

3. A fundamental issue with which we see Nevins struggling in the article is that of the presence of in situ masses of coralline algae, sponges, and bryozoans, all of which often have a branching growth habit somewhat resembling that of the higher plants. He admits (on pp. 243 and 246) ~~concludes~~ that the Capitan reef may have some masses of these in growth position, and remarks that if such is the case, the Capitan reef would not have been formed by the Flood (pp. 243, 244, and 246).

~~Actually~~ Actually the author whom Nevins cites most often as an authority, strongly emphasizes the abundance of such in situ growth (in the very paper which Nevins cites eleven times).⁴ Nevins says (on p. 240) "Probably the most qualified person to speak concerning Capitan 'reef core' is C. W. Achauer who has examined hundreds of slabbed and etched samples and hundreds of thin sections under the microscope," but he ignores the fact that Achauer strongly supports the in situ growth of the reef. Nevins emphasizes Achauer's belief that the reef was not wave resistant. So much as to sound like Achauer is of the opinion that the reef could have been formed rapidly. In reality, ~~indeed~~ Achauer merely points out that the reef grew as a non-wave-resistant (or only slightly wave resistant) organic bank, instead of as a true barrier-type reef. It is significant that Nevins could not find even one source in the geologic literature ~~in which~~ ^{gives} ~~the~~ ~~author~~ states any opinion that there is evidence ~~for~~ this reef's having been formed rapidly by water transport. It would therefore seem best for us to place a high value on Achauer's explanation that the Capitan reef grew in place ("thrived", p. 240) as an organic bank-- especially if we take seriously Nevins' statement that Achauer is highly qualified to speak concerning the core of this particular structure.⁵

4. Nevins has ventured a statement that "there is wide agreement among geologists that the alleged Capitan 'reef core' lacks large organically-bound frameworks" (p. 240), but in the light of his statement on p. 234 that "only a few notable articles have taken exception to the popular views [the reef interpretation]," this statement