



Timothy Larsen

“War Is Over, If You Want It”: Beyond the Conflict between Faith and Science

Timothy Larsen

The purpose of this article is to help emerging scholars, especially in the sciences, to reframe the issue of the relationship between faith and learning in a productive way. While critiques of the warfare model exist in the specialized literature of the history of science, the presumption of conflict continues to dominate in the media and in popular conversations in both secular and religious contexts. As a result, young scholars have often imbibed this model themselves as an accurate portrait of the way things are, and they usually do not have a clear, up-to-date reflection on the relationship of faith and learning to put in its place. This critique is offered as such a resource.

In an earlier work that focused on the foremost secularists or atheists in nineteenth-century England who came to faith, I examined the pattern of the gaining or regaining of faith, of Christian conversion or reconversion.¹ This is an extraordinarily significant pattern. Many of these reconverts were once counted among the leading half dozen of the most respected and prominent national leaders of organized free thought. While a whole range of such figures could be highlighted here, I will present only George Sexton as he was indisputably considered the greatest authority on science in the secularist movement, and I want to make the relationship between faith and science the focus of this article.

George Sexton was the only atheist leader in nineteenth-century Britain with an earned doctorate—although he was English, his PhD was from the venerable University of Giessen in Germany. As a man of science, he was a Fellow of a whole range of elite, learned institutions including the Royal Anthropological Institute, the Zoological Society,

and the Royal Geographical Society.² As an atheist, perhaps his most important scientific publication was a work drawing on Charles Darwin’s thought entitled *The Antiquity of the Human Race* (1871).³

Sexton is but one of many such figures who abandoned secularism for Christian thought. By my calculations, at least 20% of the top leadership of organized atheism or secularism in nineteenth-century Britain eventually came to Christian faith and went on to defend Christian orthodoxy publicly,

At least 20% of the top leadership of organized atheism or secularism in nineteenth-century Britain eventually came to Christian faith and went on to defend Christian orthodoxy publicly ...

Timothy Larsen is Carolyn and Fred McManis Professor of Christian Thought, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois. He is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society and in 2007 was a Visiting Fellow, Trinity College, Cambridge. His research articles have appeared in numerous journals including *Journal of Victorian Culture*, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, *Church History*, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, *Pro Ecclesia*, *Journal of Religious History*, and *Parliamentary History*. He is also a contributing editor to *Books & Culture*. Larsen has edited *Modern Christianity and Cultural Aspirations* (with David Bebbington) and *The Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology* (with Daniel Treier) as well as several other books. He is the author of four monographs, including *Contested Christianity: The Political and Social Contexts of Victorian Theology* (Baylor University Press, 2004) and *Crisis of Doubt: Honest Faith in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford University Press, 2006). He is currently working on a book on the Bible and the Victorians.

Article

“War Is Over, If You Want It”: Beyond the Conflict between Faith and Science

and a number as high as 35% is a realistic estimate from the evidence.⁴ These were scholars who had not only read and understood the latest learned critiques of faith, but who had dedicated their lives to expounding and disseminating these skeptical views in lectures, debates, and publications. These views included philosophical challenges to faith such as Hume’s critique of miracles, and scientific ones such as materialism, including a variety that incorporated Darwinism.

After their Christian conversions, these erstwhile secularist leaders spent the rest of their lives—usually a decade or more—lecturing, debating, and writing on how faith and learning could be integrated. They tackled head on, in an unflinching and erudite manner, all of the issues that they had raised as skeptics. Sexton, for example, lived for another twenty-five years after his conversion to Christian orthodoxy, and he wrote numerous works expounding on the intellectual credibility of Christian thought including *The Fallacies of Secularism* (1877).⁵ His *Biblical Difficulties Dispelled* (1887) demonstrated that he was just as committed to the latest scientific thought as ever and that he believed that it was fully reconcilable with a belief in the divine inspiration and truthfulness of the Bible.⁶

This story has never been told before.

Instead, the story of religion and the Victorians has usually been told as one of “the loss of faith.”

This story has never been told before. Instead, the story of religion and the Victorians has usually been told as one of “the loss of faith.” The Victorian crisis of faith or loss of faith has been a reigning theme for over fifty years now in the scholarship. Especially in the fields of intellectual history and literary studies, it is often the only thing that is said about faith in the nineteenth-century university courses and textbooks. A whole succession of books have been written recounting the lives of Victorians who lost their faith, from Basil Willey’s *More Nineteenth Century Studies: A Group of Honest Doubters* (1956) to A. N. Wilson’s *God’s Funeral* (1999).⁷ Despite this being presented as the main story, it does not, however, measure up against the reconversions of secularists. In these collections of deconverts by Willey, Wilson, and others,

there is not a single prominent Christian leader who lost his or her faith—no celebrated preacher, no bishop, no key functionary in a Christian denomination or organization—whereas, as has been said, at least 20% of the prominent secularist leadership came to faith.

So how did the “loss of faith” become the overarching theme in certain streams of scholarship and in popular thought? A possible explanation is that deconversion narratives fit into another pattern: the war between faith and learning. In the nineteenth century, the human race learned enough to realize that “faith is not credible.” If some daring and perceptive souls had discovered this earlier, it was not until this century that this realization became widespread. People who were intelligent and brave and keeping up with their reading, therefore, inevitably lost their faith. As my work on the conversion of secularist leaders reveals, this is simply a false picture of the relation between faith and learning in the nineteenth century: the intellectual claims of orthodoxy were actually quite compelling to many of the bravest, smartest, best-read people, even to those who had a deep bias against Christianity and a vested interest in opposing it.

The so-called “war” between faith and learning, specifically between orthodox Christian theology and science, was manufactured during the second half of the nineteenth century. It is a construct that was created for polemical purposes.⁸ The main architects of the notion of a “war” between theology and science were scientists and advocates of secular education. An enormously influential book in this regard was John William Draper’s *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (1874).⁹ Draper, who was professor of chemistry at the University of New York, is an example of a scientist fueling the notion that the relationship between faith and learning should be viewed as a “conflict.” His book was so successful that it went through fifty editions in the half century after its publication. A famous successor in the same vein was Andrew Dickson White’s *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896).¹⁰ White was the founding president of Cornell University, an upstart institution that used its secular stance as a way of setting it apart in the market from the old Ivy League schools that, for example, still had mandatory chapel attendance.

Draper and White were not simply describing an ongoing war between theology and science, but rather they were endeavoring to induce people into imagining that there was one. In order to do this, they repeatedly made false claims that the church had opposed various scientific breakthroughs and developments. For example, Draper and White encoded into popular thinking the erroneous notion that Christian orthodoxy had insisted for centuries that the earth was flat. A standard version of this urban legend includes a tale claiming that Columbus's expedition was opposed by church leaders on the grounds that it was based on the heretical notion that the earth was round. It has been so effectively disseminated that even Christians generally assume that it is true. In a recent book, David Kinnaman gives as an admirable example of contemporary Christian ignorance, a church that did a series in which it extended five apologies for the sinful behavior of the church in the past. The five most important things for which the church allegedly needs to repent included: "We're Sorry for Saying the Earth Is Flat."¹¹

In fact, Christian theologians have always declared that the earth is round, from the early church through the medieval to the Reformation and beyond. Even the venerable Bede, a monk living in the eighth century, after the fall of the Roman Empire and before the reign of Charlemagne—a period which, in the old history books, was called "the Dark Ages" because it was seen as a low point in the state of human learning—asserted this unequivocally. I well remember reading up on Bede for a church history lecture I was preparing and, having myself grown up assuming that the flat-earth myth was true, being stunned to read Bede mentioning casually that the earth was in the shape of "a ball."¹² You can find the same view in the writings of Thomas Aquinas in the high medieval period or pretty much anywhere else you would care to look. Moreover, all the church leaders who discussed Columbus's possible expedition with him assumed that the earth was round. Their objection was that the earth was much bigger than he was assuming and therefore Columbus's calculations regarding how long it would take to reach India were inaccurate. These medieval clerics were, of course, right about this—their scientific theories were more accurate than those of Columbus. The eminent evolutionary biologist and nontheist, Stephen Jay Gould,

in a full and candid exposure of this false claim that the church once taught a flat earth, has carefully explained that "the nineteenth-century invention of the flat earth ... occurred to support another dubious and harmful separation ... the supposed warfare between science and religion."¹³

The so-called "war" between faith and learning, specifically between orthodox Christian theology and science, was manufactured during the second half of the nineteenth century.

Another example is in the field of anesthetics. Draper and White also popularized the urban legend that the church opposed the use of anesthetics for women during childbirth on the grounds that it was a violation of the statement in Genesis that childbirth would be painful. Just recently, Deborah Blum, a Pulitzer-prize winning science writer and a professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, wrote in the *New York Times*: "When 19th-century doctors began using chloroform to alleviate the pain of childbirth, the Scottish Calvinist church declared it a 'Satanic invention' intended to frustrate the Lord's design."¹⁴ This is simply wrong. No church has ever pronounced against anesthetics in childbirth. Moreover, there was no vocal group of ministers who opposed it. In fact, the inventor of chloroform received fan mail from ministers of the major denominations thanking him for helping to alleviate the suffering of women in labor. Rather, the opposition to anesthetics during childbirth came from medical professionals, not from ministers, and for scientific, not religious, reasons.¹⁵

A major figure in the construction of the notion of a war between theology and science was T. H. Huxley, the English biologist who was a principal champion of Darwinism and who coined the word "agnosticism" to describe his own viewpoint regarding religion.¹⁶ James Moore has observed that warfare was Huxley's "favorite metaphor" for the relationship between science and religion.¹⁷ Huxley even described himself as a "gladiator-general" in this alleged fight. Huxley saved his most savage attack for a Roman Catholic biologist, St. George Jackson Mivart. Mivart's infuriating crime was to accept scientific claims, not to reject them. He

Article

"War Is Over, If You Want It": Beyond the Conflict between Faith and Science

claimed that Darwinism was perfectly compatible with historic Christian teaching. Huxley was furious with this Catholic thinker because Huxley was trying to generate the perception of a war between faith and learning. Huxley insisted that Mivart had to choose whether he wanted to be "a true son of the Church" or "a loyal soldier of science" (notice the military metaphor).¹⁸ In short, Huxley was not witnessing a fight between faith and science; he was trying to provoke one.

So, one may well ask, why? Why did Huxley want a fight? Why did Draper and White manufacture evidence in order to lead people to imagine that there was one? Why was the notion of a war between faith and science constructed in the second half of the nineteenth century? Frank M. Turner, John Hay Whitney Professor of History at Yale University, has argued persuasively that the notion of a conflict between theology and science was generated as part of a campaign of professionalization by would-be scientists. In the mid-nineteenth century, there was no such profession. Charles Babbage, the brilliant mathematical thinker who first conceived the programmable computer, observed in 1851:

Science in England is not a profession: its cultivators are scarcely recognized even as a class. Our language itself contains no *single* term by which their occupation can be expressed.¹⁹

In other words, this was before there were "scientists." Instead, there were only "men of science," a term, like its counterpart, "men of letters," that referred more to the pursuits of gentlemen of leisure than to what someone did for a living.

Until several decades into the nineteenth century, there were only two universities in England, Oxford and Cambridge. Both saw Classics, that is, the literature and philosophy of ancient Greece and Rome, as the rightful core of a university curriculum and therefore had few faculty positions in the natural sciences. Moreover, in order to hold a position at these universities, one would need to be ordained in the Church of England and thus also be a clergyman.²⁰ The same would have been true of schools for children and youths. There were no state schools until 1870, and therefore most schools, especially the elite ones such as Eton, Harrow, and Rugby, had an explicitly Anglican identity. Indeed, being a priest in the Church of England was widely seen

as the most sensible way to make a living for someone who wished to pursue scholarly interests. It was a learned profession that allowed one considerable time to invest in intellectual pursuits of one's own choosing. For example, Connop Thirlwall (1797–1875) eventually rose to bishop in the Church of England. Nevertheless, his sympathetic biographer admits that Thirlwall's ordination "was determined, in cold-blooded fashion, simply by force of circumstances in order to obtain a decent leisure for his literary pursuits."²¹ Thus, most scientific work in England was being done by clergymen. Moreover, much of it was remarkably good work. Not only were many of the nation's greatest men of science also clergymen, but numerous, more obscure clergymen up and down the country were also carefully, patiently, and accurately cataloguing the natural world and discovering its secrets.

Huxley and others who aspired to turn scientific pursuits into a profession ... "needed" a war between science and religion.

One can see how this would be very annoying to Huxley who wanted to be a man of science himself but, not least because of his agnostic views, was unable to make a living either as an Oxbridge professor or as a clergyman. In fact, as celebrated as Huxley was, his career was not as a university professor or some other such position that we could assume to be a fitting one for a scientist of his reputation today. Rather, he was fortunate to make a living by lecturing at the Government School of Mines, and even this opportunity would not have been available earlier in the century.

Huxley and others who aspired to turn scientific pursuits into a profession, therefore, "needed" a war between science and religion. The purpose of the war was to discredit clergymen as suitable figures to undertake scientific work in order that the new breed of professionals would have an opportunity to fill in the gap for such work created by eliminating the current men of science. It was thus tentatively asserted that the religious convictions of clergymen disqualified them from pursuing their scientific inquiries objectively.

More to the point, however, was the fact that clergymen were undertaking this work for the sheer love of science and thus hindering the expectation that it would be done for money by paid full-time scientists. Clergymen were branded amateurs in order to facilitate the creation of a new category of professionals. In addition to Draper and White, another book that illustrates this point is Francis Galton's *English Men of Science: Their Nature and Nurture* (1874).²² Galton, like Huxley, also wanted a war. His research for the book included sending out questionnaires to scientists. To his disappointment, the overwhelming majority reported that religious beliefs were in no way a hindrance to scientific work. In an ironically unscientific way, he decided to ignore these results and simply to assert in his book that religious convictions were "uncongenial" to the pursuit of science, despite the fact that his own data did not support that conclusion.²³ The professional dimension of this story is reinforced by recalling that the other great enemy of the new breed of scientists was the animal rights advocate. What clergymen and animal rights advocates had in common was that the new would-be scientists perceived them as standing in the way of their ambitions for developing the profession.

Let me take a brief detour into the social sciences. While less scholarly work has been done on this, I think a similar professional dimension is a significant factor in the perception of a war between faith and anthropology. In a professional reading of the situation, missionaries "needed" to be labeled biased amateurs in order to make room for a new category of professionals, the anthropologists. Anthropologists have been so forceful in their attacks on missionaries precisely because missionaries are so good at doing excellent anthropological work. Indeed, anthropologists have a hard time competing with them. The heart of good anthropological research is field work, and missionaries are simply in the field, carefully observing and recording, much longer than almost any anthropologist can expect to be. A dirty secret of anthropologists is that they sometimes steal most of their data from the work of missionaries, often leaning on them heavily while they are in the field, and then disparaging them thereafter. Anthropologists "need" to say that the faith commitments of missionaries disqualify them from doing truly scholarly work, in order to open up a space for themselves as professionals.

This hostility is illustrated in the case study of the "missionary position." Numerous anthropologists have mentioned in their writings that missionaries once insisted on one sexual position as the only appropriate one, condemning other practices in the cultures where they were working as sinful. In the minds of these anthropologists, the "missionary position" is a classic example of the prudish, joyless, rule-obsessed, life-denying influence of missionaries. The notion of a sexual position dictated by missionaries has become such a common "fact" that it shows up in dictionaries, in works of reference, in magazines and newspapers, seemingly everywhere. Nevertheless, Robert J. Priest, in a 2001 issue of *Current Anthropology*, has demonstrated incontrovertibly that this is an urban legend.²⁴ At no time and in no place did any missionary ever teach any such thing.

It turns out that the notion of a "missionary position" was coined by the famous social scientist, Alfred Kinsey, in his *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948).²⁵ Kinsey claimed to have learned of this from the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski's *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-Western Melanesia* (1929).²⁶ Kinsey had misremembered this, however, and in a way that reveals hostility to missionaries. What Malinowski actually wrote was an account of seeing an engaged couple leaning against one another and holding hands in public. This was condemned by traditionalists in their community as their behaving "'missionary fashion,' one of those novel immoralities introduced by missionaries."²⁷ In other words, "the missionary position" actually represents the influence of missionaries decreasing prudishness and restrictions in an affirmation of joy, life, love, and sexuality. Such an affirming story is not retold, however, but rather is replaced with a fictitious story that puts the missionaries in an unfavorable light. This is done, I am positing, because a conflict is "needed" in order to help the anthropologists establish themselves as the only professionals when it comes to gaining knowledge about people groups across the globe.²⁸

To reframe my argument in another way, I am suspicious of the assumption that it was something intrinsic to the nature of modern discoveries that caused the perception that faith and learning were at odds. To continue with our case study, I am suspicious, specifically, of the assumption that the

Article

“War Is Over, If You Want It”: Beyond the Conflict between Faith and Science

advance of scientific knowledge in the last one hundred fifty to two hundred years has created an unprecedented problem for the reconciliation of faith and learning. The story of the nineteenth century is actually one in which orthodox Christian ministers, theologians, churches, and denominations accepted dramatic scientific developments with remarkably little fuss. Christians quickly accepted the new findings of geology, for example, and an earth that is millions of years old was the normative view among clergymen even well before Charles Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species* (1859).

Likewise, the introduction of Darwinism into Victorian thought is not a story of denominations making official pronouncements against it or clergymen lining up to attack it, but rather of widespread acceptance and even championing of it by ministers and theologians.²⁹ Indeed, the main champion of Darwinism in America was himself a devout evangelical Christian, Asa Gray, professor of botany at Harvard University. Or, to take another example, a major popularizer of evolution for evangelicals was the nineteenth-century evangelist Henry Drummond, a colleague of the great Chicago revivalist D. L. Moody. Drummond wrote best-selling religious books in which he incorporated into evangelical theology his assumption that Darwinianism was sound science.³⁰ These names are only illustrative. It would take a long, long time to list all of the prominent orthodox Christian ministers, theologians, and thinkers who accepted Darwinism promptly as good science that did not conflict with Christian teaching.

The word “fundamentalist” comes from a series of pamphlets published in the early 1910s entitled *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*.³¹ Remarkably, in the light of subsequent history, several of the contributors to this series that literally served to launch the fundamentalist movement were ministers and theologians who believed in evolution. Princeton theologian B. B. Warfield, who is famous for championing biblical inerrancy, was one of them.³² Another was James Orr, a professor of apologetics in Scotland, who wrote the very first tract in *The Fundamentals*. Another was George Frederick Wright, an American biblical archaeologist. Nevertheless, later in the series came a couple of anti-evolution tracts, most notably one by an obscure author entitled “Decadence of Darwinism.”³³ This was a sign of where the nascent fundamentalist

movement was heading. After a full biblical generation of certain polemical scientists promoting the notion that there was a war between faith and learning, conservative Christians came to believe it. At this crucial moment, the war metaphor would be adopted by the other side. Fundamentalists now published volumes with titles such as *The Great Conflict*, *The Battlefield of Faith*, and *War on Modernism*.³⁴

Although certain strident scientists
in the second half of the nineteenth
century constructed the notion of a war
between faith and learning,
conservative Christians deserve
their share of the blame for having
adopted and perpetuated this model
in the twentieth century and beyond.

The result has been a widespread suspicion of mainstream scholars by conservative Christians. The possibility of a vast, godless conspiracy by academics or scientists is a real one in many fundamentalist or conservative evangelical minds. The resulting anti-intellectualism, lamented and explored in Mark Noll’s classic study, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*, has taken a great toll.³⁵ In other words, although certain strident scientists in the second half of the nineteenth century constructed the notion of a war between faith and learning, conservative Christians deserve their share of the blame for having adopted and perpetuated this model in the twentieth century and beyond. The notion of a war between faith and science has been so successful that now some conservative Christians can cavalierly dismiss the evidence for global warming as a result of human behavior—not on the basis of countervailing scientific evidence (a perfectly legitimate effort), but on the grounds that it comes from scientists who are opponents not to be trusted. Huxley, I suspect, has got more than he bargained for.

To quote John Lennon, “War is over, if you want it.” If the notion is actually fictitious—that it is getting harder, if not becoming impossible, to reconcile an orthodox Christian faith with the latest findings by scholars—then where do we go from here? After

the conflict between faith and learning comes the integration of faith and learning. This is what came before the warfare imagery as well. In other words, it has always been the task of learned, thinking Christians to take seriously both orthodoxy and the latest learning and to find a way to think about both of them in a coherent, faithful, noncompartmentalized way. Integration does not mean that historic Christian commitments are abandoned or contorted in the face of every wind of intellectual fashion. Neither does it mean that new scholarly findings leave our old ways of speaking about the faith completely untouched. Rather, it means that difficult intellectual work is needed, that of making the call on what is and is not a part of the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.

It has always been the task of learned,
thinking Christians to take seriously
both orthodoxy and the latest learning
and to find a way to think about
both of them in a coherent, faithful,
noncompartmentalized way.

This has been done in every generation. Already in the second century, Justin Martyr was working on the integration of the Christian faith with classical learning, including the philosophy of Socrates and Plato.³⁶ In the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas pursued the integration of faith with the new dominant intellectual culture of a revived Aristotelianism.³⁷ One can see the Reformation, both in a Catholic form as articulated by Erasmus, and in a Protestant form as expounded by Calvin, as a theological appropriation of the new intellectual climate of Humanism.³⁸ These integrations involve both changing the way Christians think and speak about theological issues, and a willingness to hold to orthodoxy even when current intellectual fashions assail it. When my students sometimes argue that Justin Martyr was a compromiser who attempted to incorporate too much of Greek philosophy into Christianity, I remind them that when Justin was a schoolboy he did not give his last name as “Martyr” and thus he obviously tenaciously held onto key beliefs which could not be made compatible with the wider culture. Thomas Aquinas accepted many aspects of Aristote-

lian thought, but rejected its teaching on the eternity of matter because he discerned that it was incompatible with the orthodox Christian doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*.³⁹ This is what is meant by integration. Therefore, as I have used Darwinism as a case study for part of this article, I would like to point out that what I mean by integration is not that Christians should accept evolution uncritically *in toto*. In my own theological reflection on this subject, I would insist that any potential integration with Darwinism preserve the following elements: God as Creator; human beings as uniquely made in the image of God, yet fallen and sinful; and the Bible as a unique, truthful, and trustworthy communication of the inspired Word of God written.

I should also clarify that, of course, there were Christian ministers in the nineteenth century who were public and vocal opponents of Darwinism. The point is that this should not be viewed as part of a war in which “the Church” opposes “science” or “learning,” but rather as an example of the kind of in-house conversations that Christians have always had—no different in kind from the church father Tertullian’s rejection of the significant drawing upon Platonic thought being done by fellow believers following the pattern set by Justin Martyr or the way that thirteenth-century Franciscans were more resistant to the appropriation of Aristotelian thought than the Dominicans were.

Integration is not easy, and it is all the harder in a time when a climate of suspicion has been created by the now entrenched warfare model. I am well aware that as long as there are secular thinkers in our disciplines or Christians in our faith communities for whom the war is not over, then this legacy will continue to impinge on us in negative ways that we cannot control. Nevertheless, there is much that we can do to further integration for ourselves and our communities. For integration to be successful, it involves both a commitment to, and sympathetic and learned understanding of, the content of the Christian faith and the scholarly discipline under consideration. In other words, pastors who know the Bible and theology well but are ignorant of the actual contours of a secular body of knowledge cannot do integration. Likewise, scholars who know their discipline well but who only have a hazy understanding of the contours of the Scriptures and classic Christian orthodoxy cannot do integration

Article

"War Is Over, If You Want It": Beyond the Conflict between Faith and Science

effectively either—even if they happen to be personally devout Christians.

In conclusion, the way forward must be a sympathetic collaboration between groups of people of goodwill from both of these areas of expertise—a collaboration that results in everyone becoming progressively more literate in both areas. This will mean making strategic friendships, projects, and consultations, and committing to spending a portion of our reading time studying material outside our own discipline. For example, to continue with the case study I have followed throughout, scientists reading theology, and theologians reading science.⁴⁰ War is over, if you want. Long live integration. ☉

Notes

¹Timothy Larsen, *Crisis of Doubt: Honest Faith in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

²In *Crisis of Doubt*, I expressed some skepticism as to whether the extant claims regarding Sexton's life story were reliable, speculating that he might have fabricated some of his own history and apparent qualifications (especially his ordination). Since publication, however, I have found a contemporary biographical sketch which solves the riddles that had concerned me and therefore I am now convinced that his life story is reliable: "George Sexton," *Human Nature* 8 (1874): 24–9.

³George Sexton, *The Antiquity of the Human Race*, 3d ed. (London: Austin and Co., 1871).

⁴I resisted giving an estimate of a percentage in *Crisis of Doubt* and only do so here due to the need for a brief substitute for the cumulative evidence and arguments I present at length there. I still maintain that calculating a percentage is not only problematic but also that it can be distracting rather than illuminating.

⁵George Sexton, *The Fallacies of Secularism* (London: G. S. Sexton, 1877).

⁶George Sexton, *Biblical Difficulties Dispelled: Being an Answer to Queries Respecting So-Called Discrepancies in Scripture, Misunderstood and Misinterpreted Texts, Etc., Etc.*, 2d ed. (Toronto: William Briggs, 1887).

⁷Basil Willey, *More Nineteenth Century Studies: A Group of Honest Doubters* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1956); A. N. Wilson, *God's Funeral* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999).

⁸This claim is well substantiated by existing scholarship, some of which will be cited below. I would like to commend here an important survey of the relationship between faith and science. It is John Hedley Brooke's *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

⁹John William Draper, *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (New York: D. Appleton, 1874).

¹⁰Andrew Dickson White, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (New York: D. Appleton, 1896).

¹¹David Kinnaman and Gabe Lyons, *Unchristian: What a New Generation Really Thinks about Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007), 55–6.

¹²Benedicta Ward, *The Venerable Bede* (London: Continuum, 1990), 35.

¹³Stephen Jay Gould, *Dinosaur in the Haystack: Reflections in Natural History* (New York: Harmony Books, 1995), 41.

¹⁴Deborah Blum, "A Pox on Stem Cell Research," *New York Times*, 1 August 2006.

¹⁵An exposure of this urban legend is forthcoming by Rennie B. Schoepflin, a historian at California State University, Los Angeles, in a volume edited by Ronald L. Numbers, *Hilldale Professor of the History of Science and Medicine*, University of Wisconsin-Madison, which is scheduled to appear from Harvard University Press. I am grateful to Schoepflin for allowing me to see this work in advance. (This help includes pointing me to the Deborah Blum example.)

¹⁶A brilliant, critical biography is Adrian Desmond's *Huxley: From Devil's Disciple to Evolution's High Priest* (London: Penguin Books, 1998).

¹⁷James R. Moore, *The Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms with Darwin in Great Britain and America, 1870–1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 58.

¹⁸Frank M. Turner, *Contesting Cultural Authority: Essays in Victorian Intellectual Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 190–2.

¹⁹As quoted in Turner, *Contesting Cultural Authority*, 177.

²⁰For the passing of this model, see A. J. Engel, *From Clergyman to Don: The Rise of the Academic Profession in Nineteenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).

²¹John Connop Thirlwall, Jr., *Connop Thirlwall: Historian and Theologian* (London: SPCK, 1936), 41.

²²Francis Galton, *English Men of Science: Their Nature and Nurture* (London: Macmillan, 1874).

²³As quoted in Turner, *Contesting Cultural Authority*, 185.

²⁴Robert J. Priest, "Missionary Positions: Christian, Modernist, and Postmodernist," *Current Anthropology* 42, no. 1 (February 2001): 29–68.

²⁵Alfred Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948).

²⁶Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-Western Melanesia: An Ethnographic Account of Courtship, Marriage and Family Life among the Natives of the Trobriand Islands, British New Guinea* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1929).

²⁷As quoted in Priest, "Missionary Positions," 31.

²⁸For a wide-ranging analysis of the issue of faith and the discipline of anthropology, see an article published in this journal by a colleague of mine that I had the privilege of commenting on when it was still developing. Dean E. Arnold, "Why Are There So Few Christian Anthropologists? Reflections on the Tensions between Christianity and Anthropology," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 58, no. 4 (2006): 266–82.

²⁹See, for this, David N. Livingstone, *Darwin's Forgotten Defenders: The Encounter between Evangelical Theology and*

Evolutionary Thought (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1987).

³⁰For both Gray and Drummond, see their entries in Timothy Larsen, ed., *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals* (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 2003).

³¹The classic study of the origins of fundamentalism is George Marsden's *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

³²Mark A. Noll, *The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: Scripture, Science, and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001).

³³Henry H. Beach, "Decadence of Darwinism," in *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth* 8 (Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company, n.d.), 36-48.

³⁴Moore, *Post-Darwinian Controversies*, 75.

³⁵Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

³⁶For Justin Martyr and Middle Platonism, see Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

³⁷For this, see Fernand van Steenberghen, *Thomas Aquinas and Radical Aristotelianism* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1980).

³⁸For the Reformation and Humanism, see Alister E. McGrath, *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).

³⁹For this, see Jozef Wissink, ed., *The Eternity of the World in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas and His Contemporaries* (Leiden: Brill, 1990).

⁴⁰I am grateful to Wheaton College for facilitating such collaborative reading and discussions through its Faith and Learning faculty development program. For example, I was allowed to serve as a reader for an excellent paper by my colleague in the chemistry department, Peter Walhout, and I am currently serving as a reader for a promising project by another colleague in the natural sciences. A germane, interdisciplinary volume arising from the Wheaton faculty is Dorothy F. Chappell and E. David Cook, eds., *Not Just Science: Questions Where Christian Faith and Natural Science Intersect* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005).

A Call for Book Reviewers

The readers of *PSCF* have long appreciated the many insightful reviews published within its covers. Reviews have been assigned to whoever requested a particular book first. Out of fairness to ASA members with different post delivery times and to assure the best fit between reviewer and book, *PSCF* is planning to **initiate book reviews by invitation**. If you would be open to being asked to contribute to this interesting and important service of writing a book review, please send a brief email to psfranklin@gmail.com that describes your areas of interest and expertise, preferred mailing address, and phone number. This information will be entered into a database that will bring you to the book review editors' attention when a book of interest to you and *PSCF* readers becomes available for review. Of course, when a book is offered to you by email or phone for review, you will still be able to accept or decline the mailing of the book at that time.

Book Review Editors

Rebecca Flietstra (Point Loma Nazarene University)
3900 Lomaland Drive
San Diego, CA 92106
rflietst@pointloma.edu

James C. Peterson (McMaster University)
Divinity College and Faculty of Health Sciences
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON L8S 4K1 Canada
peterso@mcmaster.ca

Arie Leegwater (Calvin College)
1726 Knollcrest Circle SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49546-4403
leeg@calvin.edu