

1106 Hall Avenue  
Gladewater, Texas 75647  
August 17, 1973

Dear Mr. Keowles:

The Dinosaur manuscript arrived yesterday and I found myself a quiet place where I could take two hours and read it carefully and without interruption. With Mr. Ginskey's changes I find no real problem at all with the material. It is the same geology that I have been teaching for years.

A comparison of the fossil record with our knowledge of a world prior to Adam ruled over by Lucifer, this later knowledge from the Bible, strongly suggests that Lucifer ruled over the dinosaur world. Proof is another thing. I like the booklet as is and think it will be a very effective item in answering the questions that come in on geology.

It leaves unanswered a number of vital questions, but on those questions I would like to beg for more time. The question of which deposits along with Noah's Flood, what geologic changes occurred during "creation week" which is really a misnomer as it was more a reordering, a reestablishing, a remaking of the earth than it was a creation. Man and Sabbath are new (or was the Sabbath a part of an earlier world also, really the answer has no bearing on us), sea creatures are mentioned as being created but otherwise this Week where Adam shows up is hardly Creation Week in any proper sense of the word.

Then there is the question of whether there was a mammal-angiosperm world prior to Adam, and closely tied to that question is the one of when the Tertiary deposits were put down. Carbon-14 dating is involved; potassium-argon dating I think can be shown faulty in many cases. Like Daniel said, "Why is the decree so hasty?" Give us a few months or a few years or longer if need be. These secrets of earth's history do not give way with just armchair geology.

In my opinion it would have been a serious mistake to publish the deleted material in the manuscript. I like the idea of putting the author's names on the item. If at a later date we were to find error in a booklet, the readers have an "out"; they merely say, "all that was so-and-so's 1973 conclusion and I see this latest Plain Truth article has modified information."

I do want to make a few comments on specific pages of the manuscript and will type them up on a separate sheet to go with this letter. Mr. Hegvold wanted to see the manuscript and intimated that Dr. Deakins would also like to see it. I'm hard pressed for time this morning and want this information in the mail to you this morning. I would think they would be pleased with the more limited scope of the manuscript as corrected.

Please be understanding with my typing; Susie had a fine time at the dance last night and I was awake much of the previous night also; and she obtained her Texas driver's license yesterday, my most trying ordeal is over, I hope.

The MS. was appreciated.

incerey,

Ken Herrmann