

in advertising, the algorithms used by Facebook to decide who gets to see one's posts, and more. She writes, "I am worried about the separation between technical models and real people, and about the moral repercussions of that separation (p. 48)." Hence, she identifies several sources of the problems that turn algorithms into WMDs. Models may encode human prejudice, misunderstanding, and bias into the software systems. Oftentimes, problems arise from the choice of goals, for example, desire for profit may far outweigh fairness. Many use proxies that are poor substitutes for the data one really wants but cannot measure directly. Opacity is often defended as "intellectual property." Software often does not get feedback on its performance.

O'Neil never plays the role of the neutral observer of algorithms for analyzing big data sets. Her passion for her message is explicit on every page (which for me, made reading her book somewhat exhausting). She does not pay much attention to the benefits these algorithms can provide. To her credit, however, she goes beyond analyzing the problems to propose and discuss solutions, including the use of some type of Hippocratic Oath for modelers, reevaluating metrics of success, identifying and eliminating unfair systems, incorporating positive feedback loops into models, requiring the auditing of algorithms, adapting and enforcing current laws, and requiring that models that have a significant impact on people's lives (e.g., those that assess credit ratings and e-scores) be open to the public and available.

The book is a must-read, I believe, for statisticians, operations researchers, managers of information systems, and anyone studying these fields. Relevant chapters should also be read by people working in or studying human resources, finance, educational assessment, criminal justice, and insurance. The book will also appeal to anyone interested in the impact of technology on culture.

Reviewed by James Bradley, Professor of Mathematics Emeritus, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, MI 49546.



SHADOW OF OZ: Theistic Evolution and the Absent God by Wayne D. Rossiter. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2015. Paperback; \$24.00. ISBN: 9781498220729.

This is an anti-evolutionary book that stands basically within the tradition of the modern intelligent design movement (e.g., Stephen Meyer, Discovery Institute). In particular, Wayne D. Rossiter attempts to argue that theistic evolution is not only scientifi-

cally vacuous, but more seriously it falls far short theologically. From his perspective, "there is no distinguishable difference between theistic evolutionism and atheism when it comes to our physical reality. Neither includes a God that is in any way *detectable* in his creation" (p. 25, my italics).

The notion of so-called "divine detectability" is a long-standing theme of the ID movement. To be more precise, Rossiter and ID theorists confidently proclaim that there are places in nature where God has miraculously intervened during the past. Rossiter openly states that he views God "as an active participant in his creation" and "an evidenced player in the workings of the universe" (p. 17). In appealing to scripture, Rossiter asserts, "In the Bible, God is clearly in the business of doing things that we would see in terms of manipulating physical laws and material quantities" (p. 115).

Of course, Rossiter's approach is another God-of-the-gaps view of divine action, and the history of science has repeatedly shown the failure of such attempts. The purported gaps in nature are, in fact, gaps in the scientific knowledge of those defending these anti-scientific and anti-evolutionary views of nature.

In his criticism of theistic evolution, Rossiter attempts to gather scientific arguments against biological evolution, but it is quite obvious that the foundation of his God-of-the-gaps thesis rests firmly on a concordist hermeneutic, not science. For example, he argues,

The word "kind" appears twelve times in the Genesis 1 account (NIV), and the phrase, "according to their kind" – plural – occurs eight times. Old Testament Jewish authors used such repetition for emphasis of important ideas. It was clearly important to indicate God *directly* made numerous kinds, and not just one. (p. 50, my italics)

However, Rossiter completely fails to appreciate that the category of "kinds" in Genesis 1 is an ancient taxonomical notion reflecting the common belief that living organisms were immutable and created *de novo*. To be more specific, this notion is rooted in an ancient phenomenological perspective. Evidence that Rossiter is completely unaware of the ancient scientific context of scripture appears when he states, "There is nothing in the Bible that teaches that we must see the Earth as the spatial center of creation, nor that the universe should be smaller than it is" (p. 59). It is well established within evangelical biblical scholarship that scripture features a three-tier universe (e.g., John Walton, Paul Seely, Peter Enns, Kenton Sparks, Kyle Greenwood). Christian astronomers today never appeal to this ancient cosmology in their daily work, nor should Christian biologists,

Book Reviews

such as Rossiter (he is a parasitologist), employ the ancient biology in the Bible to understand the origin of life.

To employ a term used by Rossiter, there are some statements in his book that are “patently false” (p. 17). He asserts in one place, “theistic evolutionists get their pantheism honest” (p. 20); and in another, “the basic view of theistic evolution is that of process theism” (p. 69). It is evident that Rossiter is completely unaware of the distinction between pantheism and panentheism.

In another patently false assertion, Rossiter asks, “What exactly does Jesus do in the theology of theistic evolution? Other than the satisfaction of knowing that the universe is created, their worldview seems to offer nothing different than that of secular atheism” (p. 85). Would Christian evolutionists of the American Scientific Affiliation or the BioLogos Foundation see their views as nothing but a form of secular atheism?

This is a deeply flawed book at many levels. But its greatest problem is that it conflates evolutionists of a wide range of theological/philosophical views into one category—theistic evolution. In this way, it collapses into one undifferentiated smudge conservative evangelical Christians (Francis Collins) with panentheists (John Haught), liberal Christians (Karl Giberson), and naturalists (Howard Van Till). I suspect that most evangelical Christians who accept evolution would be troubled (and maybe even insulted) with this conflation, as I was.

I do not recommend this book.

Reviewed by Denis O. Lamoureux, Associate Professor of Science & Religion, St. Joseph's College, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 1H7.

PHILOSOPHY & THEOLOGY

DIGNITY AND DESTINY: Humanity in the Image of God by John F. Kilner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015. 402 pages, including bibliography and indices. Paperback; \$35.00. ISBN: 9780802867643.

What does it mean to say that human beings are created in God's image? This question has fascinated and puzzled biblical commentators and theologians for centuries. It has been of interest recently in pop culture as well, for instance, as one of the running themes of Darren Aronofsky's 2014 film *Noah*. The film juxtaposes two contested interpretations of the image of God, contrasting Noah's family on the one hand, whom God had charged with caring for the

earth and its inhabitants, with the villainous Tubalcain on the other, who believes that bearing God's image entitles him to seize, dominate, consume, and control.

Aronofsky's film vividly portrays the problem that John F. Kilner, Forman Chair of Christian Ethics and Theology at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, seeks to address in his important new book, *Dignity and Destiny: Humanity in the Image of God*. Specifically, Kilner addresses the issue that has plagued numerous interpreters of the *imago Dei* through the ages: “Rather than people being in the image of God, God is remade in the image of people” (p. 50). This happens when interpreters define the image in terms of attributes that people presently possess. The reasoning seems natural to many: we humans are uniquely made in God's image, so we can unpack that image by looking at attributes uniquely characterizing human beings, and even come to a better understanding of God in the process. But this, says Kilner, reverses what the biblical authors understand the image to be and how they employ it throughout scripture.

The book is divided into three major parts. Part I addresses “The Human and Divine Context” and sets the stage by discussing the importance of the image of God, why interpreting it correctly is so crucial (and incorrectly so harmful), and the basic meaning of the term in the Bible. Part II is entitled “Human Dignity” and explores the image of God in light of its connection to the inalienable, God-given dignity that all human beings have by God's decree. Part III, “Human Destiny,” explores the renewal and consummation of the image of God in human beings, through their union with and transformation in Christ, who is the definitive and ultimate Image of God.

The book is comprehensive in gathering the scriptural and historical texts that directly reference the image of God. Four major themes are prominent. First, Kilner exposes the tendency of interpreters to view the image of God in terms of how people are presently like God, especially in terms of human attributes. (This charge is repeated many times, to the point of being repetitive.) At best, interpreters with this tendency are well intended but still misconstrue the biblical data while pursuing their own theological aims. At worst, this tendency leads to abuses of image language with horrific consequences, in support of discrimination (of the disabled, the mentally impaired, women, etc.), racism, colonialism, slavery, and genocide (see pp. 18–37). Such abuses ensue when interpreters first equate the image of God with certain human attributes, and then notice that these are diminished or absent in some people, leading to