It is from these notably *un*scientific experiences that McHargue launches the second half of the book, which expounds his prima facie case for the core tenets of the Christian faith using scientifically grounded premises that even the most ardent atheist would have to concede as valid. These "Axioms about Christian Faith" have gained some degree of notoriety in the blogosphere and are aggregated in an addendum. While each is a soft argument in comparison to traditional doctrinal statements, his goal is simply to make the case that belief itself is reasonable.

While McHargue draws upon physics, he leans most heavily on Andrew Newberg's work in neurotheology and Tanya Luhrmann's anthropological work with evangelicals. He interacts with their work admirably, but the set of beliefs he constructs are constrained to a bare-bones natural theology by necessity.

In this regard, those unsatisfied by Einstein's God may be disappointed with McHargue's specific conception of prayer, the members of the Trinity, the Bible, et cetera. It is worth reiterating that McHargue consciously chooses *not* to construct a systematic theology in this particular undertaking. Rather, his goal is to demonstrate that Christian beliefs are not merely benign but that they are functionally beneficial both to the individual and to society. There is value in creating an irreducible scaffold on which to frame the beliefs one finds indispensable. This may prove especially true for those struggling to hold on to faith or those seeking faith for the first time. The project is meant as an aid in doing the "good kind [of pretending], where the pretense leads up to the real thing" that C. S. Lewis argues for in *Mere Christianity*.

Putting the weight of the argument on neuroscience, anthropology, and social psychology of belief is a boon for some and a potential pitfall for others. McHargue's emphasis on contemplative practices as opposed to strict adherence to doctrine will be liberating to those who find themselves incapable of intellectually assenting to particular beliefs, while others might question the point of engaging in spiritual practices that can be reduced to mere brain states. On the other hand, scientists know better than most that understanding the underlying processes of a system can often lead to a deeper appreciation of the subjective beauty of the whole.

Ultimately, *Finding God in the Waves* is a product of the zeitgeist. Readers comfortable with the work of Barbour may find McHargue's open posture to be radical, even troublesome, especially his full embrace of even the most troublesome scientific findings (viz., the Benson et al. and Swinburne intercessory prayer studies). Those looking for robust theology may criticize McHargue for failing to bridge the gap between the god of the mystics and the God of Christianity, a charge he concedes. Nonetheless, as the epigraph's author might surmise, the ability to accommodate uncertainty is necessary even in the face of protests that "God does not play dice." In an age of unprecedented scientific advancement, this is a book for those crying out, "I believe; help my unbelief!" (Mark 9:24).

Reviewed by Gabriel Harder, Infinite Campus, Minneapolis, MN 55449.

Social Science

CONFIDENT PLURALISM: Surviving and Thriving through Deep Difference by John D. Inazu. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2016. 176 pages. Hardcover; $29.00. ISBN: 9780226365459.

The American society that steps from the pages of *Confident Pluralism* is diverse indeed, composed of bikers and Baptists, lesbians and xenophobes, occupy protesters and labor unions, *Big Mama Rag* and Bob Jones University. Pluralism is real, apple-pie American, but as partisan polarization and violent confrontations across deep differences forcefully demonstrate, America embraces it only with reluctance and resists its implications. American history also attests to this reluctance, which the reader meets in the story of Lily and Taizo, the author's grandparents, whose Japanese ancestry earned them internment after Pearl Harbor, despite their being American citizens who had never set foot in Japan.

To address these challenges, Inazu argues for a set of constitutional principles and civic practices that he dubs "Confident Pluralism." For each of these Inazu presents a triad of imperatives. The constitutional principles include freedom of association, protection of public and private spaces for the exercise of this right, and the guarantee of equal treatment by government. Civic practices include tempering free speech by softening its tone; practicing tolerance, humility, and patience in boycotts, strikes, and protests; and seeking to bridge deep differences in search of common ground.

Inazu finds the legal-constitutional infrastructure for confident pluralism wanting in the American constitution. The Constitution contains no explicit right of association, whose protection relies instead on the First Amendment's free speech clause, from which the courts have fashioned twin rights of intimate and expressive association. The first is so restricted that Inazu finds it "almost meaningless," while the

second makes a group's right to associate dependent on proving a religious, social, educational, or similar purpose. Thus the Top Hatters, a motorcycle club, failed to qualify as an expressive association, while the Minnesota Jaycees found that even a successful demonstration of that status guaranteed no protection against the state's interest in eradicating discrimination, forcing the group to admit women. Religious groups at public universities have discovered that expressive association is no protection against "all-comers" policies that require them to admit as members or even leaders any student who wishes to join. Against these restrictions, Inazu insists that government demonstrate a compelling interest before interfering "with the membership, leadership, or internal practices of a voluntary group."

Time, place, and manner restrictions have weakened the Public Forum Requirement, while the court's insistence that these restrictions be "reasonable," "neutral," and make available "ample" alternative venues for communication places few restraints on government in practice. Here the examples stretch from Ferguson, Missouri, to sidewalk protests outside abortion clinics. Alongside the parks or city streets that comprise traditional public forums are the private-public forums such as shopping malls, social networks, and online commerce sites. Here the right to occupy such a forum—or in the case of New York's privately owned Zuccotti Park, to occupy Wall Street—faces significant restriction from the private property right.

For traditional forums, Inazu again argues for a compelling interest standard for restricting the Constitutional protection for voicing dissent, and would extend that standard to private-public forums in some cases. "Confident pluralism does not allow us to exclude from generally available resources those groups that we don't like." For Inazu, the Supreme Court's 1983 decision to uphold the IRS's action revoking Bob Jones University's tax exempt status because of its ban on interracial marriage, violates pluralist norms. This third, most controversial, precept is the public funding requirement, which declares that "When the government offers generally available resources (financial or otherwise) to facilitate a diversity of viewpoints and ideas, it should not limit those resources based on its own orthodoxy." Inazu, of course, is no friend of the ban on interracial dating, but he is a friend of a pluralist public square.

In a mirror image of the first part of the book, the author's exploration of confident pluralism's civic aspirations yields three imperatives, one each for speech, collective action, and common ground. Inazu juxtaposes the permissiveness of the First Amendment to the many attempts to limit it, via the "hurtful insult," the "conversation stopper," and the deploying of stigmas, insisting that we embrace a commitment to "soften our tone," and embrace "living speech, even in the midst of real and painful differences, [which] can be one of our most important bridges to one another."

As for collective action, "boycotts, strikes and protests," their legitimacy should be weighed against "the civic aspirations of tolerance, humility and patience." This section closes with a brief chapter on the search for common ground—the third civic practice imperative—in which the author features unexpected friendships that have formed, such as that between Larry Flint and Jerry Falwell, that underscore an important reality that "we're stuck with this difference," or as one might say, our deep differences flow from the most cherished liberties of the American republic.

"One might think," muses Inazu in his introduction to the Constitutional principles section of the book, "that increased awareness of religious diversity that includes nonbelievers would be reflected in Establishment Clause doctrine. But that has not happened." The rest of this section is devoted to explaining how it might happen. However, readers should pause a little longer than the author does to consider why a broader pluralism of confessions, religious and otherwise, has not taken hold. For though Inazu's prescriptions for achieving confident pluralism seem eminently reasonable and fair, confident pluralism comes into sharp, perhaps debilitating, conflict with the American public philosophy of natural rights liberalism. That public philosophy purports to form sufficient common ground for a free, equal, and diverse society. But there's a catch: natural rights liberalism protects its privileged status, leaving genuine pluralism vulnerable to restrictions on groups and viewpoints seen as threatening its norms. Confident pluralism's American challenge is that it must overcome political and cultural instincts that resist its principles—a tall order to say the least.

What may secure these principles? Individualist public philosophies cannot do so because individual liberty reflects at best a partial vision of what it means to be human. The social and transcendent character of human beings that scripture describes, and that traditions such as the neo-Calvinist and Roman Catholic affirm, seems capable of supplying the full three-dimensional view.

Consider Abraham Kuyper's pluralist vision that endures via its contribution to twentieth-century Christian democracy. Taking as his point of depar-

ture the sovereignty of God, Kuyper sketched out a society-wide structure of obedience to his sovereign. He distinguished the government's obligation to do public justice from nongovernmental tasks such as raising children, creating prosperity, or doing works of charity—tasks no less God ordained than doing justice. Alongside this "sphere sovereignty," and the limited government it recognizes, Kuyper asserted a robust conception of religious liberty writ large so as to encompass the traditionally religious, those who reject traditional religion, and everyone in between. This confessional pluralism recognizes that, for example, parents are the primary educators of their children, whom they will raise in accordance with their basic beliefs. Government's task is to extend support and deference to those beliefs, regardless of their content. But Kuyper's pluralism put roots down into an already socially pluralist soil—Inazu must contend with the thin soil of American individualism.

Christian sensibility and the public justice that its moral imperatives call forth lend their influence to *Confident Pluralism*, albeit Inazu eschews an expressly religiously grounded appeal. Even so, his is a persuasive argument, well organized and very clearly written. Students of our contemporary struggles, from Ferguson to Charlottesville and on university campuses, will be the wiser for considering its merits.

Reviewed by Timothy Sherratt, Department of Political Science, Gordon College, Wenham, MA 01984.

TECHNOLOGY

THANK YOU FOR BEING LATE: An Optimist's Guide to Thriving in the Age of Accelerations by Thomas L. Friedman. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2016. 486 pages. Hardcover; $28.00. ISBN: 9780374273538.

Thomas Friedman continues his series of books identifying mega trends that influence living at both a personal and global scale. *Thank You for Being Late* establishes the year 2007 as the epoch of titanic alterations in our social, political and environmental structures. That was the year the iPhone emerged, the Android operating system appeared, IBM's Watson super computer began making its mark, personal DNA sequencing costs had a precipitous decline, and a host of other technologies matured further and faster. Friedman describes how these ignited an overwhelming change in our world through a journalistic style of writing that includes interviews, second-hand research, and personal reflection. In addition to a historical analysis of how these changes came about, Friedman also offers solutions for the negative consequences.

After an opening chapter, in which he uses the vehicle of a personal story to explain his journalistic style and the source of his personal values, Friedman discusses three forces that have changed and will continue to change our future: Moore's Law, Globalization of Marketing, and "Mother Nature." He advocates that there are links between these forces. Succinctly, the pace of innovation has dramatically driven our ability to organize at a global scale. That expansion of industry has exacerbated the consumption of our earthly resources, which ultimately accelerates global climate change. The increased pace of innovation presents unprecedented challenges from personal privacy to global warming. The foundation of the problem is the inherent inability of humans to adapt to changes in a timely way. Friedman's quote of Jeremy Grantham succinctly sums up the problem: "we humans are wickedly bad at dealing with the implications of compound math."

His observations about the benefits and penalties of accelerating technologies seem well balanced. For instance, he points out new opportunities created by technology. These include the use of data mining for more efficient agricultural production and the use of robotics leading to an expansion of careers, even though the initial impression is one of only displacing workers. Yet, the technology that has made marketing more efficient has potentially sinister implications: for instance, the unique identifier of any computing device (known as a MAC address) can be exploited through cell phone usage to make one's personal habits known to the entire world.

Friedman explores the accelerations from a faith perspective in the chapter "Is God in Cyberspace?" Friedman begins by considering Jewish teachings interpreted by a favorite rabbi. This discussion about good versus bad boils down to the claim that God is in those places where we let him in. While this can invite an extensive theological discussion, the main point Friedman makes in this chapter is that goodness is possible through a community effort (local or global). Beyond that, the book encourages a healthy discussion about stewardship and the ethical considerations of technological progress (i.e., technology is not neutral).

For me, the book became disappointing as it transitioned from exploring and explaining the nature and impact of the forces to his contemplation on reconsidering historical values. His vehicle for this is a reflection on his formative years in St. Louis Park, Minnesota, contrasted to the current nature of his