roots" change group. For the "Call to Action" to have its maximum impact (chapter 6, "Sowing Seeds of a Movement"), the author questions the wisdom of having both "grass tops" and "grass roots" approaches while acknowledging that both may have value.

The book reads well, although not always easily. The language can be a bit dense. The main points advanced by the author are presented in the book's conclusion, but their accessibility is rather difficult without a careful reading of the preceding chapters. The chapter order was sensible, but subsection divisions within chapters were overdone. Subchapter breaks utilized Bible passages heavily, a practice found a bit odd in that this book is written by a secular environmentalist. While appropriate passages were mainly used for these section heads, they were seldom developed within a section's content. At one point, mid-book, Wilkinson attributes a parishioner's quote ("let God worry about the climate") to "Calvinist theology that understands divine sovereignty to be absolute." A more Calvinist perspective might be to acknowledge a person's free will to choose or not choose to worry about the climate. A clearer understanding of Calvinism would have provided greater accuracy and helped the author make her point more clearly.

In conclusion, this is a very good book for Christians and secularists alike who want to deepen their understanding of evangelical Christianity, creation, and global climate care. The three related topics are woven together well and give one a helpful perspective as to why evangelicals have responded to environmental issues the way they have, why many evangelicals are increasingly embracing environmental concerns, and how increased future involvement in creation and global climate care by evangelicals could not only be possible but critically important for both climate and religious issues. As the author argues in her final chapter, creation, neighbor, and global climate care movements need evangelical Christians to provide "leadership, theology, ethics, alliances, and engagement" and, at the same time, the evangelical church needs "environmental issues [to] shape religion" as well.

Reviewed by David Dornbos Jr., Professor of Biology, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, MI 49546.

History of Science

AFTER THE MONKEY TRIAL: Evangelical Scientists and a New Creationism by Christopher M. Rios. New York: Fordham University Press, 2014. 260 pages. Hardcover; $45.00. ISBN: 9780823256679.

What happened to the relationship between science and evangelicalism after the 1925 Scopes Trial? One common answer is, "What relationship?—unless conflict and mutual suspicion can be regarded as a relationship." According to this take on the drama, most conservative evangelicals remained hostile to reigning scientific orthodoxies, despite the public humiliation of their fallen hero, William Jennings Bryan. As this story goes, evangelical anti-intellectualism, especially as manifested by stiff opposition to biological evolution, historical geology, and biblical criticism, endured well into the second half of the twentieth century when it resurfaced publicly as the young-earth creationism advanced by the Creation Research Society and popularized by the Institute for Creation Research. Ample evidence exists to support this narrative of evangelical opposition to modern science, and historians of recent decades have given it due attention, perhaps even too much attention.

Such fixation upon this version of the engagement between evangelicalism and science suggests that theologically conservative Christians simply cannot take modern science seriously, but rather, that they can only take up arms against it. This new book by Christopher Rios offers a corrective to such a conclusion as it considers episodes in the twentieth-century forging of a "new creationism" by theologically conservative evangelical scientists who "refused to take up arms against modern science—those who sought to show the compatibility of biblical Christianity and mainstream science, including evolution" (p. ix).

This book should be of keen interest to American Scientific Affiliation members. After all, what group is not interested in itself? Rios, now Assistant Dean in the Baylor University Graduate School and part-time lecturer in religion, has produced a very readable historical investigation of two groups of evangelical scientists, The American Scientific Affiliation (ASA) and the Research Scientists' Christian Fellowship (RSCF). Both organizations originated in the 1940s, the former in the United States, the latter in Great Britain. Accordingly, the book is set up wonderfully to offer a transatlantic comparative study of the twentieth-century's nonmilitary evangelical engagement with science. Although the two organizations began in distinct contexts, separated by an ocean,

and possessing differing founding aims and aspirations, by the mid-1960s they had found one another and begun to work together in the study of similar issues.

The setting of their first official contact—a moment Rios has chosen as a focal point in his narrative—was a small July 1965 conference in Oxford, England, the majority of attendees of which were members and representatives of either the ASA or the RSCF. Although Rios's account of the conference consumes barely five of the book's pages and he admits that "lasting effects of the conference are difficult to discern" (p. 127), the year 1965 functions nicely as a mid-way point in a book whose temporal focus begins in the early 1940s and concludes, for reasons that are not well explained, in 1985, the year that the ASA and the RSCF gathered for their first official joint meeting. The book's six chapters offer a tidy and, perhaps, too symmetrical arrangement. Following a brief introduction that situates his study with respect to its "creationist context" and that reviews the historiography of the "conflict thesis," Rios turns in his opening chapter to a sweeping and breathlessly hurried survey of evangelicals and evolution from before Darwin to the 1940s. The chapter reads a bit like the compulsory "background" material one would expect to find in a doctoral dissertation; this is understandable in view of the book's being a revision of Rios's Baylor PhD dissertation. This first chapter is quite good, given its ambitions, even if marred by mistakes that betray haste. For example, he identifies "the discovery of radioactivity in 1896" on page thirty-five and then on the next page refers to "the discovery of radioactivity in 1898." While lapses of this sort may be minor, the book contains them in sufficient number to distract.

The real meat of the study comes in the next five chapters: two on the period from the 1940s to 1965 (one each on the ASA and RSCF), and two focusing on 1965 to 1985 (again, one each on the ASA and RSCF). The pre-1965 chapters are separated from the post-1965 chapters by a brief middle chapter surveying the history of young-earth creationism from the 1960s to the 1980s. Although Rios notes the occasional points of contact between the ASA and the RSCF, their respective stories, especially before 1985, are largely independent. This renders not a single tale of evangelicals and science, but instead, dual narrative threads between the covers of one volume.

Still, there is a unifying concern. Rios's investigation clearly refutes the contention that theologically conservative evangelicalism entails antievolutionism. After reading the book, an old quip from H. L. Mencken came to mind. When asked if he believed in infant baptism, the journalist allegedly replied, "Believe in it? Heck, I've seen it done!" Similarly, this book functions as an answer to the question, "Can Bible-believing conservative evangelicals accommodate the teachings of modern science, especially evolutionary biology, and retain their faith?" Rios effectively says, "Yes! I've seen it done."

The stories of how it was done reveal that the task was not easy and often fraught with controversy. The ASA and the RSCF were both born in the post-War era during which the cultural hegemony of big science was waxing as increasing numbers of young people entered colleges. The perception that these changes posed theological threats was not unwarranted, given the long-standing evangelical concerns about evolutionism and the corollary fear that modern science underwrote non-Christian naturalistic philosophies. As these groups sought to defend traditional evangelicalism's compatibility with the day's best science, each was challenged to navigate between the extremes of fundamentalist Bible-science notions on one hand, and theological liberalism on the other. As an example of the former, a resurgent fundamentalist young-earth flood geology persistently challenged the ASA and its claim to the creationist moniker, while, as an example of the latter, the theological evolutionism of Teilhard de Chardin challenged the RSCF to resist the period's theological liberalism.

Among the mechanisms that these groups embraced to facilitate their respective accommodations of modern science, the concept of "complementarity," as articulated by C. A. Coulson and especially Donald MacKay, figured prominently. Rios does a nice job covering the subject, as he does with his consideration of the ways in which each group endeavored to maintain its high view of scripture amidst contentions that science might compromise belief in biblical inerrancy.

One undeniable truth about the leading characters from both the ASA and RSCF is that they were fascinating, highly educated, faithful, and serious Christians. Rios's book might have deepened readers' appreciation for this by more fully introducing his readers to these people as the colorful and atypical human beings that they were. Instead, the book relies rather heavily on published materials as it engages principally with their ideas. The result is an exercise in drier intellectual history than the story might otherwise have been. There are, of course, exceptions to this generalization that colorfully emerge from Rios's periodic engagement with archived correspondence.

As an attempt to fill a gap in the history of science and religion by considering mid-twentieth-century evangelical scientists, the book meets with real success, if not unqualified success. The very brevity of the book—only 175 pages of text following the introduction—demands that important material be omitted. For example, Rios's treatment of the ASA's consideration, in the late 1960s and 1970s, of social issues "beyond evolution" could have at least mentioned, if not considered in depth, the 1970 book prepared under the auspices of the ASA, *Our Society in Turmoil*. And following the success of Carl Sagan's book and television series, *Cosmos*, ASA leaders began in 1984 to plan a five-program response that they hoped would rebut Sagan's naturalism before a nationwide audience. Neither this effort nor the publication of the contemporary ASA booklet, *Teaching Science in a Climate of Controversy*, which was distributed to 60,000 teachers in 1986, was even mentioned in Rios's book. And while exploring the RSCF's association with Inter-Varsity Fellowship, he neglects to treat comparably the ASA's association with such entities as the Moody Institute of Science or with the Evangelical Theological Society, an organization with whom the ASA held numerous joint conferences during the 1950s and 1960s. Examples of such omissions are many.

Nevertheless, *After the Monkey Trial* deserves careful attention, especially by readers of this journal. Even if the book does not provide the last word treating the history of twentieth-century evangelical engagement with science, what it does provide is important and very interesting. Rios shows how these devoted evangelical men, and a few women, engaged with science, accommodated their faith to its claims, and wrestled with their young-earth Christian brethren who strove to deny them any right to identify as creationists while they embraced evolution with their evangelical hearts.

Reviewed by Mark A. Kalthoff, Salvatori Chair in History, Professor and Chairman, Department of History, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI 49242.

THE SLAIN GOD: Anthropologists and the Christian Faith by Timothy Larsen. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. 256 pages. Hardcover; $45.00. ISBN: 9780199657872.

Throughout its history, anthropology has had an uneasy at best, hostile at worst, relationship with Christian faith. Most anthropologists have been atheists, and the discipline has forbade theological speculation in its discourse. Anthropology sees itself as the rational, secular, and natural science of people. The exclusion of religious thought from critical analysis has been far from a benign division of labor. Anthropologists have a reputation for being openly hostile to Christianity. Their antagonism is especially strong for missionaries, who are deemed agents of the West, destroying traditional cultures. But, more than this, anthropologists find it difficult to relate to and understand religion as a whole, even the religions of the cultures they are investigating. As a result they have developed theories of religion that reduce it to functions of cultural arenas they understand better: cognitive uncertainty, psychological need, social unity, political legitimacy, symbolic meaning, and so forth.

Timothy Larsen is a historian at Wheaton College who studies nineteenth- and twentieth-century British Christian faith and thought. In this book, he examines six well-known British anthropologists, intertwining biography with anthropological theory. The six anthropologists studied are ordered historically, but also form a "ring composition" with regard to their individual relations to Christian faith, from atheists to believers to animist.

First is Edward Tylor, the founding "father" of anthropology in England. Tylor was raised as a Quaker, but gave up his faith and became openly antagonistic especially to Catholicism. He denied the existence of the spiritual world entirely in his attempt to create a positive science of people that would be legitimate in the secular academy. Larsen says that Tylor had locked religion and science into a "zero-sum struggle" (p. 25), and that once he had allowed reason in, "there was no apparent way to stop scepticism from undermining religion as a whole thereafter" (p. 35).

Next is James Frazer, the author of the popular classic in comparative religions, *The Golden Bough*. Frazer too had come from a Christian home, but embraced skepticism, "rationalism," and science as the replacement for religion. Larsen suggests,

> While Frazer was ostensibly … [making] savage practices more familiar and understandable, his covert intention was in all likelihood the reverse: to make familiar religious practices that his readers had always accepted as understandable come to appear strange and savage. (p. 48)

E. E. Evans-Pritchard, whom Larsen identifies as the center of the ring (p. 221), was a believing Christian throughout his adult life. He is a complex figure: the son of an Anglican clergyman who encountered real personal difficulties in adulthood (a drinking habit, a wife who committed suicide, and psychological war wounds), but who converted sincerely to Catholicism. His church attendance was not regular, but his faith included a strong personal devotional