B. Site 62 [See my Chap. 9, p. 189 (p. 162 of printed book)]

--This site was thoroughly cored.

(a) --The upper 1,200 ft. had 80 to 94% $CaCO_3$ in most parts. Very few parts of the upper 1,200 ft. contained less than 70% $CaCO_3$.

--Nearly all is of accumulated micro-shells and shell parts, of too small a size to settle rapidly, i. e., nannofossil chalk ooze and nannofossil chalk.

(b) Rates of deposition (and time estimates of column at Site 62)

In these tropical waters the rates of deposition of calcareous ooze (from Foraminifera and coccoliths mainly) hardly ever exceeds 20 mm/1,000 years. (a little less than one inch) At 20 mm/1,000 years, even the upper 1,200 feet of the column at Site 62 would have required about 18,000,000 years to accumulate.

--And the lower 600 ft. most likely required another 9,000,000 years. (The lower part of the column was classified as Upper Oligocene [about 26 million yrs. B.P.]

Notice that even if a person were to throw out ~~all~~ this dating and assume that the pelagic microorganisms grew (and settled) 10 times as fast as they do now, 2½ million years would still be necessary for the formation of this column.

If we are going to be honest we just must recognize the natural laws of growth and settling.

Oftentimes people ignore or disregard these laws because they don't understand them. But we have a responsibility to acquaint outselves with them. (They are God's laws, not man's laws.)

C. Other similar sites:

Lack of ~~time~~ time is going to prevent my describing the several other similar sites in the Pacific--such as Site 64--Which was an even deeper, mainly-carbonate column (3,000 ft. of mainly chalk ooze, chalk, & limestone.