

72 see caption
D. Wonderly
(see notes by D. Wonderly add map at end)

A REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE:

"IS THE CAPITAN LIMESTONE A FOSSIL REEF?" by Stuart Nevins,
CREATION RESEARCH QUARTERLY, Vol. 8, MARCH 1972, pp. 231-243.
By Daniel E. Wonderly, 1972.

The author of these comments believes that they will be found to be simple enough for the average reader to understand, even if such a reader has not carefully read Mr. Nevins' article. An effort has been made to make these comments informative, without using much of the technical terminology which is found in Mr. Nevins' paper, and to include a good amount of data which will shed additional light on the nature and positions of existing ancient reefs.

This review has been written with the hope that it will help our Christian, fundamentalist scholars to adopt definite, much needed safeguards in Bible-science research, ^{and} to realize the tragedy of not doing so, and the necessity of making use of the vast amount of stratigraphic data which is now available to us. There is no longer any need for us to make our investigations with the aid of only a few scattered sources of data, because both industry and governmental agencies are providing us with scores of objective research reports each year, which we can use for understanding God's marvelous creation.

It is gratifying to note that an interest in the study of the underground formations found in oil fields has begun to develop among fundamentalists. In reading the article "Is the Capitan Limestone a Fossil Reef?" by Stuart Nevins one is impressed that the author has done a great deal of careful investigation of the texture of parts of the northwestern segment of the Capitan reef, and in the identification of specific classes and types of fossils in the same. Also he has probably done the public a service in calling attention to some evidences for a lack of wave resistance in that part of the Capitan reef.¹ However, it is doubtful that the article will help to clarify any of the Bible-science issues. Below is a list of problems and deficiencies which can be observed in this article.

1. The author takes a position which will be misleading to the Christian, because it requires such extensive and specialized geologic events since the Flood that the Biblical Flood would have to be placed back at least some hundreds of thousands of years, (as will be seen in sections # 8 and 9 below). Thus, Nevins—even though he may not realize it—is calling for a much longer history of man on earth than the Bible seems to suggest.

2. This was a study of only one of a great many reefs which are now well known in the oil fields of the world. Even if further study should demonstrate that the Capitan reef possesses no in situ fossils, or is not a true reef, this would not