

the characteristics of the rock layers and of the depositional activities which produced them. As a result we frequently find, in a given geologic formation, that some of the strata were deposited rapidly whereas other layers in the sequence were deposited very slowly. A high percentage of the methods which are used for such an analysis were unknown in the early 1960's when Whitcomb and Morris first published their ideas regarding "Flood geology." At that time many geologists did tend to rely too heavily on uniformitarian theory, but that picture has changed rapidly, beginning in the late 1950's.

Sedimentary geologists, such as those employed in the petroleum industry, now regularly look in the strata for evidences of early geologic processes which indicate either rapid or slow deposition. For example, ancient debris flows (of sediments) are easily identifiable in the strata, and of course indicate rapid sedimentation. On the other hand, biologically cemented, fossiliferous, limestone mounds (bioherms) located in a sequence of strata indicate slow deposition. Many other processes which give definite indication of depositional rates in ancient sequences of strata are now known. Because of this, the science of sedimentology has had spectacular success, especially in enhancing petroleum field research during the past two decades. This development of abilities to understand the ancient depositional processes by identifying characteristics in the strata was not for the purpose of promoting any particular theory of origins or age; so, we should feel free to use the results of sedimentological research. Christian science teachers thus do not need to be afraid that the data collected by modern geologic research has been "polluted by uniformitarianism." In some cases the conclusions drawn by the research personnel may be slightly biased by uniformitarian assumptions, and in a few cases the conclusions may be severely biased by the same. However, the latter will be easily detected by any observing person who is familiar with the main steps of the scientific method of research, and who has enough familiarity with the subject to be reading the research report.

2. "Flood Geology" Teaching in our Christian Schools

It is well known that a high percentage of Christian elementary and high schools, and many Bible colleges, teach what is often called "Flood geology" as though it were valid science which had been derived from geologic research. But, since almost none of the ideas contained in this system of thought are based on actual collected scientific data, those ideas should not be taught as being science. The teaching of "Flood-geology" hypotheses as science is producing little more than confusion in the minds of the students and is obscuring the true nature of science besides. It would of course be permissible to teach the students about "Flood geology" and the religious leaders who originated it, and then to have the students compare the various assertions of that system with actual scientific data which have been carefully collected. But the teaching of "Flood geology" as science implies that its assertions are conclusions based on scientific research--which is not the case.

The most prominent element in the "Flood geology" system of thought is the belief that practically all of the sedimentary strata of the earth were laid down, together with their contained fossils, during the Biblical Flood--with perhaps a few of the formations being deposited very soon after the end of the Flood. (We need to keep in mind that this belief is not actually based on the Bible, for the Bible gives us no specific information on the kinds, amounts, or locations of any sedimentary deposition the Flood may have caused.) Many of the creationists who hold to this belief are unaware that it is not supported by actual geologic observations, and that it is really a set of ideas which arose in the minds of