of time-lines are those who possess a child-like faith in God and His Word, have an interest in philosophical questions, and who see themselves as students of history.

Your letter mentions Ross' establishing that evolution and time-lines are separate issues; however Ross fails to realize that the only reason one needs to believe in an old-age universe is if there is a felt need to justify evolutionary notions. In that regard old-age and evolution are inextricably linked. Ross' assertion that "(i)nterpreting the Genesis creation days as tens of millions or even hundreds of millions of Earth years in no way lends support to evolutionism" (p.80) reveals a profound unawareness of Darwin's writings (and motives) as well as those of the early old-age proponents. Ross asserts that the whole age question is largely irrelevant (p.75), while at the same time composing a book to show how foolish, untenable and offensive (p.72) the young-earthers are; and how scientifically sound are the billions-of-years notions.

This ignorance of the history of old-age thinking gives Ross the confidence to challenge ICR's Henry Morris and his interpretation of evolution's impact on society (p.81). After extensive personal research on the history of old-age notions and evolution in general, I can here state on authority that Henry and John Morris are absolutely correct when they declare:

The continued insistence on an ancient earth is purely because of the philosophic necessity to justify evolution and the pantheistic religion of eternal matter. The old earth is an integral component of evolutionary ideas. . . The old earth concept is a requisite of evolutionism. (p.82)

Ross' idea that the universe is "only" 17 billion years old is not a final number by his own admission. Actually most evolutionists adhere to a universe 20-25 billion years old and this is what is taught in school, what appears in textbooks, and what is portrayed in the media. If you look at his chart on page 101 you will see that Ross' 17 billion is actually representative of a range from 11-24 billion years, hardly differing from the standard uniformitarian/evolution notion.

The matter of 17 vs 25 billion years is not the determining factor anyway in "proving" evolution -- reality is! The issue is not so much evolution as it is Uniformitarianism, upon which evolution and the old-age time-lines are based. Ross' cursory handling of this central point (pp.110-111) indicates either an ignorance of the subject, or a lack of interest in researching it fully. Worse, by his statement, "Coral atolls serve as one example of the principle of uniformitarianism and as evidence that the earth is hundreds of millions of years old," Ross is admitting that he has bought into the spurious assumption which Lyell proposed.

In the process of attempting to re-establish the broadly discredited gap and old-age creationist notions Ross unwittingly denies the universal, cataclysmic, world-destroying "flood" of Noah. This denial among the secular, naturalist circles came about primarily because the Noahic Event represents, first and foremost, the judgment and terrible wrath of God against the world's sin; and consequently, it is the ultimate Old Testament's testimony of Man's need of a Savior.

The denial of the Universal Flood also undermines faith in all the Biblical accounts of the providential acts of God. The Flood (and Noah's salvation) was, no doubt, the most dynamic event, completely supernatural in its scope, that has ever occurred in earth's history. Its not the most significant -- clearly the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Christ represents such to the believing world -- but it surely had the largest physical impact of any other of God's earthly interventions.

Notice that Ross tries to avoid the Noachic flood or pooh-poohs it as one of the "weaknesses" of the young-earth argument (p.73). In fact, based on his discussion on pages 104-5, Ross seems totally ignorant of the Flood and its impact on the earth's surface (p.55). In the final analysis, the Noachic Flood is the true demarcation between the uniformitarian and the creationist world-views.

If I understand Ross' goal in writing *Creation and Time*... it is to reconcile the old-earth and young-earth notions and dispel the animosity which he perceives exists between the "Christian" and the "scientific" communities. In this he fails miserably, primarily because he is an unabashed and dogmatic old-earthier who attempts to carry these bizarre notions into Christian theology. He boldly declares that even the theological case (as opposed to the scientific) supporting a young earth is untenable! (p.72) And, as indicated on page 89, Ross has a proselytizing mission to convert young-earthers to his point of view. Objective on this subject he is not!

Clearly (and to be intellectually honest) Ross should classify and openly declare himself to be an antagonist, a combatant on this time-line issue, and not one who has arrived on the scene to present the healing (and saving) solution that can bring both sides together in one harmonious understanding. Anyone who would uncritically cite these words, "(I)t would be easier to believe in a flat earth than to believe the universe is 6,000 years old, or anything other than about 15 billion years old" (p.101), has certainly revealed his bias.

In all of my considerable research I don't recall anyone who has attempted to camouflage his true intentions as Ross has done. Morris, Ham, Gish, Austin, Gentry, Denton / Lyell, Darwin, Huxley, Hawking, Gould, Sagan, have all clearly defined themselves as antagonists and are willing to declare their true motives, and the reader knows (usually beforehand) where each stands on the issue. Ross unwittingly reveals his bias early on by referring to the young universe and young earth ideas as a "faulty creation message" (p.13), and he should simply come forth and declare that there is no compromise in his position. To equate the age issue, the matter of creation and a reflection of the Creator Himself, with the early Church issue around circumcision (pp.160-162) is naive at best.

Ross' notion that young-age proponents (even Christian churches, schools and organizations) are "anti-science" and "anti-intellectual" (p.165) provides an insight into his bias, his limited knowledge of the creationist movement, and even reveals his ignorance of what science is and its realm of operation.

Ross wrongly stereotypes all young-age creationists as intolerant of Christians who hold to old-age notions (p.43). In this regard he is seriously ill-informed and misguided. Let me give you an example.

In our church fellowship we have a wonderful young Christian family where both parents are science teachers. They came to Christ after receiving their formal education and so they go through some real struggles on the issue of time-lines. I recognize this and rather than condemn them (as Ross asserts I would do) I simply see the difficulty their belief in an old-age universe has for their spiritual growth. I view these dear people as no less a Christian than myself.

For Ross to assert that the Morrises, et.al., are responsible for preparing Christians to be hate-filled and full of contempt for others holding divergent views is naive at best, and at worst a pathetic understanding of history and present trends.

I do not doubt the personal (and hurtful) experience Ross shares on page 86. What he and other old-earth believers fail to realize is that the outburst he describes results from the indoctrination which students have been subjected to in public school science classrooms for the past 40 years. There exists even today a solidly entrenched mindset which mandates that students thoughts about creationism are unreasonable and should not (cannot) be allowed expression within the science classroom (refer to the California Science Framework, page 20 for specifics on this point). Believe me, as an educator who opposes dogmatism and indoctrination at every point, I confront this problem far too often!

Ross repeatedly puts forward the notion of the "Facts" of science. There are many who would like to project themselves as "imminent experts" in certain fields, and the profession of the sciences, with white coats and all, is no exception. If a science student is taught well however, s/he will learn that the scientific method does not allow for such an attitude. All theories of science (even the laws -- i.e., gravity, which remains, after all, the least understood force in nature) are open to scientific investigation. An attitude which says in science that we have reached ultimate truth = "fact" is what Hawking describes when he acknowledges that a common occurrence for scientists is knowing the result they want to get before doing their science. In that sense, they become self-fulfilling prophets.

Ross needs to be especially careful based on the long tradition of his field (astronomy) which can be directly linked to the alchemists and astrologers of old, always seeking to know the future that their

wares might be turned to gold. The analogy holds for the modern astronomer who peers through the scope, applies his unique philosophic expertise, mixes in a bit of elixir, and a large dosage of grand wizardry, turning the observations of the present into "knowledge" of the past in order to be a recognized prognosticator of future events.

The authors of the *California State Science Framework*, which "guides" curriculum in our state would like (force?) us to believe that "a fact is a statement based on confirmed observation and inference... (like)... the descent of birds from dinosaurs."

People can react to the ludicrousness of such a statement of "fact" in several ways, but none-the-less, the state has codified this bizarre idea in policy and now it is a prominent display in all the major dinosaur exhibits which the public is exposed to.

These "confirmed observations" have indeed led to an inference: A reptile fossil with wings = half reptile, half bird. Denton (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*) does an outstanding job in refuting such nonsense, but beyond that, the average person doesn't realize that wings don't a bird make (as the old Dutchman would put it). There are flying insects (mosquito, flies, hoppers, beetles, etc.), flying mammals (bats), and, during the days when reptiles were more prominent, there were reptilian specimens that flew! To make the inference that birds descended from reptiles based on some spurious fossil "evidence" is not science, it is pseudo-science at best, and foolishness at worst!

In the same fashion, Ross places full faith and trust in his field of "expertise" – astronomy – and tells us that there can be no (or very little) doubt that astronomy has the final word when it comes to questions pertaining to the age of the universe. Could it be that Ross has become so heavenly-minded that he is no earthly good?

MAN'S WISDOM - OUR FOOLISHNESS

Ken, forgive me for sermonizing a bit here, but Ross' chapter nine (9), "Scientific Evidences for the Universe's Age," sent me on a real mission. This is where Ross rather arrogantly tells us "scientific evidences explicitly and overwhelmingly affirm [the old-age of the universe]." Ross obviously views himself as the quintessential scientist (although his methodology lacks at least one essential descriptive requirement -- stated assumptions) and as such he is trying to tell us that he (and astronomers in general) are singularly qualified to interpret the past for the lowly commoner.

Such arrogance is bound to lead one to a great deal of self-deception, and the foolishness that follows, when compounded many-fold by an entrenched and dogmatic body of closed-minded intellectualism, can send any number of persons off in completely errant directions.

The Apostle Paul had a similar experience with the intellectuals of his day when he visited Mars Hill. The big difference is that the Greeks actually invited him to speak and present his case, with several listening open-mindedly. I'm sure that because of this experience as well as others of like happening, Paul could pen the words found in 1 Corinthians 3:19, "For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, 'He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.'" Taylor, in his paraphrase puts it this way: "God uses man's own brilliance to trap him; he stumbles over his own 'wisdom' and falls." I would say that God uses the simple things of the world to confound the wise.

As an astronomer, Ross claims that he is looking into the past and actually seeing the initial stages in the creation of the universe some 17,000,000,000 years ago (p100)!

What is the problem with his logic; and what is Ross actually "seeing"? When it comes to matters of "history" (years ago), Ross unabashedly puts his faith in science and interpretations of what is "observed", rather than the record of inspired scribes, most notably the author(s) of Genesis. Ross' relentless quest for knowledge of the past, gleaned from the "facts of nature" (as correctly interpreted), in order that he might be the acknowledged expert of the present, has led him down a perilous path.

Hawking (*A Brief History of Time...*, p168) discusses (and apparently holds to) this same elitist, esoteric, and neo-Gnostic attitude:

Because theories are always being changed to account for new observations, they are never properly digested or simplified so that ordinary people can understand them. You have to be a specialist, and even then, you can only hope to have a proper grasp of a small proportion of the scientific theories. . . . Only a few people can keep up with the rapidly advancing frontier of knowledge, and they have to devote their whole time to it

and specialize in a small area. The rest of the population has little idea of the advances that are being made or the excitement they are generating.

Are Ross and Hawking "aware" and do they sound "excited"? They certainly make it sound as if they are. But, alas, it reminds me of the adage that all too frequently a specialist is someone who learns more and more about less and less, until finally he knows *nothing* about *everything*! In a previous work (*The Creator and the Cosmos...*, 1993, p.87) Ross freely admits to having struggled with professional pride, among scientists that being to know the mind of God, as Hawking (*ABHT*, p175) puts it.

This "professional pride" emanates from two sources; one being the natural human desire to become as God – all powerful, all knowing, immortal; while the second source comes from feelings of inadequacy which academicians frequently struggle with: The "Publish or Perish" syndrome. In a field where the only *goods* produced are theories and expositional papers, there is a constant need for self-gratification, self-advancement, and a large measure of hype which can inevitably lead to self-deception!

Unlike the craftsman who has a tangible product to display and who then is judged to be either a novice or master in his field, the scientist practices an esoteric art, one which brandishes a need for expertise, interpretation, and once that, professional speculation (often classified as "scientific fact"). Such pride is, of course, an affront to God and directly contrary to the design of His Word, which is provided on the premise that the faith of a child is sufficient to gain the depths of its meaning, and that includes the facts of His creation.

By setting aside the literal Genesis creation account, applying spurious tests of Biblical criticism while seeking knowledge of the ultimate, reminds me of the ugly incident of Eve, the serpent, and the Tree of Knowledge as recorded for us in Genesis 3. Malcolm Muggeridge, the British journalist and Christian intellectual, offered these insightful words concerning the quest for knowledge that seems so applicable here:

Accumulation of knowledge is a form of avarice, and lends itself to another version of the Midas story; this time of a man so avid for knowledge that everything he touches turns to facts. His faith becomes theology; his love becomes lechery, wisdom becomes science. Pursuing meaning he ignores Truth!

What is it that astronomers actually see as they peer through their scopes? Is it really the past? How does time, that limiting force over our being, restrict us to the present and keep us functional as human beings?

In the first place, time, as an entity, is difficult to understand. We experience it moment by moment in the present, and we readily use it to make life operational; but we understand so little about it. And, because of our mental limitations, we find *eternity* impossible to comprehend. We find a similar problem when we pass from present to past, and present to future.

For the past we have recorded words, oral traditions, pictures, and memories which allow us to catch glimpses of things that happened before. Each of these aids give us considerable problems as has been repeatedly demonstrated. Our memories are fogged and overwhelmed with information which hinders our ability to recall particulars. Consider the witness at any court trial. Oral traditions add and lose substance as time flows on -- witness any gossip chain. Recorded history (even audio and video tape) is open to the interpretations of the recorder as well as the reader/viewer. Truly, pictures are worth a thousand words and usually a thousand meanings.

For the future, we have imagination, calculated predictions, and prophecy to give us indications of what will transpire in time ahead. Imaginations are known to run wild; predictions are many times false; and as Christians we are repeatedly warned about prophecy.

So what is it that astronomers "see" in the skies that would lead them to believe that they know the age of the universe? If anything, the heavens provide a picture of the present, light-years notwithstanding! God allows us to comprehend the beauty of His majestic creation in the present, not the past. How does worldly "wisdom" manifest itself in today's intellectual and technologically-charged environment of ideas?

Albert Einstein had a brilliant mind and contributed much to scientific and metaphysical debates. His ideas have largely captivated the scientific community in a way that Newton's once did. (I find it interesting that Hawking, the evolutionary physicist, could make this statement: "We still use Newton's theory for all practical purposes. . . [because it]. . . has the great advantage that it is much simpler to work with than Einstein's!" - *ABHT*, p10. Indeed, the worldly wisdom has become so bizarre that we are now being led to believe, as principles of science, such peculiar notions as the uncertainty principle, imaginary

time, imaginary numbers, quantum measurements – all in the name of "sound science" by proclaimed experts and specialists in specific scientific fields. No wonder that Hawking started his concluding chapter by saying "We find ourselves in a bewildering world." Not much joy or hope in that statement. The rest of his book had simply boxed him in and left him in this dilemma. Contrast that message with the Psalmist as he marveled in the majesty of God's creation.)

But, in one highly significant and critical area for our purposes, Einstein made a mistake which, I believe, has done much to send the fields of worldly wisdom on an errant course. When he proposed that time was simply a dimension of space (instead of being a created entity unto itself) the notion of space-time was accepted, and with it the idea of light-years and a dimensional measurement of not just distance but a measurement of time (in the past). To uncritical minds, light-years as a measurement of time provides a simple tool for projecting all sorts of notions and "facts." This gross misunderstanding has caused the field of speculative science (the quest for origins) to literally fixate on the past (cf. my essay "Time As An Issue"). It is my assertion that time is not a dimension of space but a separate (yet integrated) entity of our existence.

With that thought in mind, could it be that as Ross peers into the heavens, what he is witnessing is a dimension of time which is simply beyond human understanding – indeed, looking into a realm of eternity where the constraints of time don't exist, and time (millions and billions of years – light-years!) are mere illusions? Remember that time as we know it is a uniquely earthly experience governed by both georotational forces and inherent ageing (factors possessed by all living forms).

When one peers into eternity he enters into a non-time experience. Recall that time has many aspects. But essentially time is consecutiveness and successiveness. In eternity things may be largely simultaneous (Wood, pp.135-136).

Ross repeatedly seeks assurances that God has not deceived us (i.e., p.97). Instead of a Divine Deception, what Ross actually (and unwittingly) encounters is his own misinterpretation of God's creative and sustaining processes, processes which quite possibly fall outside the realm of human comprehension.

This notion is analogous to our inability to understand eternity, omniscience, omnipresence, the *Tri-unity* of God, an immaculate conception, a resurrection from death. These are facts to be trusted in by faith, and repeatedly acknowledged as parts of God's magnificent glory. They apparently are not intended to be reduced to Man's poor and restricted capacity of knowledge.

We don't know how Christ came back to life, but we (those of us who share His wisdom) understand that He did, and why He did. We don't know why God manifests Himself to us in three "forms" but we understand and experience Him to be so. We don't know why He chose to create the universe and all there is in six days, when He no doubt could have done so instantaneously, or over 17 billion (or 25 billion for that matter) years; but we know from His Word that He performed His creation one earthly day at a time, with the sun "rising" and "setting" once each day. To argue otherwise is to replace faith with theology, and wisdom with science, in Muggeridge's inspired words.

* * * * *

Now that the sermon is over, I will comment on some additional concerns raised by *Creation and Time*.... Are you still with me?

As an educator I am deeply concerned that we are not preparing our children to be critical thinkers. Some of those who speak of this dilemma are my colleagues in science who are upset because so many students (in fact a majority) graduate from high school still believing that God created everything; and even that within a young-age context. Obviously someone is not doing their job correctly; and critical thinking in this fashion really means indoctrinating young people so that they will "know" as fact that evolution and all it represents is true and correct.

Believe me when I say that there are a number of elitists who hold that it is immoral to teach young people that God created, and that the Universe is 10,000 years old. Witness the work of the reactionary Berkeley group, the National Center for Science Education (NCSE) which bills itself as the protector of science education. Ross cites this group (p37) with impunity while also recognizing their antagonistic nature: "The declared purpose of NCSE and [their committees of correspondence] is to 'keep scientific creationism from being taught as legitimate science'". Apparently Ross agrees with this bigoted purpose.

With that attitude what is left but to indoctrinate students in evolutionary notions. Instead of giving our students all points of view, and teaching them how to critically analyze the information they're

given, our educational institutions attempt to overwhelm with information and then proceed to indoctrinate students through the science and social science (history, etc.) curriculum, through the ubiquitous textbooks, and through the selection (and exclusion) of alternative views.

I've included a copy of a cover letter from NCSE to science educators. I have a copy of each of the 10 (ten) brochures which they publish and send free upon request. I would strongly suggest that you request them to send these to you. They are a real eye-opener! Simply write to their address and request them (www.ncseweb.org).

Ross gives every indication of being caught-up in what I call the "reasonableness syndrome." This is most pronounced as he is trying to lay the theological ground-work for his old-age notions (pp.49-58). When people don't have a firm grounding on an absolute and immovable truth they frequently speculate, and often do so wildly (ie. Hawking, *A Brief History of Time...*). Ross has bought into the "seems reasonable" terminologies that permeate much of "the "scientific" literature today.

According to Ross, it "seems reasonable to conclude then, given the parallelism of the Genesis creation account, that the first six days may also have been long time periods." (p.49) He is willing to speculate about the true ages of Adam and Eve at creation (p.54). Ross feels that it is reasonable to conclude that the physical universe speaks truly (p.55).

Usually these people are more than willing to draw firm conclusions from their speculations even when there is little objective evidence to support their position. Sometimes they make far-fetched statements as when Ross finds that the diameter of the universe (!) must be no less than 56,000 light years (p.58). And frequently such speculating can produce some rather foolish conclusions as we see when Ross discusses his idea of ethnos. He actually classifies the community of scientists (whatever that is) as an ethnos! This is a real stretch of the language, to say the least.

Ross also has a strange understanding of the term spontaneous (p.75). Perhaps he gets too close to the evolutionist camp when he pens the words "spontaneous *formation* of life." Formation implies external input; spontaneous essentially means taking place without external force or cause. It should be noted here that evolutionists have been toying with the notion of spontaneous generation as the fundamental platform for biological constructs for years (although Redi and Pasteur disproved it); and in the most recent edition of our 7th-grade biology textbooks they are again asserting its possibility!

Whenever I see scientists using speculative language while trying to convince others of their argument, I get skeptical, as I'm sure you can see by the essay I've enclosed for your pleasure.

* * * * *

This raises an issue that greatly disturbs me about Ross' theology which is found on pages 55-56:

Many young-universe creationists limit the Word of God to the words of the Bible. Since the Bible declares that only God and His Word are truth, these creationists consider information from any source outside the Bible as inferior and suspect.

Apart from the fact that he goes on to make a ludicrous sweeping generalization ("To them, extra-biblical data holds little value for clarifying what the Bible teaches on any issue or for prompting correction of faulty interpretation"), for Ross to place himself open for extra-Biblical *revelation* is highly dangerous. The extent to which he goes in this regard is clearly revealed in his discussion: "So, God's revelation is not limited exclusively to the Bible's words. The facts of nature may be likened to a sixty-seventh book of the Bible." This is pretty weighty stuff -- words which immediately bring to mind Revelations 22:18-19:

And I solemnly declare to everyone who reads this book: If anyone adds anything to what is written here, God shall add to him the plagues described in this book. And if anyone subtracts any part of these prophecies, God shall take away his share in the Tree of Life, and in the Holy City just described. (LB)

The years of contact with Catholic and Mormon friends has taught me the dangers of seeking extra-biblical revelations, as well as the pit-falls in serving under a prophet (or pontiff). In fact, a study of religious history reveals that it has been an appeal to extra-biblical "truth" that has led to the abuses prompted by those who claimed to hold this so-called truth. We know it to be error; but to those who pay their

allegiances to their ecclesiastical authorities, the word of the prophet are as good, and often better than gospel (and the Gospel).

I'm going to make a harsh-sounding statement here, so please stay with me. Ross sees himself as a scientist's scientist; he affronts both evolutionists and young-earth creationists, in the process declaring that his notion of old-earth creationism is the only correct way. Then he proceeds to set himself up as having the solution for all the animosity that exists in the debate; and if his solution is accepted he would truly be a savior, wouldn't he?

I've been a student of these areas (science, creation/evolution, world religions, human psychology) for many years, and I am so thankful that God has held me strictly to His Word, and that I've had teachers like yourself who have taught me no other way. The liberty we experience because we accept His Word literally, and none other as "truth," is a blessing that passeth understanding.

The other side of that coin is the bondage experienced by those who find the need to seek "truth" elsewhere. I have an abiding sorrow for those who are caught up in the cults (religious and scientific - and many times they blend); and I'm afraid that our brother Hugh Ross is moving in that direction. That is not to say that he is far from the truth (the real, literal Biblical truth) on this matter.

I don't know if I've ever shared with you how I was freed from this bondage. You should hear it since you played an important part in helping me to obtain my liberty. Here is that story.

I was raised in a Godly home and attended Bible-believing churches -- you know what I mean. When I went to high school our pastors frequently warned us about the atheistic sciences as this was just the time (early 60's) when evolutionary indoctrination was gaining a foot-hold. There was, as such, no creationist movement to offset the dogmas we were confronting, and the pastors weren't taught how to help us confront the issue and preserve our faith in the God of creation.

As a result I avoided the sciences in my studies. When I went to college I ultimately ended up in the sociology department at a very "liberal" state university. This was in the days (1966-67) when the campuses were burning and Herbert Marcuse and Angela Davis were blanketing the state with their socialistic and atheistic messages.

By the time I had graduated college, my faith had been seriously challenged and deeply wounded. It manifested primarily as a questioning of the Bible and its worth. I was now an intellectual and my eyes had been opened to other "truths." For me it centered around the creation account, 6,000 vs. billions of years. I had been so indoctrinated in the long time-spans that I felt the need to reject the first parts of the Genesis account of Scripture. As I did that, other doubts crept into my faith and I didn't know which way to turn.

To top it off, I was working in a very "liberal" occupation as a social worker, and these "intellectuals" were really mixed up. It got to the point where I didn't know which account to embrace.

In October of 1969 you conducted a brief evangelistic series in the church just down the street from us. At that time the Holy Spirit prompted me to respond to your invitation and rededicate my life to Him.

What followed next was amazing. As part of my commitment I give God "one more chance" and determined to have a time of devotion each morning. Shortly thereafter, as I was reading John 14, I rediscovered v.6, where Jesus says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life. . . ."

I had always been taught that Jesus was the *way* and the *life*; but the "truth" part was just glossed over by my Bible teachers. At that point I accepted Jesus as Truth. Almost immediately the "fog" was removed from my "eyes" and I could "see" a recent creation. Following that blessed event I again could take the entire Word literally (and seriously)! That was a liberating event for me. I've had no doubts since!

Well Ken, any more books you want to send me? Don't feel so bad. I have a former student who writes (types) me letters this long and she fully expects similar verbosity in my responses. So I'm used to some rather lengthy correspondence.

In all seriousness, and with great appreciation, I express to you how stimulating this study was. It is another example of how your efforts have aided me in this compelling calling which the Lord has prepared me for. I just hope it has been a help to you and yours.

Sincerely,

Bruce Schweigerdt, M.A.
(address)