

## BOOK REVIEWS

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE RECONSIDERED: A BUILDING-BLOCK APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF RELIGION AND OTHER SPECIAL THINGS. By Ann Taves. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009. xv + 212 pp. \$26.95 cloth, \$22.95 paper.

Few concepts in the study of religion have enjoyed such heights and suffered such lows as “religious experience.” Emerging in 18th-century Protestant theology, it was proposed as a category that captured the essential core of religious life, one that could both generate a research agenda and forge ecumenical common ground. James’s effort at mapping religious experiences raised it to new heights, putting the study of such experiences within psychology’s scientific domain while leaving room for extra-scientific religious possibilities. The late 20th century saw a change in fortune for this and other concepts forged in the *mélange* of theology, natural science, and social science that was early religious studies. The possibility of accessing experience unmediated by culture was criticized, as was the notion of scientific inquiry into religion at all. Increasing awareness of the role of power in academic inquiry raised concerns about how generalizing ideas such as experience decontextualized religious life and dismissed the religious explanations people gave for their experiences. Proudfoot’s 1985 work further destabilized the category by demonstrating its use for apologetic, protective purposes.

This genealogy is more fully, and more usefully, parsed in Ann Taves’s remarkable effort at reformulating a rigorous concept from the exhausted (and often exhausting) debates over religious experience in the humanities and the natural sciences. The project is ambitious, attempting to build “usable, albeit imperfect bridges” between disciplines that have long talked past each other. She does so by taking the concept of “religious experience” apart, breaking it down into “experiences deemed religious” and other “special things,” and show-

ing how these reimagined concepts can be used as building blocks to understand religions, spiritualities, and experiences at biological, personal, cultural, and social levels. The result is an impressive example of disciplinary reflexivity focused on gaining analytic perspective on the construction of categories for the purposes of making stronger ones.

The book begins by arguing for a conceptual shift from “religious experience,” to “experiences deemed religious,” one that reflects Taves’s adaptation of attribution theory. The shift is useful, she argues, in part because it allows for the analysis of religious designations on individual, interpersonal, group, and intergroup levels and provides a clear limit on what can be analytically pursued in the study of religion. It also allows us to understand things that are deemed religious by comparing them with similar things that are not so deemed. Using Durkheim as her guide, Taves proposes that things considered to be religious (with experiences understood as a kind of thing) can be understood as a set within a larger set of things considered special or outside of ordinary rules of interaction and exchange. Comparing things that share a sense of differentness or specialness but that differ in terms of designation allows Taves to dismantle the protective wall other scholars have erected around religious things in order to bring them into conversation with other things and other disciplines. This category of special things deemed religious becomes the primary element—or block—from which to build an understanding of more complex social formations involving special things, such as particular religions and/or spiritualities, rather than “religion” *per se*.

Having cleared the religion terrain, Taves turns her attention toward experience. She argues for an understanding of experience that would address it at every level, from the neurophysiologic to the sociocultural. With little interest in rehashing debates over the possibility of accessing experience independently of language, she argues that a more robust understanding of experience based on the natural sciences allows us to see the interrelationships, and continuities, between experience and representation. Such an understanding allows Taves

to explicate what kinds of data can be gathered regarding experience and how it can and should be evaluated for different analytic purposes.

She then takes on the problem of causal argumentation in the study of religion, with particular attention to balancing respect for research subjects' supernatural explanations of their experiences with researchers' interest in naturalistic analyses of the phenomenon in question. She explains the analytic process using two narratives of religious experience to model the different levels of analysis necessary to avoid what Proudfoot calls "descriptive reductionism," while still putting experiential data into analytic frameworks that yield real insight into the attribution of religious meaning.

Finally, having specified the objects of inquiry and the kinds of causal claims that can be made, the book attends to the construction of robust comparisons. Rather than basing comparative work on abstract religion-based ideas such as religious experience, she argues for defining a clear point or issue of analogy that is wide enough to contain both things deemed religious and things not so deemed. She then discusses what kinds of questions can be addressed by comparing both simple and complex religious ascriptions within self-contained cases and between those that cross boundaries of time and culture. Comparison, she argues, can get at a key question about "experiences deemed religious"—why experiences deemed religious come to feel real for the subject, so real that the designation of "religious" can be made with genuine conviction, and how that works biologically, culturally, in relatively isolated circumstances, and through processes of exchange and interaction. In this discussion, and throughout the book, Taves deftly moves between the careful exposition of analytic possibilities, research questions and levels of analysis, and well-chosen examples that make the possibilities of her model shimmer.

This is a book that should be read widely and that the field should engage deeply. It is a serious, compelling effort at reshaping the analytic underpinnings of the study of religion in a truly interdisciplinary context. It will be invaluable for investigators at all levels of experience, not just for its helpful articulation of the divides

that have shaped the field of religious studies and its theoretical contributions to that field, but for the maps it provides for the construction of research agendas and projects. It has the potential to analytically reinvigorate our project and shape its direction for some time to come.

LYNNE GERBER  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, California

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM DENIED: RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION AND CONFLICT IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY. By Brian J. Grim and Roger Finke. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011. xiii + 257 pp. \$85.00 cloth, \$24.99 paper.

*The Price of Freedom Denied* is an extremely important contribution to the study of global religious freedom and persecution. Through extensive empirical data collection and analysis and in-depth case studies, Grim and Finke convincingly show that higher degrees of religious regulation by both states and social actors lead to greater rates of violent religious persecution and conflict. Contrary to the opinion of scholars and policymakers who argue that religious regulation helps to curb religious conflict by controlling it, Grim and Finke argue that greater religious freedom (i.e., less state and societal restriction of religion) leads to less violent religious persecution, the main dependent variable of their study. Relying on the insights of religious economies theory, they argue that greater religious freedom leads to greater religious pluralism, which decreases the chances of a single religion monopolizing religious activity. When all religious groups can compete equally for adherents, the state will have less authority and incentive to pursue regulation. Moreover, greater religious freedom protects against the "tyranny" of the majority religion and reduces the grievances of minorities. Thus, there will be less conflict between religious groups.

The book's logic is clearly outlined in the first two chapters and defended in the remaining four, using a wealth of quantitative and

qualitative data. The first chapter outlines the main argument and describes the data set the authors use to analyze the status of religious regulation and persecution worldwide. Collected under the supervision of Brian Grim, the data set extensively documents the three main variables with which the book is concerned: government restriction of religion, social restriction of religion, and violent religious persecution. The authors note the pervasive and pernicious nature of religious persecution around the world, highlighting the importance of continuing study of the topic. In the second chapter, they also argue that social restrictions—previously overlooked by scholars—are vital to examine, as they allow for governments to enforce regulations. Chapter 3 presents empirical evidence to test their argument against competing explanations for violent religious persecution. Their findings describe a cycle in which social restrictions against religion lead to higher levels of government restrictions, which lead to more violent persecution. In turn, violent persecution increases social restrictions, continuing the cycle of persecution in countries with high levels of government restriction. To make the results more readable, the authors confine the details of their empirical analyses to an appendix.

The next two chapters of the book present case studies to illustrate how government and social restrictions of religion lead to persecution. Before analyzing six individual cases, the authors devise a typology of social and government restriction of religion compared with the level of violent religious persecution and conflict (p. 84). This typology is extremely useful in conceptualizing how the authors' three main variables interact. However, the organization of the case study chapters does raise some questions. While one chapter highlights three countries where religious freedoms are routinely denied and religious persecution is high—China, India, and Iran—the other focuses on three countries with differing levels of both religious freedom and violent religious persecution: Japan, Brazil, and Nigeria. The authors note that they selected their cases based on how they differ on the main independent variables and imply that they are emblematic

of the category of country they outline in their typology. However, closer examination of the data presented with each case study shows that countries within each category range rather widely in terms of both religious freedom and levels of persecution, with no explanation for how the categories were created. More explicit attention to the logic behind the typology would be useful to convince the reader of the appropriateness of the authors' case selection.

The authors also devote an entire chapter to Muslim-majority countries, which they find to have both high levels of religious restriction and violent religious persecution. They blame this state of affairs on religious social movements that challenge the state and advocate restricting religious freedom. Therefore, contrary to “clash of civilizations” arguments that predict religious conflict between the Islamic world and the West, the authors argue that it is conflict within Islam that explains religious persecution and conflict. While at some points in the chapter, it appears that the authors blame Sharia law for religious persecution, I believe that they intend instead to focus on how religious social movements are a vital component in explaining how government restriction of religion promotes persecution. In countries with Islamist movements that focus on exclusionary interpretations of Islam, we find religious persecution and conflict. This may be due to the actions of the movements themselves, or to governments that enforce the will of the movements or repress their members in the interest of maintaining security.

I find this book to be one of the most important pieces published on the topic of religious freedom in recent years. Despite some questions concerning selection of cases for closer study and the way that Muslim countries are highlighted as a separate case study rather than being incorporated into the larger typology they propose, I believe this to be a valuable contribution for scholars and policymakers concerned with promoting religious freedom and preventing religious persecution worldwide.

ANI SARKISSIAN  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

A FAITH OF THEIR OWN: STABILITY AND CHANGE IN THE RELIGIOSITY OF AMERICA'S ADOLESCENTS. By Lisa D. Pearce and Melinda Lundquist Denton. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010. xi + 231 pp. \$24.95 cloth.

Each time I teach sociology of religion, I begin with a simple statement: "Religion is a multidimensional phenomenon." Students brainstorm about and discuss religion's many dimensions. We then proceed to read at least a dozen *excellent* studies in which the authors examine a single dimension of religion, apologize for the drawbacks of using just a single measure, and then make largely believable claims about the role of "religion" in the lives of (fill in the blank).

Faithfully acknowledging that religion is a multidimensional problem while routinely relying on a single one of its dimensions in our work may be one of our discipline's worst habits. That Pearce and Denton's new study of the religious lives of adolescents directly names this as a problem and employs a novel method to address it makes *A Faith of Their Own* (AFOTO) unique among the spate of recent books on the topic.

The approach of AFOTO is simultaneously sophisticated yet simple for readers to grasp. Pearce and Denton organize religiosity around three Cs—the *content* of religious belief, the *conduct* of religious activity, and the *centrality* of religion to life. They decide on a series of eight admittedly debatable but reasonable measures of religiosity, and use latent class analysis (LCA) to create a set of religious profiles that can be used to divide the youth population in the United States into five distinct groups: the Abiders, the Adapters, the Assenters, the Avoiders, and the Atheists. The text is not bogged down by methodological detail, but the appendices contain clear and sufficient methodological detail about LCA to satisfy readers seeking to apply this approach to other populations and data sets.

Substantively, Pearce and Denton leverage these profiles to several different ends. First, they combine the LCA results with in-depth interview data to provide a rich, descriptive overview of the five profiles, including the

sociodemographic, psychosocial, and institutional predictors of profile membership. An important theme of their work is the issue of religious congruence. Only two groups—the Abiders (strongly religious across multiple dimensions, about 20 percent of the adolescent population) and Athiests (about 3 percent)—can be characterized as having a highly consistent or congruent set of religious beliefs. The vast majority of U.S. adolescents share one of the other three configurations of religious inconsistency. Unlike texts that bemoan the religious state of today's youth, Pearce and Denton take pains to describe and analyze incongruence without pathologizing it. Incongruence is normal, its nuances are revealing, and it probably is not only characteristic of adolescents.

Second, they discuss the implications of the profiles for some basic measures of adolescent well-being. With regard to "risk behaviors," their analyses will hold few surprises for researchers and practitioners who are familiar with the existing body of literature. However, with regard to adolescent health and well-being, Athiests and Abiders—far apart on the religiosity spectrum but similar in being the two congruent profiles—share the highest levels of overall health, the lowest (i.e., healthiest) average body mass index, and the lowest levels of depression.

Third, they analyze religious change in profiles during a two-year period, using the metaphor of scaffolding to describe how family, peers, and religious institutions provide the structure in which religious beliefs develop and change over this period of the life course. Overall, the message is one of stability over change: relatively few adolescents undergo radical transformations in their religious lives, and in contrast to tropes about religious decline during adolescence, Pearce and Denton find that roughly equal proportions of adolescents become more and less religious during this period of life.

Their approach is more than the application of a new-to-us statistical method. It represents a shift from the variable-centered approach that characterizes most of the quantitative research done in the sociology of religion to a person-centered approach. This person-centered approach is strengthened by

the use of in-depth interview data to provide illustrative examples of adolescents going through these changes, though these cases may not necessarily typify any particular group or process of change.

It remains unclear whether the profiles and patterns Pearce and Denton discuss are specific to adolescents or whether they might not be more generally applicable to the configurations of religious life in the American population today (i.e., the parents and grandparents of the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR) respondents). Comparable analyses with other U.S. cohorts are almost certainly the only way to find out. Fortunately, *AFOTO* provides both students and scholars with an excellent model for how to move beyond merely *thinking* about religion as a multidimensional phenomenon and actually begin *treating* it as such in our scholarship.

JENNY TRINITAPOLI  
The Pennsylvania State University  
State College, Pennsylvania

**MUSLIM WOMEN IN AMERICA: THE CHALLENGE OF ISLAMIC IDENTITY TODAY.** By Yvonne Yazbeck Haddad, Jane I. Smith, and Kathleen M. Moore. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. vi + 190 pp. \$30.00 cloth, \$19.95 paper (released April 2011).

How Muslims understand themselves to be Americans has become of central concern since the tragic events of 9/11, given the rising level of anti-Islamic sentiment in North America and in other parts of the Western world. *Muslim Women in America* delves into the lives of Muslim women who have had to live with the emergent portrayal of Islam as violent and oppressive to the women who follow the faith. This book examines how Muslim women are negotiating the meaning of being a woman and being Muslim in America today.

Haddad, Smith, and Moore point out in the introduction that they wish to focus on women who are openly maintaining their religious beliefs while living in America. Thus, they offer a critical analysis of how these Muslim

women are negotiating family relations, their faith, their identity, and the stereotypes that surround them. They offer a diversity of opinions that exist among American Muslim women. The book begins by documenting patterns of Muslim immigration to the United States, the diverse heritage of Muslims living in America, and the unique issue that affects Muslim women who don Islamic dress, usually the hijab. The authors then shift focus to illustrate how stereotypes about Muslim women in particular have evolved from 18th-century colonial times to the present, to demonstrate how popular culture and media have influenced how the world sees the Muslim woman: an oppressed victim, culturally different, and possibly dangerous.

The authors then examine the concept of conversion to Islam and how some women are living with their "new status as Muslims" (p. 57) and the conflicts that can arise from such changes. A major part of the book is devoted to the ways in which Muslim women are reinterpreting their faith to negotiate gender issues and cultural issues, maintaining tradition and empowering themselves, and how some Muslim women are pushing boundaries within their communities: from officiating at a Muslim marriage to leading a congregation in prayer. Chapters 4 to 7 focus on how women negotiate between their Muslim identities and their American identities, in the workplace, at home, and in the mosque. The book captures a range of voices of women from different generations, new immigrants to America from different countries, and women who have lived there for generations. The fact that the authors include sectarian differences between Muslims clearly illustrates the extensive variances that exist among the voices and lives of Muslim women living in America. The final chapter summarizes the competing discourses that are vying for attention about women's lives as Muslims and Americans: from the deeply conservative to the feminist call for new scriptural interpretations.

Although there is a growing field of scholars examining the portrayal of Muslim men as terrorists and the women as oppressed in the media and popular culture, there are few books that investigate how Muslim women

themselves are negotiating these stereotypes on a daily basis. The authors further illustrate the different ways in which these women live their religion while participating in American society. An inspiring component of the book is the focus on the ways in which Muslim women are renegotiating their own roles within their faith and reinterpreting the way Islam can be lived. The fact that this book is written by three scholars who specifically examine Islam in America offers a successful in-depth study of the diversity of lives of Muslim women and is an important contribution in understanding how Islamic identity, especially for women whose voices are often marginalized in the mainstream, is being negotiated in an American context.

RUBINA RAMJI  
Cape Breton University  
Sydney, Nova Scotia

**FAITHFUL REVOLUTION: HOW VOICE OF THE FAITHFUL IS CHANGING THE CHURCH.** By Tricia Colleen Bruce. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. viii + 215 pp. \$49.95 cloth.

In early 2002, as revelations concerning clergy pedophilia and bishops' awareness (and reassigning) of abusive priests continued to unfold, a group of Boston-area lay Catholics founded Voice of the Faithful (VOTF), which eventually grew into a roughly 30,000-member-strong national movement. Intending to, as their motto puts it, "Keep the Faith, Change the Church," it aims to (1) support the victims of clergy abuse, (2) support "priests of integrity," and (3) change the institutional structures of the Catholic Church that helped bring about this crisis in the first place. This is a fascinating story. Institutional conflict and change, the interplay between collective grievances and culture, the role of religion in social movement activism—there are many twists here and, to her great credit, Tricia Bruce addresses them all in her sensitive and insightful account.

To do so, she relies upon standard sociological methods. First, she did fieldwork at the VOTF affiliate in Santa Barbara, California

(for two years) and then spent another year at numerous affiliates and movement-sponsored events throughout the country. Second, she conducted semi-structured interviews with a purposive sampling of 50 people involved in the movement. And, lastly, she relied upon discourse analysis of such artifacts as press releases, letters to bishops, online postings, and so forth.

These methods serve her well. They enable her to give the reader a good sense of the movement's history. They also provide an *in situ* sense of what the movement actually feels like for its members. Their anger upon learning about the sex abuse crisis, their sense of empowerment, the frustrations wrought of the hard (typically thankless) work of trying to change a large and powerful institution: it's all here. So too are all the ambiguities and complexities that accompany the consolidation of any social movement. The above-mentioned aims of the movement may seem clear enough, but Bruce does an excellent job at describing just how contested—and often at odds with one another—each of them has been among VOTF activists.

What she does especially well, and is evidenced throughout her book, is tease out the analytical nuances derived from her deft framing of VOTF as an "intra-institutional social movement." These are social movements operating within such institutions as schools, corporations, and, most germane here, churches. They are unique, she tells us, in that the *target* of collective action is the institution (rather than, say, the state) and also because movement *participants* are "insiders" who remain affiliated with the institution.

Bruce leverages this basic insight to good effect. On the one hand, she shows how sharing a common religious culture enables activists to articulate a vision for ecclesial reform—drawing upon the life of Jesus or the character of the early church, for example—in terms discernable to both one another and church leaders. On the other hand, and most compellingly, she is also attentive to the myriad of ways in which this shared religious culture constrains the collective identity, form, and tactics of the movement—often at the expense of its overall effectiveness.

For instance, in order to legitimate their claims before church leaders and their fellow laypeople, VOTF members are careful to hone their identity as “committed Catholics.” But this has largely kept them from collaborating with such organizational “outsiders” as SNAP (Survivors Network of Those Abused by Priests). With respect to form, VOTF’s strategy of reflecting the practices and norms of the larger institution also have had unintended consequences. The movement supports priests and requests the use of parish space for meetings, but this also functions to reify priestly authority. It tries to separate doctrinal (“keep the faith”) from administrative (“change the church”) issues, but this creates problems when these prove less easily separable for many Catholics. It declines to share with the media the details of its leadership’s meetings with church officials, but such gestures bode to replicate more than challenge the church’s culture of unaccountability. And, with respect to tactics, the movement has relied far more on conciliatory than aggressive ones. Preferring prayer services and “Healing Masses” to direct protests, and preferring to focus on the sex scandal rather than also incorporating such “hot button” issues as priestly celibacy and women’s ordination, the movement sustains its legitimacy but may lose some of its energy in the process.

Bruce delineates these and other tensions with much aplomb. So much, in fact, that my one caveat about this book is that it demonstrates less, as its subtitle denotes, “How Voice of the Faithful is Changing the Church” (the degree to which is debatable) than how the church’s institutional culture is constraining and thus changing VOTF. I say this especially in light of Bruce’s own demographic data that reveal VOTF activists to be primarily white, educated baby boomers (average age of 58 years) whose expectations of their church and its leaders have been shaped by the collaborative ecclesiology articulated by Vatican II. I am not sure that younger generations of American Catholics sufficiently share either these expectations or the activist bent of the people discussed in this book to further advance their project of changing the church. Yet, whatever the ultimate outcome, I am quite sure that this fine book provides an excellent model for the

very sort of scholarship required to tell that currently unfolding story with rigor and verve as well.

JEROME P. BAGGETT

Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University  
Berkeley, California

**MORMON POLYGAMY IN THE UNITED STATES: HISTORICAL, CULTURAL AND LEGAL ISSUES.** Edited by Cardell K. Jacobson with Lara Burton. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011, 368 pp. \$ 29.95 paper.

The 2008 Texas state raid on the Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (FLDS) is the backdrop for the new volume edited by Cardell Jacobson and Lara Burton, *Modern Polygamy in the United States*. The FLDS is one of several sects that broke from the mainstream LDS Church over the issue of polygamy or “Celestial Marriage” after the Church issued the 1890 Manifesto abandoning polygamy. The polygamous sects are distinguished by both adherents and scholars alike as the “fundamentalists.” The FLDS is the largest of the fundamentalist Mormon groups.

The editors use a prologue to briefly describe the Texas state raid on the FLDS community in Eldorado. The community was established in 2004 as the Yearning for Zion (YFZ) Ranch and by the time of the raid in 2008 had approximately 800 residents. The YFZ branch of the FLDS represented a vanguard of believers who left the base community in Hildale, Utah/ Colorado City, Arizona and followed its prophet-leader Warren Jeffs to Texas to prepare for the new millennium. The Texas raid revived critical issues that have plagued the FLDS for more than 70 years—polygamy and young brides. This was not the first government raid on the FLDS. The FLDS has been targeted on three previous occasions: in 1935, 1944, and 1953. But as the contributors to this volume point out, the previous state raids have not deterred the FLDS from practicing plural marriage and the most recent raid will likely not be any different. The FLDS holds Celestial

Marriage to be the centerpiece of its beliefs and identity as a religion.

Following the prologue, the book is divided into three sections. Part 1 examines historical and cultural patterns of polygamy in the United States. This section contains five chapters and features some of the most prominent scholars in the field—Martha Sontag Bradley, Kenneth Driggs, and Janet Bennion among them. This portion, which is largely historical, is very strong, though perhaps redundant in places as contributors all revisit the development of the origins of polygamy stemming from Joseph Smith's founding revelation and the subsequent schism created by the 1890 Manifesto. Martha Bradley's chapter, entitled "A Repeat of History," offers a comparative analysis of the three previous raids on the FLDS and draws on lessons learned and not learned. Bradley is uniquely positioned to conduct this analysis having written extensively about the FLDS raids elsewhere. Space does not permit a discussion of all the chapters here, but I found the chapter by Ken Driggs especially insightful as a summary of observations based on numerous visits to the FLDS community over a period of 20 years. Driggs challenges the stereotypes and unfortunate media images that flowed from the news coverage.

Part 2 of the volume offers social science perspectives on polygamy. There are six chapters in this section, including a demographic analysis of the FLDS by Tim Heaton and Cardell Jacobson, and a media analysis of the Texas raid by Ryan Cragun and Michael Nielsen. Two chapters offer comparative analyses, which are helpful in giving the raid some context. Janet Bennion draws on data she collected among several Mormon fundamentalist groups to identify significant variation in polygamous practices. Gordon and Gary Shepherd compare elements of government raids among the FLDS, the Branch Davidians, and the Family International. Carrie Miles examines polygamy in cross-cultural, historical, and economic perspective, drawing a sharp contrast between plural marriage and romantic love. Arland Thornton analyzes the predominant narrative of modernity, which is used by mainstream media and critics to condemn Mormon polygamy as "backwards" or bar-

barian. He rightly challenges this simplistic narrative.

Part 3 of the volume examines legal and ethical issues surrounding the seizure of the FLDS children by authorities in Texas. This section contains two chapters. Deborah and Ryan Cragun explore the ethical implications of parentage testing in the FLDS case. They note that the FLDS parents felt coerced to submit to presumably "voluntary" DNA samples and observe that there were probably more prudent and less invasive ways to determine parentage. Linda Smith provides a legal examination of the actions taken by Texas authorities. Smith is more reserved in her critique than I or others have been elsewhere. Her criticism of the state's action is largely confined to the mass custodial detention of FLDS children. While I concur with the custody criticism, I would also argue that the paramilitary raid was excessive and unnecessary; it does not require a battalion of militarized police with fully automatic weapons and an armored tank to execute a search warrant on a peaceful religious community. My colleague Jim Richardson has also taken issue with the extraordinary conditions imposed on the FLDS in order for them to retain custody of the children, raising questions about the extent of social and legal control of religious communities allowed in the United States. These and other legal issues are not addressed, though one has to keep in mind that the book's primary focus is not the Texas raid, but rather polygamy among fundamentalist Mormons more generally.

Those seeking a solid primer on Mormon polygamy will find this volume very helpful. The editors have commissioned an excellent group of scholars and they bring a wealth of knowledge to this project. I have spent the last two years working on a volume on the FLDS raid (with Jim Richardson) but I still learned a number of things I did not know from reading this book. For example, gender roles vary greatly among different fundamentalist groups. Some households and families are actually run and organized by the wives, while others are more patriarchal. Also, many Mormon fundamentalist men have only two wives and do not become polygamists until they are in their 30s. Fundamentalists also believe that God had at

least two wives, Eve and Lilith, and that Christ was married to both Mary Magdalene and her sister, Martha. The book is full of such curious and interesting details. Overall, it is a substantial and valuable contribution to the scholarly literature on Mormon fundamentalism and polygamy and I highly recommend it.

STUART A. WRIGHT  
Lamar University  
Beaumont, Texas

SCIENCE AND RELIGION AROUND THE WORLD. Edited by John Hedley Brooke and Ronald L. Numbers. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. xv + 316 pp. \$29.95 paper.

DARWIN'S PIOUS IDEA: WHY THE ULTRA-DARWINISTS AND CREATIONISTS BOTH GET IT WRONG. By Conor Cunningham. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010. xx + 543 pp. \$35.00 cloth.

One of the most pervasive, persistent, and popular myths since the late 19th century is that religion and science are incorrigibly at war. John William Draper compiled his *History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science* (New York: D. Appleton) in 1874, followed by Andrew Dickson White's sequel of sorts for the same publisher, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, 2 vols. (New York: D. Appleton, 1876).

For Draper, White, and their contemporary dauphins Richard Dawkins and Daniel Dennett, beleaguered scientists and other people of goodwill must courageously persevere against a frenzied global onslaught of religious bigotry striving to strangle science and human progress. According to this narrative, religion plays the paradoxical roles of powerful benighted oppressor and archaic doddering dimwit, ripe for euthanizing.

John Hedley Brooke and Ronald L. Numbers in *Science and Religion Around the World* assemble essays and recommended reading challenging these "warfare" narratives with interactions between science and

early Judaism (Noah Efron), modern Judaism (Geoffrey Cantor), early Christianity (Peter Harrison and David C. Lindberg), modern Christianity (John Hedley Brooke), early Islam (Ahmad S. Dallal), modern Islam (Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu), early Chinese religions (Mark Csikszentmihayli), Indic religions (B. V. Subbarayappa), Buddhism (Donald S. Lopez, Jr.), African religions (Steve Feierman and John M. Janzen), unbelief (Bernard Lightman), as well as a chapter entitled "Which Science? Whose Religion?" (David N. Livingstone).

In their introduction, Brooke and Numbers appreciate the vigorous tradition of cross-pollination between Christianity and science. At the same time, they seek to expand the scope and array of voices in contemporary science and religion dialogs, emphasizing history.

Noah Efron traces Jewish aspirations in the Hebrew Bible, Talmud, and Middle Ages to appreciate and unravel the "secrets of nature" or "natural wisdom" (p. 20). Efron incorporates intermittent Jewish cooperation in science and philosophy with Christians and Muslims. Geoffrey Cantor focuses on Sephardi and Ashkenazi Jews following the scientific revolution, relaying Jewish anxieties about science and other disciplines possibly supplanting attention to Torah study. Cantor surveys a spectrum of Jewish responses to Darwin, closing with a synopsis of "Jews in the Modern Scientific Community" from Oppenheimer to Einstein (p. 56).

Turning to Christianity, Harrison, Lindberg, and Brooke record "both opposition and encouragement between Christianity and science" (p. 67). For these authors, there is abundant "encouragement" that Christianity's cultured despisers obscure or ignore. Harrison and Lindberg diagnose the "warfare" narrative as displaying a "dearth of supporting historical evidence" (p. 67) based on sensationalized yellow-journalism-style rewrites of supposed clashes between religion and science involving Hypatia (ca: 360–415 AD/CE, who had many Christian pupils), Galileo, Darwin, and Thomas Henry Huxley. But from Christianity's inception, "[m]ost of the church fathers were educated, adult converts" (p. 68), and

European leading lights of science from Galileo to Newton and Faraday were profoundly religious, motivated in their scientific work by their Christian faith. Christian theologians for centuries likewise saw science as a “handmaiden” to theology, and Christians since the 19th century have articulated and endorsed rich continuums of engagement with Darwin and evolution, ranging from skepticism and denial to enthusiasm and virtual patronage.

Harrison, Lindberg, and Brooke invite consternation from popular purveyors of science and religion as irreconcilable enemies. Ahmad S. Dallal provokes spirited debate with more established academic opinion surrounding science and Islam. Dallal takes a revisionist approach contesting presuppositions that Islam itself is somehow responsible for the decline of astronomy, philosophy, medicine, and mathematics in Muslim-dominated regions following the death of al-Ghazali (1111 CE). Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu then describes “selective transfer of ‘European’ science” (p. 148) to the Ottoman Empire in the modern era, when Ottomans pursued geography, astronomy, technology, and even alchemy, which implied or paralleled scientific endeavors. The Industrial Revolution and European military defeats of the Ottomans occasioned Ottoman awareness of Western science, philosophy, and technology. Some modern Muslims adopted or explored social Darwinism, while others such as Adnan Oktar (pen name Harun Yahya) in his *Atlas of Creation* formulated Islamic creationist frameworks.

Csikszentmihalyi’s “Early Chinese Religions” examines three representative episodes “from the history of science and religion in China” (p. 179): (1) proto-scientific probing of musical acoustics circa third century BCE, (2) Chinese medicine from third century BCE to the 1500s CE encounter with Jesuits, and (3) the growth of knowledge and technologies in China’s “early modern period” under Manchu and Mongol rule (p. 179).

B. V. Subbarayappa classifies Hinduism, Jainism, and Buddhism as “Indic religions,” casting traditional Indian astronomy, mathematics, medicine, and “related biological ideas” as developing within or because of these

religions (p. 196). For example, Indian astronomy “was essential for determining the timing of rituals and sacrifices . . . the construction of several forms of sacrificial altars . . . determination of celestial events such as solstices, when sacrifices had to be performed. The first activity gave rise to Vedic geometry” (p. 196). Subbarayappa credits Indian mathematicians for devising the so-called Arabic numerals before they were adopted by Muslims. He closes by summarizing the history of science in India prior to British colonialism and on until 1958, and briefly alludes to “Hindu evolutionists” (p. 204).

Donald S. Lopez overviews the traditional Four Noble Truths and life of Siddhartha Gautama, the Buddha, moving quickly to “Colonial Encounter” (p. 213) where Europeans began to investigate Buddhism in its original languages and to leverage Buddhism against Christianity. Lopez quotes Buddhists who see Buddhism as a science of the mind, “not only . . . compatible with modern science but superior to it” (p. 218), partly because science is entangled with “the tyranny of the machine and all those monstrous powers to which Science has given birth” (p. 218). Buddhism allegedly possesses “access to states of wisdom that science alone can never attain” (p. 220). Lopez documents Japanese and Indian government censure of Buddhism, and the Dalai Lama’s respect for science as a helpful but deficient tool: “A real understanding of the true nature of mind can only be gained through meditation” (pp. 225–26).

Feierman and Janzen shine light on holistic health as conceived by Christian and animist Africans concerned with communal care, identity, and empathy for mental and physical suffering. They explain how Western science and Christian missionaries have prompted and still prompt some Africans to employ African and Western sciences as complementary ingredients in healing.

Bernard Lightman covers some of the same material as Harrison, Lindberg, and Brooke; composing a more nuanced history of science through the eyes of “unbelief” than the melodramatic alarmism peddled by Richard Dawkins. Lightman situates Dawkins and other atheists who try to pit “science” against “religion,” by comparing 21st-century “New

Atheists” with their antecedent non- or unbelievers from the Enlightenment to the present day.

David N. Livingstone’s concluding essay brings together previous chapters and counsels readers to guard against postulating “science” and “religion” as two monolithic entities totally antagonistic or in tandem to each other. Livingstone cautions against referring to “Buddhism,” preferring the plural “Buddhisms” (p. 282, cf. Lopez on pp. 214 and 219), and observes that preceding chapters reveal multiple “religions” and “sciences,” neither “tidily segregated” (p. 279) nor identical, but “delightfully” complicated (p. 292). Livingstone additionally advises historians and other scholars to *localize* encounters between religions and sciences according to geographic region, to address their politicization, and to recognize *hybridization* integrating science, unbelief, and varied religious traditions as “cross-cultural syntheses” (p. 285).

Here it is useful to bring in a near-concurrent publication pertaining to the science-religion “warfare” narrative, Conor Cunningham’s *Darwin’s Pious Idea: Why Ultra-Darwinists and Creationists Both Get it Wrong*. Cunningham writes as a Christian theologian who sees modern Creationism beginning with William Paley (1743–1805) as heretical to Christianity. Certain to exasperate New Atheists, Cunningham perceives Dawkins, Dennett, and other “Ultra Darwinists” as Creationists’ gnostic ideological twins. Both for Cunningham promote unworkable hybridizations and politicizations of religion and science.

Cunningham asserts that Creationists appeal to privileged or elite knowledge about the Bible as though it were a comprehensive information manual, while New Atheists quasi-worship reductive physicalism by forcing Darwin’s scientific insight into an operational theory of everything. Cunningham sees Creationists and New Atheists interpreting God as a crass, easily (dis)provable scientific hypothesis; and both as holding living, breathing creatures in contempt.

Creationists do this by overspiritualizing heaven over and against the physical renewal of the “New Heavens and Earth” actually pro-

claimed by the Bible. Ultra-Darwinists reduce everything that exists to its crude physical description. Darwin’s “pious idea” instead dignifies all living beings—indeed all God’s creation—by demonstrating their intrinsic interrelatedness giving rise to and sustaining each other, including humanity, who God wonderfully fashions in God’s image through the intricate process Darwin enunciated (cf. Genesis 1).

*Darwin’s Pious Idea* references 100 pages of endnotes, interacting scrupulously with contemporary science and philosophy regarding the science–religion “warfare” narrative and allied matters. Cunningham furthers conversation for the guild, but his punctilious jargon (though amply seasoned with British humor) will render his book perplexing to nonspecialists. Cunningham also less than thoroughly cites Creationists who actually hold views he disdains.

Brooke and Numbers collate a groundbreaking but accessible anthology containing fresh analysis easily utilized for university courses, book clubs, and perhaps even for advanced high school or secondary classes. I offer three critiques.

First, Cunningham uses heavily male, gender-specific terminology. Brooke and Numbers feature no female contributors. This is unfortunate, given that science and religion are both historically criticized as patriarchal enterprises, or as institutions marginalizing women’s voices.

Second, Cantor’s “Modern Judaism” contribution avers that there neither is, nor has been, “antievolutionist movement among Jews comparable with the very hostile creationist opposition by some Christians and Muslims” (p. 55). Cantor fails to note the widely distributed theatrical release, *Expelled! No Intelligence Allowed* written and hosted by the Jewish actor and former Nixon/Ford presidential speechwriter, Ben Stein. This documentary film leans heavily, though not exclusively, on Jewish intelligent design theorists and/or Creationists. One could also ask Cantor for any available data about Creationist or equivalent beliefs proportionally held by select Jewish, Christian, and Muslim populations.

Finally, David Livingstone's thoughtful synopsis may overdo distinguishing between Buddhism and Buddhisms, science and sciences, and so forth. Few scholars would dispute potentially limitless manifestations or expressions of Christianity, Buddhism, Islam, and the like. As Gandhi (1997) famously remarked, "there are as many religions as there are individuals." Science, religion, and particular named religions such as Buddhism may be difficult to demarcate.

Even so, if there are no decisive qualities unifying "Buddhisms" within a broader "Buddhism," or if there is no characteristically "Hindu" or "Jewish" interaction(s) with "science" or given scientific disciplines; this may confuse efforts to decipher incidents and opportunities for cooperation, dialog, and other types of relationships between science and religion; not to mention various entities, positions, or subgroups for these categories. How do perpetually diverse "Christianities" coalesce within or

as "Christianity" confronting or collaborating with science(s)? How far should science and religion researchers vaguely or explicitly postulate hypothetical subcategories without losing clarity? Current and future practitioners may continue to differentiate or specialize *ad infinitum*, but carefully considering the mode and manner whereby this proceeds will be fruitful for cultivating delightfully complex rather than incoherent results. Chronicling science and religion around the world merits nothing less.

BENJAMIN B. DEVAN  
Durham University  
Durham, UK

#### REFERENCE

- Gandhi, M. K. 1997. Cambridge texts in modern politics. In *Hind Swaraj and other writings*, edited by Anthony J. Parell, p. 52. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.