the authors' emphasis on individual pilgrimage failed to adequately address how all thinking and knowing remain grounded in communities and traditions, whether science or faith. Thus, the intentional focus on individual pilgrimage leaves the grounding of our personhood weak and unaccounted for. Scientists, for example, work out of a communal understanding of the scientific process, a central tradition informing the exploration of reality.

Second, I found the distinctions among the four pathways to be weak, and, at times, the biblical texts used to argue for the four felt forced and artificial. Rachel Carson lived as an empirical scientist but surely her work involved proclamation and changed the trajectory of environmental understanding and policy. She also expressed deep compassion for the natural world. Paul Farmer operated out of a deep compassion for the health of the underserved but measured his effectiveness using evidence-based practice. His work remained embedded in attentiveness to local systems and cultures. James Cone spoke against structural racism, but the evidence for such broken systems is seen in empirical measurements, including the results of redlining by banks and the pattern of toxic waste facilities concentrated in communities of color. Thomas Merton's representation of contemplation seemed to represent a different type of truth seeking based on self-understanding, rather than seeking understanding about the world around us.

The authors could develop a stronger pilgrimage framework by combining the four pathways into impulses embodied by all on the journey of faith and learning. Henri Nouwen, in *The Wounded Healer* (1972), says that we must first articulate the truth of the pain and suffering in the world and its complex reality. Second, we must be transformed by stories of real people, places, and processes because they are concrete examples of the present state of reality. We must be attentive while we crunch numbers in order to explore the fullness of reality. Third, we should allow our emotional assessment of the situation to be transformed into intellectual understanding. Through our transformation, we may develop a deeper understanding of the societal structures around us and thus have a clearer view on what changes we wish to proclaim. Nouwen concludes that, ultimately, this process of discovery moves us toward a deeper sense of our own self-understanding in God's world.

I would recommend this book to readers for two reasons. First, its breadth adds to what many have experienced as a largely North American conversation about faith and learning. Second, the concept of pilgrimage is a rich one which invites reflection. This lens for viewing faith and learning is one that speaks to the present generation and counterbalances the traditional propositional approach to such discussions.

Reviewed by Janel Curry, president of the American Scientific Affiliation, former dean for research and scholarship at Calvin University and former provost at Gordon College.

History and Philosophy of Science

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56315/PSCF6-26Lightman

THE SHAPE OF WONDER: **How Scientists Think, Work, and Live** by Alan Lightman and Martin Rees. Pantheon, 2025. 208 pages. Hardcover; $28.00. ISBN: 9780593702024.

Ask any person on the street to describe a "scientist." You may receive a wide range of responses. One might mention traits such as intelligence and dedication. Another may imagine a serious person wearing a lab coat. Some may hold scientists in high esteem. Some may suggest a degree of distrust. Lightman and Rees want us to know that scientists are everyday people with special training in pursuit of wonder. In *The Shape of Wonder*, Lightman and Rees endeavor to paint a compelling and winsome picture of who becomes a scientist, how a scientist works, and what their role in public policy and society may be.

The authors are ideally suited for this task as distinguished scholars and ambassadors for the sciences. Alan Lightman is an astrophysicist and currently MIT professor of the Practice of the Humanities. Martin Rees is the former director of the Institute of Astronomy, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and co-founder of the Centre for Study of Existential Risks. Both men are passionate about science and those who practice it.

The authors seek to shape how the public sees scientists and their discipline. After debates about policy measures to fight covid and climate change, some groups may be losing trust in scientists and science as whole. Lightman and Rees aim to humanize scientists and dispel myths about what science is and how it is pursued. They define the work of science as "disciplined wonder" and view scientists as ordinary people with extraordinary education. To illustrate this, the authors fill the book with winsome portraits of contemporary and historical scientists in a diversity of fields. One reads not only of these individuals' scientific pursuits, but also of their childhood, hobbies, relationships, and dreams.

The work is structured in eight chapters that explore common questions about the life of a scientist, from why they enter discipline, to how they pursue their craft, to what keeps them going. The book concludes with a discussion of scientists and ethics with respect to their role in public policy debates of our time.

Lightman and Rees are at their best describing the lives of scientists. Reading about these individuals' hopes, dreams, struggles, and even their failings, connects us with these scientists. In addition to numerous historical biographies, Lightman and Rees interviewed five currently active scientists from a wide variety of backgrounds. Often writing in the manner of a travelogue, our duo describe the experience of meeting with their fellow practitioners. At times, readers feel as if they are at tea, listening in on conversations. We see real people. One physicist confesses, "Physics is not the most fun thing I do … sometimes it is very frustrating" (p. 79), before sharing a love of rock climbing. Another featured scientist was inspired in her pursuits by growing up in a disadvantaged community and now researches topics that could help her neighborhood. The authors capture their subjects' "humanness" well, and illustrate that the practice of "disciplined wonder" is open to anyone.

The Shape of Wonder would be a wonderful gift for scientifically inclined students and mentees or someone considering a career in science. It offers a warm introduction to the life and practice of science. However, the book does have its weaknesses. The authors missed an opportunity to explore scientists motivated by faith. They briefly mention physicist Don Page's work in speculative cosmology and casually note that he "retained his fundamentalist beliefs" (p. 95). From the context, the authors seem to be perplexed by an evangelical Christian in physics. I was disappointed that they chose not to interview Page or another scientist from a faith background since "wonder" is an integral part of Christian faith and practice. Such a discussion could have further broadened not only the discussion of wonder in the book, but also the audience for it.

The weakest section was their discussion of ethics and public policy. Lightman and Rees were motivated to write because they perceive a growing distrust of scientific opinion in debates on the environment and public health. Public trust is essential in grappling with the complicated challenges we face in public policy. We need reliable and trusted voices to provide their expertise. At this point, the authors attempt to grapple with the possibility that scientific findings can lead to both good and evil results. They confess that "sometimes it is not easy to define the good" (p. 166). They go on to state, "Our view is that science and the technology resulting from science do not have values in themselves. It is we human beings who possess values. And we should employ those values in how we use science and technology" (pp. 166–67). They conclude that good "probably meant … increasing the well-being-happiness, and quality of life of the largest number of people … and bad diminishes that well-being" (p. 167).

Utilitarianism is speciously attractive as a scientific approach to ethics since it advocates the collection of data and weighing the consequences. This approach can have significant unintended social results since "the greatest number" still leaves a vulnerable minority. The utilitarian view begs the question of what is "good." The authors should consider a broader exploration of ethics for applying scientific knowledge in public affairs. Public Administration scholar James Svara, for example, suggests employing multiple theories as an "Ethical Triangle" that examines policy from the perspectives of "Principles, Consequences, Virtue, and Duty"(p. 82).[1] By examining policy from multiple ethical perspectives, one is forced to ponder that a policy that seems to benefit the majority may not be "good" for all in society.

While the authors approach this work from materialist convictions, the concept of wonder is implicitly Christian. Sometimes it seems that the chasm between the materialist and Christian worldview is too wide to cross. Yet we share a sense of wonder about the world and universe in which we live. As the Psalmist writes, "the heavens declare the glory of God" (Ps. 19:1). When the marvels of the creation fill us with awe, one might just discover that wonder reveals the God-shaped hole in our hearts.

Note

[1]James Svara, *The Ethics Primer for Public Administrators in Government and Nonprofit Organizations*. 2nd ed. (Jones & Bartlett Learning, 2015).

Reviewed by M. G. Moland, dean of education, arts and sciences, LeTourneau University, Longview, TX 75602.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56315/PSCF6-26Howell

DESIGNER SCIENCE: A History of Intelligent Design in America by C.W. Howell. NYU Press, 2025. 296 pages. Hardcover; $35.00. ISBN: 9781479827671.

"Intelligent design" (ID) has been debated in the pages of this journal for decades, but *Designer Science* provides something unique: a long-form history of the century-long debate around this specific term. In this book, religion scholar C.W. Howell describes not the arguments themselves, but the intellectual, social, and legal dynamics around them. It provides a valuable resource for anyone who has participated in these debates, giving a historical perspective that individual journal articles cannot, although the author's own beliefs skew the narrative somewhat.

Howell writes his history as a tale of two trials: the 1925 *Scopes* "Monkey Trial" and the 2005 case, *Kitzmiller v. Dover*. Both were local proceedings that drew national attention, both were about education more than about science, and both were more important for their social impact than for their legal findings. Also, both split Christians, some moving away from a literal interpre-