

behaviors and of the evolved capacity to question and reflect on these behaviors. When reflection is done with others in community, general ethical principles arise. When these are combined with our understanding from the sciences of the way things are, the result is an overarching vision that integrates cosmology and axiology, facts and values.

However, this is not sufficient to bring about positive moods and motivations in response to the fundamental context for “religion and science”—life as lived here and now. In chapter 7, “Meaning in a Material World,” Drees suggests that we need stories that are consistent with our understanding of the ways things are and that “are manifest forms of symbols that influence mood and motivations” (Geertz) in order to live out our values. Because religious stories respond to ongoing basic human experiences and concerns, one source of stories is the wisdom of the world’s religions. We can also develop new stories and images from contemporary understandings rooted in science. Drees closes with an image of “place” from the video *The Powers of Ten* (Ray and Charles Eames) and a story of “time”—his own poem of the epic of creation.

Drees packs a wealth of material and insight into this wonderful book. At times I wanted him to expand his specific discussions. Yet, overall this is one of the best books I have read in forty-four years on the general subject of “religion and science”. Everyone working in this area will benefit from reading it.

KARL E. PETERS  
 Professor Emeritus, Rollins College  
 30 Barn Door Hills Road  
 Granby CT 06035  
 Kpeters396@cox.net

*Making Sense of Evolution: Darwin, God, and the Drama of Life.* By John F. Haught. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2010. 144 pages. \$19.95.

John Haught is no stranger to the issues addressed in this slender volume. Formerly professor of theology at Georgetown University and now Senior Fellow in Science and Religion at the Woodstock Theological Center, he has written widely on them. *Making Sense of Evolution* is an admirable book that crystalizes the reflections of more than twenty years by one of the foremost experts in the field, and does so in an accessible, engaging, and thoughtful way. It is avowedly Christian in its stance and will not please some readers (those influenced by the “new atheism,” for example), but I warmly recommend it to readers of *Zygon* because Haught is an author who takes seriously what science can tell us about ourselves and our world but who nevertheless thinks that theology can tell us something deeper and more fundamental.

“Evolution makes very good sense scientifically,” Haught writes, but he asks “does it make any sense theologically?” (p. xi). He thinks it does, but one has to drastically rethink the relation between theology and evolutionary theory. In this work, as in earlier ones, Haught tries to do that. He seeks to develop a middle ground position between what he variously calls “scientific naturalism” (SN), “evolutionary naturalism,” and “scientific materialism” and the sort of crude theism

that one finds not only in “new earth creationism” but also in so-called intelligent-design theory (IDT). Writers in the SN camp (including Richard Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens) think that everything, including religious belief, can be understood and explained by means of natural science; for them religious belief is not only mistaken but also socially pernicious, since it abets everything from child abuse to suicide bombings. Writers in the creationist/IDT camp either deny evolution or fail to understand its significance. “What is needed theologically,” Haught writes, “is a thoroughgoing reinterpretation of Christian teaching about God, Christ, creation, incarnation, redemption, and eschatology in keeping with Darwin’s unveiling of life’s long evolution and contemporary cosmology’s disclosure of the ongoing evolution of the universe” (p. 143).

Haught’s proposal for bridging the divide is what he calls a “theology of evolution” (TE). This is a way of thinking about the world that asks theists to take seriously the fact of evolution, both biological and cosmological, and incorporate it into their understanding of creation; it asks proponents of SN to consider the possibility that there is a deeper theological explanation of the facts of evolution. “Without diminishing or denying the results of scientific research,” Haught writes, “a theology of evolution locates the whole drama of life and the entire cosmic process within a vision of the universe still open to becoming more deeply infused with being, goodness, and beauty as it is drawn toward its Absolute Future” (p. 52). Central to this way of understanding are several important ideas. One is that the creation is incomplete; it is an unfinished, ongoing process. God is at home in this unfinished creation, allowing it to develop on its own into a future of promise and hope, but not of certainty. Creation is a drama whose script is still being written. A second feature of Haught’s TE is the notion of “layered explanation,” the idea that aspects of the world can be (for him, should be) understood on multiple levels. This is the key to avoiding conflict: Because “a plurality of explanatory levels is available, . . . it is possible to locate theological explanation of living design in such a way that it poses no conflict whatsoever with evolutionary science” (pp. 26–27). Scientific naturalists and religious fundamentalists are both explanatory monists; they are “either-or” thinkers because they believe that one has to choose between scientific explanations/understandings and religious ones. In eleven alliterative chapters (Darwin, Design, Diversity, Descent, Drama, Direction, Depth, Death, Duty, Devotion, and Deity), Haught argues that his TE makes possible “both-and” explanations/understandings of the origin and basis of morality, among other things. Indeed, he thinks that a TE is more consonant with evolution’s liberation of a truly biblical God.

It is not possible to do justice to Haught’s subtle discussions of these issues in a brief review. I confine myself to some comments on one of them. A perennial charge against theists is that there has been too much suffering and death in the world to justify belief in a caring, compassionate, and loving Creator. Haught is sensitive to the charge in this work in a way that he has not usually been in earlier ones. One of his responses, which is probably true but will not satisfy many readers, is the following: “If God had not opened up the universe to novelty and drama from the start [that is, if God had created everything perfect from the beginning] there would have been no suffering, but there would have been no increase in value or beauty either” (p. 84). The idea here is that tragedy and sacrifice is an essential part of evolution’s forward movement in the drama of life to-

ward greater unity and beauty. But I confess to thinking that this is cold comfort to the victims. It seems to relegate their suffering and death to collateral damage in the service of a greater good. A better response is Haught's defense of the Christian belief that all of creation will eventually be redeemed, which is a hope, not a certainty, grounded in the resurrection of Jesus, that everything will be preserved for eternity in God.

Haught is regularly criticized from both sides of the naturalist/religionist divide for being an "accommodationist." For religious fundamentalists, he is a theological Neville Chamberlain for capitulating to the scientific naturalists by accepting too much from evolution. For naturalists, he is grasping at straws in trying to make a religious way of thinking about the world compatible with what science has shown to be defunct. But I welcome his recent book, as I have earlier ones, as a serious attempt by a theist and theologian to be scientifically responsible.

ROBERT J. DELTETE

Professor of Philosophy, Seattle University  
901 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Seattle, WA 98122-1090  
RDELTETE@seattleu.edu