

November 27, 1973

Dear Mr. Herrmann and geology staff:

Yesterday Robert Macdonald and I had a lengthy discussion over the evidence and the results of our studies thusfar. It is apparent that rather than geology it's been a football game in which no one really knows the goal line.

It is time we worked from the provable known, laid aside the irrelevant and waited for further answers about the doubtful. The answers then become quite apparent and it is time we sought to evaluate the physical evidence for the apparent answers thus obtained.

Point one: it is wrong to work from a philosophical hypothesis about creation week and overlook the evidence for the Flood and of history which will not fit it. It is essential that we work from the evidence which pinpoints the physical evidence of the Flood. I believe that Chris Patton, Robert Macdonald, John Hopkinson, you and I can concur in this general matter -- as also possibly others of us.

Point two: the evidence for the Flood geologically is not obvious either to uniformitarians, creationists (so-called), or us. It had to be a Bible revelation in order for us to discern where to look in the Recent. Similarly, we may find the evidence for creation week is not what we expect because we have preconceived notions of what to look for.

Point three: the evidence for the week of re-creation cannot be the Upper Pleistocene, for human artifacts and skeletons are clearly prior. Nor can it be the Middle Pleistocene, for human artifacts are clearly prior. The methods of dating by radioactivity do not need to be considered here now. They are already subject to review for the period after the Flood. The time element is already defined in the Scripture. We shall be able to discern how to evaluate radioactive dating when we have found evidence for the Flood and creation week. We shall also be able to understand the contradictions both in radiocarbon and in Potassium-argon methods, but not until the framework geologically is established by the Bible.

Point four: Human remains are found clearly in the Lower Pleistocene in the form of artifact evidence. They are found in the Villafranchian. This means that if the Villafranchian is labeled Pliocene or Pleistocene we must remember that it is the Villafranchian fauna that is understood. Today it is customary to define Villafranchian as early Lower Pleistocene, not Pliocene. Man is therefore certainly Pleistocene and Holocene.

Point five: the Tertiary is in sufficient places stratigraphic enough that we can discern where man and beast first appear as fossils. No human remains are found in Paleocene. Many mammals appear after Paleocene deposits are all laid down. It is obvious

that Paleocene cannot be construed as the time of man. In the Eocene and Oligocene human remains are not found and there are mammals that exist today that certainly have not made their appearance in the fossil record. In fact the Miocene does not yet contain sufficient varieties and genera to fulfill indications of the world as we know it. Note that animals that die out in each of these periods are irrelevant to the discussion. With the Villafranchian, separated from the Pliocene, that is, ^{is} drawing the line for the Pliocene below rather than above the Villafranchian, there are still mammals that are yet to appear.

Thus: "No radically new or different forms of life appeared in the Pleistocene, but there were notable evolutionary changes involving the creation of new species and even new genera." (Page 330 of Essentials of Earth History, William E. Stokes, 2nd ed.)

The fact is that continuous modern investigation has brought man as early as the Villafranchian in the Lower Pleistocene and it is not until the Villafranchian or Lower Pleistocene that all the genera as we know them today appear in fossil records. The conclusion based on continuing evidence is that geological support for creation week must be found in the Pliocene-Pleistocene border.

I now refer us to the giant Atlas of Israel (Geology III/1), published in 1970:

After the retreat of the Miocene sea, due to uplift in the Pontian (some 200 to 300 m), there followed a new subsidence, accompanied by the Pliocene ingression.

The Pliocene sea in the north again occupied the Qishon valley, The 'Emeq Yizre'el and eastern Galilee as far as Tiberian. In the south it reached Nevatim, east of Beersheba, and again washed the foothills bounding the present coastal plain. The character of the Pliocene (Astian) littoral sediments is similar to the Miocene except for the absence of Coral reef limestone indicating disconnection from the Red Sea and Indian Ocean.

Uplift movements at the end of the Pliocene and during the Pleistocene brought the Pliocene littoral beds to their present height of 200 to 300 m and the Miocene to 500m...

...As so-called Sakieh beds* it consists of several hundred meters of plastic clays, silty marls and marly sands....

There is sufficient evidence in Palestine and, if we search, elsewhere to indicate that creation week lies at the end of the Pliocene and beginning of Pleistocene. But it takes the Bible to define the depth of the waters, both here and at the Flood, because when waters cover over the land there is no shoreline to tell us. Shorelines pick up the story at some time during the process.

We must at some time after this investigation return to the question of Tertiary man, but for the present -- until field research is done -- no proof can be used. I think the answer will be that, if the facts are properly states in Portugese and Argentine areas and at Calavaras, the evidence will prove to be in the then not-understood Villafranchian or zone that now is in the Pleistocene earlier may have been called Pliocene ^{and hence Tertiary.}

* Miocene-Pliocene

Malo Aupito!

Norman L. Hoek