ther research (both t , "[T]hat woman e as His ice." An biology are active f tioners with the requ ficed to the monthese theories will be not understand." tific grounds any tim is an analysis of crea To understand th life and work are nize the continuum ris Library, Uniis by no means a s Then the two mo ıle. approach can be und ole. Philadelphia: embodied, for exam for Creation Resear de. Philadelphia: ment, orchestrated Seattle (see Intelli article will examine delphia: Author, the controversy, a thoughts about the : Author, 1899. Racic Classificat 11th or 1000

et biblical "days" as process, because e to accept much of mutations and not e do grant a limited petition for resou me young-earth creincredulous your lection can indeed believe in radioa com within rather errors and discrep (Answer: Any hu al term—of plants degree of error, v not whether there nuum of creationist age of the earth of y sophisticated (but such as theistic evodifferent research ign. Theistic evolu-As it turns out, naterialistic view of ationism is a qui alism, the prefere igious person: God erse, but afterward over the one prop Intelligent De natural laws (put in ationism. Some volution by natural modern, particul ed decided to have Alleria Aleira and Milana

i evolution, bom or the above, the ci cannot be blamed e s often misrepreof a large part of th in any viable sciposed to be getting is that research is exposure to the me revisions of past communities are at arp contrast, one sorry state of affairs proposed so far). in mind when discu inquiries and disthis or any other ide ally to misunder-American culture h t science is about. strands of anti-intel s an alternative? and have been long are characteristinaive to expect tha eir designer might quickly eliminate t for good reason: tion can have differ uld have either to the kind of science Christianity or to unlikely to affect the actually be evaluscience (and of evo atter is simply not hor what sort of While a discussion

take a great deal of	sions: Why So.
incipal obstacles in	Religion. Amh
cessive reliance on	Forrest, B., and P
ning practices that	The Wedge of I
er new conceptual	versity Press, 2
e of these obstacles	Hume, D. Dialog
may take a genera-	burgh: Gilbert
nt approach to sci-	Pigliucci, M. De
ritical thinking and	tism and the N
latory step not only	auer, 2002.
on-creation contro-	Rigney, D. "T
citizens better able	Rethinking E
•	(1991).
? Will the creation-	Sagan, C. The
resurgence of cre-	Candle in the
rly twenty-first cen-	Scott, E. C. "A
e intelligent design	United States.
imism. Yet there are	(1997).
ture. If we take the	