Review of "Christology and Whiteness: What Would Jesus Do?"

Jon Nilson

Loyola University Chicago, jnilson@luc.edu

Recommended Citation

to find an audience among apologists, but it should be complemented by volumes devoted to specific topics.

JOSEPH C. MUDD
Gonzaga University, Spokane


This collection of essays will discomfort white readers. Thus the volume for the most part succeeds in its aim: to problematize the apparently simple question, what would Jesus do about racism/white supremacy? The authors assume that most Christians in the United States tend reflexively to identify themselves with Jesus. Yet, if they are white and therefore belong to the taken-for-granted normative culture that dominates American discourse and practice, no such identification is allowable. Jesus himself did not—and so does not—belong to the elite nor work according to the elites’ ways and means. The title of Jennifer Harvey’s essay sums it up well: “What Would Zacchaeus Do? The Case for Disidentifying with Jesus.” Thus the challenges for whites are, first, not to blithely assume an unwarranted likeness to Jesus; and, second, to begin seeking among the most marginalized and despised in America, the African Americans, ways to respond properly to him.

The diversity of contributors is laudable: black and white, male and female, across an ecumenical spectrum (four are Roman Catholics: Laurie M. Cassidy, M. Shawn Copeland, Rosemary Radford Ruether, and Karen Teel). The persuasiveness of the 13 essays varies, as is often the case with collections. For a few (those by William David Hart, Anthony B. Pinn, Victor Anderson), the figure of Jesus is already so contested and compromised that the book’s main question is useless and unanswerable. The authors that deem Jesus living and present today—a conviction implicit in their essays—make the stronger cases.

The most creative and provocative contributions come from Cassidy, Copeland, Cheryl Townsend Gilkes, Harvey, James W. Perkinson, Teel, and Traci C. West. These seven are worth the price of the book. Grounded in careful biblical and historical research, they not only illumine the central question of the volume, but demonstrate once again the truth of James Cone’s statement: any theology that does not fight against white supremacy forfeits its claim to be Christian.

JON NILSON
Loyola University Chicago


The book is one of a small but growing number of texts that explore the European experience of a model of governance inspired by the philosophical principle of subsidiarity. The principle is defined as a “theory of social responsibility that recognizes the priority of the smallest units of society, while ensuring against interference from excessive government intervention” (136). It entails, first, a “vertical” meaning in which higher/larger institutions protect lower/smaller ones by either helping them or by preserving their autonomy; and second, a “horizontal” meaning in which social services are shared between public and private bodies, and the integrity of society is acknowledged as distinct from the state. Subsidiarity is thus “associated with three characteristics: pluralistic supply; freedom of consumer choice (via accreditation of competing providers and conferring purchasing power on users); and fiscal autonomy (based on coupons, vouchers and endowments, and tax exemptions and allowances)” (136–37). The principle of subsidiarity is linked to Catholic social tradition, particularly the articulation advanced by Pope Pius XI’s encyclical Quadragesimo anno (1931).

The focus here is on the Lombard region of northern Italy, which, over the past 15 years, has implemented a subsidiarity-informed model of governance. In this light, the book attempts