

1106 Hall Avenue
Gladewater, Texas 75647
December 20, 1973

Dear Dr. Hoeh and geology staff,

I've been giving a good deal of attention lately to the problem of Neanderthal "man", and have a good supply of up-to-date information written in layman's language in this Emergence of Man series by Time-Life. Nine volumes have been put out so far. They are:

Life Before Man
The Missing Link
~~The Neanderthal~~
The First Men
The Neanderthals
Cro-Magnon Man
The First Farmers
The First Americans
The First Cities
The Monument Builders

In addition to these are the Life Nature Library books entitled

Early Man
Evolution

plus information from a number of their other books. While the regular journals give more detail, often it is highly technical and reflects the bias of a single writer. Here one has the moderating effect of multiple authors and a broad overview, all put in language that a layman can understand.

The skulls and replicas that John Hopkinson and I looked at at PCC would be worth a thorough restudy. The Indian's skull seemed so different, so frail in contrast to the heavy features of the Neanderthal skull. The teeth of the latter met head on, a condition one finds with some people today but most of us have our uppers overlapping the lowers to some extent.

Our findings so far are certainly at odds with the doctrines that the Adventists have presented in their writings over the years. We are now putting time into the world prior to Adam. They might easily term us heretics for any one of the following conclusions, but that is their problem:

- 1) The physical universe is much older (billions if need be) than the earliest life forms on earth.
- 2) The fossil world up through the Lower Cretaceous shows evidence of at least tens of thousands of years. Since it is pre-Adamic, there should be no objection on our part if those deposits represent millions of years.
- 3) Angiosperms are clearly, unmistakably found in the Upper Cretaceous before the demise of the dinosaurs and long before there is any evidence that man is on earth.

- 4) The lower Tertiary has internal evidence of multiple thousands of years of time passing. It is not a "flood" deposit representing a single catastrophe or several of them.
- 5) Homo erectus, for what that term might mean to various researchers, seems to be pretty well restricted to apes and apelike creatures.
- 6) Neanderthal is at least a "manlike" creature, but is he man? He uses weapons, buries his dead, even with flowers. But is he truly man, a son of Adam? The term man must be restricted to the sons of Adam, as Adam is the first man. Any artifacts ~~###~~ older than Adam can not be manmade. Neanderthal seems older than Adam.
- 7) Cro-Magnon gives every appearance of being human, a descendant of Adam. He farms the land, builds cities, has creative ability; he had needles and thus one would infer that he (as Adam and Eve) had psychological reasons for covering their naked bodies. Cro-Magnon is modern man. Our problems with his artifacts is that they appear by Carbon dating to be some thousands of years older than Adam. Perhaps he used ~~##~~ old material.
- 8) Man, the sons of Adam arrive on earth in the Late Pliestocene; just when and where is a matter of semantics.

The sum total of the above conclusions (somewhat tentative in places) still leaves us with some knotty problems. At the very time when Bible ~~kkk~~ chronology is becoming rather firmly established, accurate perhaps even to the day, we find ourselves with a sort of "Frankenstein monster" on our hands. Have we found a prototype of man in the pre-Adamic world? A creature with upright stature? Using fire? Burying his dead? With a concept of a resurrection? Before attempting an answer, there are some questions I would like to ask our Adventist third cousins.

What restrictions do we place on God in His pre-Adamic existence? And which one of us was around to enforce such restrictions on Him?

There are a few restrictions. His world is trustworthy. ~~Our~~ understanding of it is limited and at times a bit muddled; and at times He is content to leave it that way. "Destroy this temple and I will raise it up in three days."

Clearly there were no men before Adam because Adam is the first man. But will we allow Him a physical universe eons old? Life forms before the six days of Creation? A series of creations? Permission to add to them or destroy portions of them at His will? All the time in the world to "toy with" those creations for purposes we admittedly find difficulty even guessing at?

Will we allow Him angiosperms in a creation thousands of years prior to man? Warm-blooded animals? Feathers on birds? Thorns? Primates? Chimps with more intellect than those we are accustomed to (including some auto mechanics)? Agriculture? (The best evidence is that it goes back less than 10,000.)

Could He have had (without our permission) creatures with eyes superior to our own (an eagle's eyes have some superior features, could a pre-Adamic creature's?))? Once we remove a few of the obstructing ~~##~~ beams from our own eyes, we blink a few times and come a few steps closer to the truth. Human vanity should not place restrictions on God's pre-Adamic activities. Getting an Amen or two on that would be a step in the right direction.

Neanderthal does not look human to me. It is not appearance alone, for that could have an explanation as the book After Its Kind by Nelson shows on page 141 in the case of the Chanoak (Flat-head) Indians. Or some hereditary factor might give some people brows that look Neanderthal to an extent or a jaw that looks Heidelberg. If these were the only problems with Neanderthal, he might be included as a blood brother.

A diversion for a moment. When the white men first came to America and met the Indian, neither recognized the other as human. One saw only an animal; the other saw a god! The solution on the part of the Indian was to hold the white man under water till he quit struggling, then put him back on shore and wonder why he did not come back to life as proof of his godlike appearance and accomplishments. A person does have to approach the problem of Neanderthal with caution, a libel or slander suit might result otherwise.

Lafayette's brow and forehead? Or the chin of the Marquis de Pinedo? Do they prove Neanderthal to be our blood relative? Or is this merely a case of a genetic defect? Let me ask a question; the flippers of the thalidomide babies, are they proof that seals are our blood relatives? Arrested development leaves many people (and many creatures also) short of the image of God. All creatures are patterned to some extent after their Maker, that is where the pattern comes from. The bulldog look some people have, what does it prove? Or the friendly comment of one German to another, "Ach, Du Esel!", what does it prove?

So the finding of some Neanderthal features in living men does not prove blood relationship.

But the Cro-Magnon is definitely on a par with man for the following reasons, reasons which exclude Neanderthal from that same "hand of fellowship".

- 1) Appearance; a high forehead, prominent chin, an aquiline nose.
- 2) Vocal apparatus; small even teeth, a longer pharynx for speech capability. Speech and language were thus possible. Animals communicate but can meet their kind from another part of the world and have no communication problem. Man's language is built by his creative ability.
- 3) Artistic ability; a creative ability that makes him in the image of God in a way that no other creature can demonstrate. It is this creative ability that allows free moral agency. It is this ability that gets man into trouble because he is free to think out evil, "unecological" things.
- 4) Taller men-shorter women: a puzzling statement about Cro-Magnon pointing him out as different from Neanderthal. Mrs. Cro-Magnon was designed as a helper, a second; a special creation; not merely as a mate as "Mrs." Neanderthal. Government might be inferred.
- 5) Intellect; artifacts are much improved. Ornamentation shows up for the first time, which again indicates free moral agency, creative ability.
- 6) Superposition; there is no evidence of Cro-Magnon living with Neanderthal or living before him. Cro-Magnon is the most recent and gives Carbon-14 dates that are more recent and could be correlated with Scriptural dates.

If these points carry weight, then we have proceeded one more step away from Adventist doctrine. And we find in Neanderthal a pre-Adamic creature with some of man's features, attributes and abilities. (But so do we in an octopus, a porpoise). The item that Neanderthal buried his dead and thus supposedly looked forward to a resurrection bothers. Are we reading too much into the bones and artifacts? He could have been buried by Cro-Magnon . . . but there is other evidence to be dealt with.

Have we ##### examined a representative sample of Neanderthal remains? If they truly grade into Cro-Magnon (as Nelson would have us believe) then surely evolutionists would have presented the evidence long ago, for that is their goal also.

Let's come back to the questions of what we are willing to allow God prior to Creation Week. To mankind he has offered the change from flesh to Sonship. Could He have offered some lesser reward to lesser beings?; not unless they too had free moral agency (the question implies choice of action on the part of Neanderthals); one finds himself far out beyond the realm of supporting evidence. Could God have made spirit creatures by first allowing them a role as flesh and blood creatures? Maybe so. But did He? That I think we can ask in just a few more years.

The conclusion of the moment is that Neanderthal should be assigned to the pre-Adamic world, that he was not man, regardless of his abilities. Whether any lived through to be with man before the Flood? Whether Cro-Magnon and Neanderthal were genetically capable of crossing, as horses and donkeys? Whether any were taken on the Ark? Whether any survive today in the form of Big Foot and Snowmen?

One has to shelve some of these questions for the present but keep an eye out for evidence that might have a bearing on them.

There are two opposing camps, one the evolutionist-doctrine-oriented camp ~~bully~~ believing that every new primate find must fit a graded sequence toward man, or else be classed as a branch that deadended.

The other camp is dead set against all the evidence of the fossil world and earns its living by nit picking while pretending holiness.

We ourselves have spent a good many years searching for loose bricks in the other man's structure; it seems time to begin building a better model.

Sincerely,

Kenneth C. Herrmann

P.S. A few thoughts from last night's lecture on Turkey by John Goddard. The city of Constantinople is built on seven hills just like Rome. And 30% of the Turks are ##### redheaded; Edom is red, no?

Leah we have suspected to be blue-eyed but there is a strong likelihood of many blue-eyed blondes and red-heads back in Abraham's time.

Rome airport and now this morning Spain. These are more than gentle nudges to put Europa together and "that which thou dost, do quickly."