

film is that they consider only the fossil-bearing layers which are near the surface. Those who made the studies used a bulldozer to go down a few feet at the side of the river bed, but no deep drillings were made; and practically no reference is made to the results of drillings which were made earlier in that area for oil exploration.<sup>31</sup> It turns out that the rock beds in which the footprints are located are underlain by over 5,000 feet of sedimentary layers which contain innumerable invertebrate fossils.<sup>32</sup> Thus the studies which were made for the film included much less than one percent of the fossil record in that area. Yet the film represents the study as giving conclusive information that the Glen Rose area contains no evidence for great age.

We do not know what factors were responsible for this failure to consider the major parts of the stratigraphic column in that area, but the fact that this kind of oversight is very common in studies which are made by those who hold to the young-earth view is some cause for alarm. Perhaps a major factor which has contributed to this fault is the lack of financial resources among these creationist groups. It is true that few if any such Christian organizations have the tremendous sums of money which are required for deep drillings and thorough laboratory studies of the many rock layers and fossil types encountered in drilling. Nevertheless, this lack of finances should not prevent them from using the many extensive studies which have been published in detail, and which are available in the libraries of our nation. At any rate, this is a point on which we certainly hope we will see improvement in the future "Christian response" to geologic data.

2. The practice of rejecting an entire geologic principle, because of one or a few flaws or variations found in the geologic record on which the principle is based. For example, because a certain group of rock layers in a two-mile-thick stratigraphic column is found to be wrongly or questionably identified, it is assumed that the entire stratigraphic column is wrongly classified and wrongly understood. Or again, because some of the details of dolomite formation in the past are not well understood, all of the many principles which are known concerning this process are rejected. Instead, an over-simplified hypothesis which ignores the chemical and structural differences between dolomite and limestone is proposed.<sup>33</sup>

3. The practice of classifying all works having to do with geological observation, either as "representing the uniformitarian position," or "representing the creationist position." Any work which points out geological processes which require long periods of time is almost invariably classified as "uniformitarian," and is usually avoided, even though other parts of the same work may recognize numerous catastrophic processes, and a global Flood. The categorizing of written resource material in this manner has regularly caused large numbers of Bible students to completely ignore works which actually contain materials that are very important to creation studies.

4. The study technique of taking individual examples of fossil