opportunities taken by Reddish to share his own views, which will resonate with many ASA/CSCA members. In his conclusion to his final chapter, for example, he encourages his readers to embrace the biblical stories on their own merits and (following Barbour) advocates for an independence stance between science and scripture, while endorsing a dialogue perspective between science and theology. There are those who may wish to push further toward a more concordist position. However, Reddish argues in chapter four that one must be careful about making the text say something it never said, and that while concordism's hermeneutic is well meaning, "it is ultimately flawed."

In David Livingstone's book *Dealing with Darwin* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), there is a chapter entitled "Toronto, Knox, and Bacon's Bequest." The "Knox" refers to the aforementioned college, and Livingstone notes that in the mid to late 1800s, the intellectual leadership at the college displayed "a notable willingness to engage in a creative conversation with evolutionary theory." Tim Reddish carries on with that tradition. He has delivered to his target audience well, but I would happily recommend the book for more general use also.

Reviewed by Bob Geddes, a retired Presbyterian pastor, former geologist, and secretary-treasurer of the CSCA.

FINDING GOD IN THE WAVES: How I Lost My Faith and Found It Again through Science by Mike McHargue. New York: Convergent Books, 2016. xiv + 274 pages, notes, index. Hardcover; $24.00. ISBN: 9781101906040.

> *"The first gulp from the glass of natural sciences will turn you into an atheist, but at the bottom of the glass God is waiting for you."* (Werner Heisenberg)

A more fitting epigraph could not have been chosen for this book. Mike McHargue, who goes by "Science Mike" these days, has been on a wild ride for the past few years. A college dropout turned autodidactic marketing VP, McHargue is now a full-time writer, speaker, host of the podcast *Ask Science Mike*, and co-host of *The Liturgists Podcast*. Readers of *PSCF* are likely to be familiar with his work with BioLogos in addition to his contributions to various magazines and blogs. *Finding God in the Waves* weaves these projects together into two parts that are essentially interleaved. The first functions primarily as a memoir of McHargue's conservative Southern Baptist upbringing, his slide into atheism, and his subsequent rediscovery of faith. The second explores how McHargue understands the intersection of science and faith today.

While he makes it clear that he is not a trained or working scientist, McHargue nevertheless possesses a unique ability to synthesize the literature into a form that is accessible and engaging to laypersons and scientists alike. With highly visible science popularizers like Tyson and Nye sometimes demeaning the religious, McHargue's ability to convey scientific concepts accurately from a radically inclusive posture is a breath of fresh air.

Regardless of one's position on where McHargue ends up theologically, it is hard to deny the power of his journey. As a self-described nerdy kid with a learning disability, bullying was a constant companion throughout his childhood. In a particularly emotional passage, he tells of how he hid amongst the trees during recess to avoid physical abuse, spending the entire time talking to his only friend—Jesus. Discovering that computers could help him overcome his learning disabilities, as well as experiencing a rock star streak in his teens, led McHargue to a place where he could develop healthier social ties. The church played no small role in this; he was ordained as a deacon at the age of 25.

McHargue's story of an unraveling faith departs from familiar accounts here. It was not Big Bang cosmology, or evolution, or the problem of evil that sparked doubt; it was reading the Bible itself. McHargue was blindsided by his father's intention to seek a divorce after nearly thirty years of marriage. Intent on helping his father see the gravity of this sin, McHargue tackled the problem by throwing himself into the scriptures. Having never read the Bible from cover to cover before, McHargue read it through four times in one year. Apparent contradictions that he had overlooked before and troubling passages that he had been able to explain away began to rear their heads anew; paradoxically, constantly steeping himself in the text made these harder to ignore. Clearly a voracious reader, McHargue sought insight from apologists and atheists alike as his faith continued to erode—until reading Dawkins's *The God Delusion* finally tipped him over the edge.

McHargue spent the next two years as "the world's least interesting secret agent—an atheist under deep cover in the Baptist church" (p. 74). He was eventually found out by his wife, and his "secret" nearly destroyed his own marriage. They managed to work it out and McHargue became, by all accounts, a well-adjusted secular humanist. However, at a conference on creativity hosted by Rob Bell, McHargue had a series of profound mystical experiences that culminated in a moment on a Californian beach in the middle of the night where he "felt connected to the Source of Life and the Source of All" (p. 127).

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