

March 30, 1973

Dear Mr. Herrmann and Staff,

This morning I completed reading your recent letters, an additional letter from Mr. Sidney Hegwood, and the reports from our Pasadena staff. We all have had the opportunity to view the film about tracks at Glenrose, Texas.

All this leads me to draw to our attention the real source of our problems and divergencies of view. We are not all using the same standards for what constitutes proof. We are not always critically examining those areas of science that will provide the evidence to resolve conflicts. We are too prone either to read interpretations into the Bible or to draw final causal conclusions from the natural sciences. We claim there is no conflict between true science and the Bible. But this is a spiritual concept. It is not based on the fact that we have examined all true science and found it so. We have only examined a small portion of science that bears on the Bible. And we have not altogether exhausted what the Bible says about the universe and earth. We cannot afford to read into science an indefensible interpretation simply because we think we see the proof in the Bible. And we cannot read into the Bible what we think we see from the natural sciences. We do not know either that thoroughly yet.

To resolve the problem in geology we must dedicate our efforts toward a study of the area of geology that is critical to our problem: "tertiary man." I have held two meetings here to that end.

I have asked John Hapkinson to examine all the available books and articles pertaining to "tertiary man" that Bentet's paper has listed. The printed evidence will be made available. It must be critically examined, and honestly examined. (Sometimes there is a difference between the two!)

Since the Bible is, on other grounds, a proven volume, we can know the following: strata, in natural superposition, that contain the kind of evidence attributable to man are evidence of the presence of man when those strata were superimposed in their present natural order. If it proves true that "tertiary man" is a reality, then we must reevaluate the philosophy underlying evidence of time. For "tertiary man" to be a reality, we must not only have critically and honestly examined the evidence, but we must also have a logical explanation for interrelationships of "tertiary man" and the succeeding pleistocene evidence of man.

We can argue at length over the matter of the passage of time, or the possibility of apparent age, or catastrophism. But no answer is possible so long as the question of "tertiary man" is unresolved. We cannot merely transfer all evidence of "tertiary man" to the pleistocene unless there is other, accompanying and compelling evidence. Nor can we maintain that creation week is in some way related to cretaceous strata, if the only evidence of man before the pleistocene is Glenrose prints, but no culture or any animal life, as we know it, is properly related to Lower Cretaceous strata anywhere else on earth.

Cordially,
Heriman L. Hoek

(Cabin to Start)