

occasionally by anecdotes of the men solemnly singing and praying as execution day neared. Whitaker admits that a number of the inmates were literate, and had their letters to loved ones been laced within the pages of courtroom drama, there would have been an added level of urgency and importance for Jones' work.

On the Laps of Gods reclaims the history of one of the many race riots that flared up across the United States following World War I. While no historian has written a compilation of instances of race-driven violence during this post-war era, a number have successfully recovered individual events. *Race Riot: Chicago in the Red Summer of 1919* (1970) by William M. Tuttle, Jr. was the first of these histories to appear. Tuttle's work details perhaps the bloodiest and most protracted riot of 1919. Legal scholar and historian Al Brophy's *Reconstructing the Dreamland: The Tulsa Riot of 1921* (2002) chronicles the outbreak of violence in Tulsa, Oklahoma in what was then dubbed "Negro Wall Street" because of the economic success African Americans had achieved there. A final work published by Kevin Boyle, *Arc of Justice: A Saga of Race, Civil Rights, and Murder in the Jazz Age* (2004), illustrates the violence and legal difficulties faced by Dr. Ossian Sweet, an African American physician who moved into a white neighborhood in Detroit, Michigan, in 1925. Whitaker's monograph fits nicely alongside these other works.

Robert Whitaker uncovers more than just another episode of race-driven violence during the red summer of 1919. The events that took place in Hoop Spur had become hidden behind the riots in Chicago and Washington, DC earlier that summer; however, it was Hoop Spur that first cracked Jim Crow's grip on race relations in America. Whitaker recognizes the *Moore* decision as the Supreme Court's first attempt to expose racism as it hid behind the protective veil of states' rights.

Andrew D. Amron
The University of Alabama

In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement. By Michael Lienesch. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007. Pp. xii, 338. \$34.95)

Historians of fundamentalism have long recognized the importance of antievolutionism and especially of the 1925 Scopes trial in the development of the movement. Nearly every work on fundamentalism deals with antievolutionism, and the Scopes trial has been authoritatively studied in Edward Larson's Pulitzer Prize-winning *Summer for the Gods*. Michael Lienesch's new book, *In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement*, thus takes up a topic that has already been well-studied.

Lienesch's interpretation is new in two ways: in the thesis for which he argues, and in the methodology by which he justifies it. His thesis is that the fight against evolution unified fundamentalists into a movement with political purpose. Before that controversy, fundamentalism was no more than a loose coalition of religious conservatives, lacking a defining identity as fundamentalists and having no aspirations to political influence. Fundamentalists found their identity when they rallied against the teaching of evolution, a fight epitomized by the Scopes trial in Dayton, Tennessee, but also waged across the country in Bible conferences and the crusades of William Jennings Bryan. By defining themselves against evolution, fundamentalists organized themselves into a political movement that continues to have influence down to the present. Lienesch therefore sees the political fight against evolution, rather than the denominational fight against liberal theology, as the defining moment of fundamentalism.

Lienesch's first seven chapters trace antievolutionism from its beginning with the publication of *The Fundamentals* through its solidification as a movement. He discusses the reluctance of fundamentalists to form a distinct identity, and how the fight against

evolution finally overcame that reluctance. Fighting evolutionists gave fundamentalists confidence to organize, because they were less reluctant to attack secular evolutionists than to attack fellow Christians in their own denominations. Lienesch details how antievolutionists took their fight to colleges and universities, and ultimately to Congress and the state legislatures. He also explains the arguments of antievolutionists – that evolution destroyed Christianity by undermining other key doctrines such as the atonement and the virgin birth of Christ; that no teacher had a right to teach evolution because he was the taxpayers’ “hired man”; and that evolution was undemocratic, even Bolshevikian. Lienesch follows other scholars in calling the Scopes trial a show trial, but he contributes the new idea that fundamentalists meant it to be a show, a “dramaturgy,” to use his word (139-141). The final chapter and conclusion continue Lienesch’s analysis of the antievolution movement to the present. That chapter might be Lienesch’s most important contribution, since as he notes in his preface, most scholarship has focused on the Scopes trial and neglected the wider history of antievolutionism. But in covering some eighty years of history in some forty pages, Lienesch’s treatment is too sketchy to be of much use.

The second way in which Lienesch’s book is new is the theory he uses to analyze the antievolution movement. His method is that of a political scientist, not a historian. He uses the “social movement” theory, which purports to explain how movements rise, operate, and fall. Thus, each chapter and section within a chapter begins with a review of the findings of political scientists. Those findings are then applied to antievolutionism. For example, in discussing the Scopes trial, Lienesch explains how and why movements attract media attention and then describes how fundamentalists sought to use the media furor. He is also relentlessly comparative – for example, the show trial of Scopes is compared to the efforts of Martin Luther King Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. One cannot fault Lienesch for using the methods of his discipline, but his theorizing does mar the historical narrative. More important, the theory sometimes seems to control the interpretation. For instance, William Jennings Bryan was by all accounts vital to the antievolution movement. Lienesch describes his barnstorming across the country to debate evolutionists, his ubiquity on the Chautauqua circuit, and his writings for a popular readership, clearly painting him as “antievolution’s symbolic leader” (174). But when social movement theory requires that movements have an ally introduce them to politics, Lienesch taps Bryan for the role as “the perfect ally” (127). The incongruity of casting Bryan as both the movement’s leader and its ally is the regrettable result of forcing the history to fit the theory. Such disconnects are frequent enough to be disturbing.

Lienesch’s research, though, is solid. He has worked through the papers of William Jennings Bryan, J. Frank Norris, and William Bell Riley, among others. He is also to be applauded for not assuming that all antievolutionists were the same. Rather, he discerns between types of antievolutionists – believers in a literal seven-day creation, in the day-age theory, and in the gap theory – and explains the difficulties those differences sometimes caused, as when Clarence Darrow exploited the nonliteral hermeneutic that Bryan used to support his day-age creationism. Lienesch also offers a helpful corrective to the stereotype of fundamentalists as being poor, southern, and unsophisticated, arguing instead that antievolutionism had its origins in the cities of the North, that it was led by articulate speakers, and that its development through publications and Bible conferences was actually quite sophisticated.

Something should be said about what the book leaves out. It focuses so much on antievolutionism that it never discusses how evolutionists responded to their critics. Discussing the interplay between the two movements would have been well within the book’s purview, and it would have explained how evolutionary theory developed and better answered the fundamental question: Why has the teaching of evolution in schools and universities so decisively triumphed over the creationist and intelligent design

movements? Then too, Lienesch's focus on antievolutionism as a political movement may have blinded him to a broader understanding of fundamentalism. One wonders whether Lienesch sees the movement as coalescing around antievolution because his definition of a social movement—that is to say, the definition provided by his theory—is essentially political. Politics, though, is just one aspect of fundamentalism, albeit the one most important to scholars seeking to explain the continued influence of a movement they consider to be without scientific validity. Thus, Lienesch's interpretation misses something of the broader development of fundamentalism as a religious movement, not just as a political force.

But perhaps that is to criticize Lienesch for not writing a different book. The book he has written is a valuable addition to our knowledge of the development of the fundamentalist and antievolution movements.

Lincoln Austin Mullen
Bob Jones University

Southern Crossroads: Perspectives on Religion and Culture. Edited by Walter H. Conser, Jr. and Rodger M. Payne. (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2008. Pp. 382. \$60.00)

The list of contributors to *Southern Crossroads* reads like a who's who in southern religious studies. It is unfortunate, then, that while providing great depth and thoughtful, provocative arguments within individual chapters, the anthology as a whole lacks a unifying theme that ties the chapters together. Certainly, this is a deliberately interdisciplinary volume that engages scholars from a range of academic fields, and demonstrates the shift in scholarship on "southern religiosity away from churches and denominations and toward religious life as it encounters disparate cultural elements" (4). Yet within this broader framework, many of the chapters do little to engage each other.

The first and longest section of the book, "Religious Aspects of Southern Culture," demonstrates this problem most clearly. In their introduction to the book, the editors mention how this section looks at the various components of southern culture. Unfortunately, culture here has no defined boundaries. This is not to say that there are not excellent chapters making up this section. Indeed, Charles Orser, Jr.'s chapter, "The Archaeology of African American Slave Religion in the Antebellum South," is one of the finest in the volume. In it, Orser presents new evidence and reinterprets old to show how everyday items, some brought from Africa, may have held religious significance for black slaves. These findings powerfully argue that African slaves had a vibrant culture that retained elements of religious worship from their homeland while incorporating elements of Christianity found in the antebellum South.

Section two, "Encounters in Southern Religion and Culture," is a stronger section, and contains a number of excellent chapters. Randall Stephens' exploration of the importance of print culture in the formation of the early Holiness and Pentecostal movements is a wonderful example of the power of the written word. Stephens' shows how the southern religious press provided support and a sense of community to members of various religious groups. Celeste Ray's chapter also explores the ways that a sense of community developed through the celebration of Scottish heritage in the modern South. Her chapter looks at how Celtic culture has come to be embraced throughout the region, as well as providing a "safe" way to define southern identity in a post-Civil Rights world. Ray argues, in part, that the "parallel mythologies" of Scottish culture, encouraged by the writings of Sir Walter Scott, and those of the South, whose remnants of the "Lost Cause" still echo through Dixie today, allow this relationship. Indeed, she notes how both identities "derive from perceived historical injuries, strong attachments to place and kin, and links between militarism and religious faith, and both