earlier evolutionary systems, not to mention pantheism, atheism, and other such anti-supernaturalist philosophies, which were every bit as prevalent then as now.

To illustrate the caliber and significance of these great scientists of the past, Tables I and II have been prepared. These tabulations are not complete lists, of course, but at least are representative and do point up the absurdity of modern assertions that no true scientist can be a creationist and Bible-believing Christian.

Table I lists the creationist "fathers" of many significant branches of modern science. Table II lists the creationist scientists responsible for various vital inventions, discoveries, and other contributions to mankind. These identifications are to some degree oversimplified, of course, for even in the early days of science every new development involved a number of other scientists, before and after. Nevertheless, in each instance, a strong case can be made for attributing the chief responsibility to the creationist scientist indicated. At the very least, his contribution was critically important and thus supports our contention that belief in creation and the Bible helps, rather than hinders, scientific discovery.

In each case, the scientists listed were strict creationists, unreservedly believing in the Bible and the God of the Bible. Some were "progressive creationists," but none were theistic evolutionists, so far as can be determined. They came from a variety of denominational backgrounds and doctrinal persuasions, but all were at least professing Christians, committed to the basic doctrines of Christianity. Additional biographical data concerning both their Christian convictions and their scientific contributions have been compiled recently by the writer for a chapter in a future book and it has been a great personal blessing to share in their lives and studies in this way. The mere listing of their names in these summary Tables may seem impersonal, but even this bare compilation is impressive.

The scientific achievements of modern creationist scientists do not yet measure up to those of these earlier creationists (neither do the attainments of modern evolutionists for that matter), but we at least have the same beliefs, the same motivations and the same spiritual resources. There is a much greater weight of establishment prejudice against modern creationists than there was against those of these earlier creationists. But "naturalism" or "materialism," according to this new definition. The very possibility of a Creator is prohibited by majority vote of the scientific fraternity, and one who still wishes to believe in God must forfeit his membership.

Well, no matter. At least we creationist scientists can take comfort in the fact that many of the greatest scientists of the past were creationists and for that matter, were also Bible-believing Christians, men who believed in the inspiration and authority of the Bible, as well as in the deity and saving work of Jesus Christ. They believed that God had supernaturally created all things, each with its own complex structure for its own unique purpose. They believed that, as scientists, they were "thinking God's thoughts after Him," learning to understand and control the laws and processes of nature for God's glory and man's good. They believed and practiced science in exactly the same way that modern creationist scientists do.

And somehow this attitude did not hinder them in their commitment to the "scientific method." In fact one of them, Sir Francis Bacon, is credited with formulating and establishing the scientific method! They seem also to have been able to maintain a proper "scientific attitude," for it was these men who were the "scientific method." In fact one of them, Sir Francis Bacon, is credited with formulating and establishing the scientific method! They seem also to have been able to maintain a proper "scientific attitude," for it was these men...

* Dr. Henry M. Morris (1918-2006) was Founder and President Emeritus of ICR.

One of the self-serving arguments of modern evolutionists is their rather arrogant claim that creationist scientists are not real scientists. No matter that a large number of creationists have earned authentic Ph.D. degrees in science, hold responsible scientific positions and have published numerous scientific articles and books—if they are creationists, they are not true scientists! In a Letter-to-the-Editor, Steven Schafersman, of Rice University's Department of Geology, says, for example: "I dispute Henry Morris's claim that thousands of scientists are creationists. No scientist today questions the past and present occurrence of evolution in the organic world. Those 'thousands of creationists' with legitimate post-graduate degrees and other appropriate credentials are not scientists, precisely because they have abandoned the scientific method and the scientific attitude, criteria far more crucial to the definition of scientist than the location or duration of one's training or the identity of one's employer" (Geotimes, August 1981, P. 11).

Thus modern creationists are conveniently excluded as scientists merely by definition! Science does not mean "knowledge" or "truth," or "facts," as we used to think, but "naturalism" or "materialism," according to this new definition. The very possibility of a Creator is prohibited by majority vote of the scientific fraternity, and one who still wishes to believe in God must forfeit his membership.

Well, no matter. At least we creationist scientists can take comfort in the fact that many of the greatest scientists of the past were creationists and for that matter, were also Bible-believing Christians, men who believed in the inspiration and authority of the Bible, as well as in the deity and saving work of Jesus Christ. They believed that God had supernaturally created all things, each with its own complex structure for its own unique purpose. They believed that, as scientists, they were "thinking God's thoughts after Him," learning to understand and control the laws and processes of nature for God's glory and man's good. They believed and practiced science in exactly the same way that modern creationist scientists do.

And somehow this attitude did not hinder them in their commitment to the "scientific method." In fact one of them, Sir Francis Bacon, is credited with formulating and establishing the scientific method! They seem also to have been able to maintain a proper "scientific attitude," for it was these men...
And somehow this attitude did not hinder them in their commitment to the practiced science in exactly the same way that modern creationist scientists do. They believed and processes of nature for God's glory and man's good. They believed and "thinking God's thoughts after Him," learning to understand and control the laws structure for its own unique purpose. They believed that, as scientists, they were believed that God had supernaturally created all things, each with its own complex authority of the Bible, as well as in the deity and saving work of Jesus Christ. They were also Bible-believing Christians, men who believed in the inspiration and that many of the greatest scientists of the past were creationists and for that matter, Well, no matter. At least we creationist scientists can take comfort in the fact fraternity, and one who still wishes to believe in God must forfeit his membership.

The very possibility of a Creator is prohibited by majority vote of the scientific definition! Science does not mean "knowledge" or "truth," or "facts," as we used to think, but "naturalism" or "materialism," according to this new definition. The definition! Thus modern creationists are conveniently excluded as scientists merely by (Geotimes, August 1981, P. 11).
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