

---

# WHY DO (WHITE)<sup>1</sup> EVANGELICALS NEED TO BE REMINDED THAT BLACK LIVES MATTER?

Steven J. Ybarrola

---

This article explores the issues of race and the church in the United States today. Specifically, it examines why it is that Christians who represent the dominant racial category (i.e. white) have difficulty understanding the experiences of members of minority populations. As a Christian anthropologist, I explore this issue from three key anthropological concepts—culture, ethnocentrism, and cultural relativism. I then examine key theological issues related to Christianity and “otherness.” I conclude by bringing these two disciplines together as a way to address how they can lead to the renewing of the mind that Paul speaks of in Romans 12.

---

In the spring of 2015, I was teaching a course at Asbury Theological Seminary titled “Ethnicity, Race, and the Church.” At the beginning of the semester, I started each class session with “What’s in the News” where we discussed current events of the week. But as more and more incidences of unarmed black men being killed by police or vigilantes added up, I was unable to continue this part of the class as it took too much time! As news reports on such violence increased, the Black Lives Matter movement arose to challenge the racially charged killings and to address broader issues of racism affecting blacks in the United States.<sup>2</sup>

One common white response to the Black Lives Matter movement has been interesting. I recall the first time I saw an “All Lives Matter” bumper sticker on a BMW driven by a white male. I thought at first, “of course that’s true.” But then I wondered why a white person in a BMW would be essentially challenging the legitimacy of the Black Lives Matter movement. An article in the Huffington Post helped articulate what I was feeling:

“All Lives Matter” is a problem because it refocuses the issue away from systemic racism and Black lives. It distracts and diminishes the message that Black lives matter or that they should matter more than they do. “All Lives Matter” is really code for “White Lives Matter,” because when white people think about “all lives,” we automatically think about “all *white* lives.”<sup>3</sup>

As an anthropologist, I have taught on issues of race and ethnicity to both undergraduates and graduate students for over 28 years. I believe three key anthropological concepts—culture, ethnocentrism, and cultural relativism—can help white society in general, and white evangelicals in particular, better understand the Black Lives Matter movement and the racial tensions we are witnessing today. After discussing these anthropological concepts in the context of race relations, I then reflect on certain theological concepts that help us better understand how Christians should respond to “otherness” in their societies today, and I

---

<sup>1</sup> The reason for putting “white” in parentheses is due to the fact that whites are not the only ones who need to know that Black Lives Matter, but since they are the dominant racial category in the United States they are the ones who are often least aware of important racial issues from the perspective of minority populations.

<sup>2</sup> For more on this see their website at <http://blacklivesmatter.com>.

<sup>3</sup> “The Real Reason White People Say ‘All Lives Matter,’” Huffington Post [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-halstead/dear-fellow-white-people-\\_b\\_11109842.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-halstead/dear-fellow-white-people-_b_11109842.html).

examine the example of Jesus himself when it comes to the importance of unity in the midst of diversity.

## Culture

Following the anthropologists Clifford Geertz and James Spradley, I view culture as the “webs of significance” (i.e., meanings) we use to interpret experience and generate social behavior (Geertz 1973, 5; Spradley 1979, 5). These meanings largely come out of the families and communities in which we were raised, and the experiences we have had. The reality of variable cultural meanings is obvious to us (hopefully) when we travel abroad and find ourselves in contexts in which we cannot interpret, or have difficulty properly interpreting, what is going on around us, and therefore don’t have the wherewithal to generate the proper social behavior. For me, this became obvious many years ago when I was traveling in Turkey. I was with two other Americans, and we went into a bank to exchange money. While one of our friends was in line to see the teller, my other friend and I sat on a small couch with a coffee table in front of us and two chairs on the other side. As my friend and I talked to one another, a Turkish gentleman came in and sat across from us in one of the chairs. As we talked, my American friend put his foot on the edge of the coffee table. The Turkish man on the other side stood up, obviously angry, said something to us in Turkish (I assume) which we didn’t understand, and proceeded to slap my friend’s foot off of the table. As American young men, we had no way of understanding what had prompted what we considered to be a rather violent response. It wasn’t until a few days later when I was retelling this story to friends who had lived in Turkey for some time that we learned that what we had done was highly offensive in that culture. To show the bottom of your shoe or foot to someone signified that you felt they were less than the dirt on the bottom of your shoe or foot. This was one of many personal experiences I have had in cultural contexts in which I was unable to properly interpret the meaning of a social act, and therefore didn’t know how to respond in an appropriate manner.

However, these cross-cultural incidences are sometimes less obvious when we are interacting with subcultures within our own society. For example, some years ago when the first O.J. Simpson trial was going

on,<sup>4</sup> polls showed that there was a great disparity between how whites and blacks felt about the verdict. Only 42 percent of the whites polled thought the not guilty verdict was correct whereas 78 percent of blacks polled believed the same.<sup>5</sup> When I talked with my almost exclusively white undergraduates about this discrepancy, they wanted to attribute it solely to race; that is, those who were white opposed Simpson because he was black, whereas those who were black supported him. What they failed to realize was that people from different communities within American society have fundamentally different experiences with law enforcement, and therefore the idea that the police might plant evidence (a key argument in the Simpson defense) seemed not only possible but probable to many from minority communities.

A “shared” post from a white friend on Facebook shows Willy Wonka, as portrayed by Gene Wilder, saying “You’re being treated poorly by the police? Have you tried not breaking the law to see if that helps?” This post fit my experience as a white male with law enforcement—they are there to serve and protect. However, many of the minority populations in the United States, and especially poorer African American communities, have a completely different understanding of law enforcement; they are not there to protect and serve, but often to harass.<sup>6</sup>

The Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor has discussed the importance of “social imaginaries” for how we understand social reality. He defines these imaginaries as

something broader and deeper than the intellectual schemes people may entertain when they think about social reality in a disengaged mode. I am thinking, rather, of ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations. (Taylor 2003, 23)

More simply, we can think of social imaginaries as “...a way of thinking about, speaking about, and organizing relations among and within human groups” (MacEachern 2012, 36). The social imaginary of race in the United States developed from the very founding of

---

<sup>4</sup> The former American football star, broadcaster, and actor O.J. Simpson went on trial in 1994 for the murder of his ex-wife Nicole Brown Simpson and her friend Ron Goldman. In October 1995 he was acquitted by a jury of the charges.

<sup>5</sup> <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/Simpson/polls.html> (last accessed 12/01/18).

<sup>6</sup> See the Department of Justice’s report on the Ferguson, MO, and the Chicago police departments which, among other things, point to the racism and abuse by these departments in largely poor and African American neighborhoods ([https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/ferguson\\_police\\_department\\_report.pdf](https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/ferguson_police_department_report.pdf); <https://www.justice.gov/opa/file/925846/download>).

*Ybarrola*, Why do (White) Evangelicals need to be Reminded that Black Lives Matter?

the country. Consider the American Founding Father Thomas Jefferson, principal author of the Declaration of Independence, and third president of the United States—but also a slaveholder with a slave mistress, Sally Hemings. In 1781 Jefferson wrote, “I advance it therefore as a suspicion only, that the blacks, whether originally a distinct race, or made distinct by time and circumstances, are inferior to the whites in the endowments both of body and mind.”<sup>7</sup> Less than a hundred years later, this “suspicion” was widely considered a scientific “fact,” and codified through, among other things, the Supreme Court’s *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision in 1857. *Dred Scott* declared that slaves were “chattel” (i.e., moveable property), and remained so even if they moved to free territories, and could not become citizens of the United States.

All social imaginaries are based on certain assumptions that groups just take as true. Following the Christian anthropologist Jenell Williams Paris (2007, 20), some of the assumptions of the racial social imaginary are that 1) race is, in fact, real; 2) race is clearly bounded; and 3) racial differences are innate and hierarchically ranked. As Williams Paris argues, since whites were the ones doing the ranking, it is not surprising that “the white race...emerged as superior” (23). Minority populations also developed social imaginaries about the dominant (i.e., white) group as well as about other minority populations. But, due to power differences, some imaginaries are privileged over others. Clearly, in the American context, the “white” social imaginary is the privileged one, which I can illustrate from my own experience. As a white male, at the very least, I can go through every day without having to think about race or gender; I am the American “default” according to the dominant social imaginary. However, members of minority groups often are reminded every day that they are different through what I refer to as the “daily indignities of life” (e.g., being followed around in stores, having their credit questioned, not being able to rent an apartment that is available, being harassed by police for “driving while Black,” or being told that a posted job opening is no longer available).

## Ethnocentrism

This brings me to the second anthropological concept, ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism can be viewed as “. . . the idea that our beliefs and behaviors are right and true, whereas those of other peoples are wrong or misguided” (Robbins 2009, 8). Studies indicate that ethnocentrism is a “natural” part of being brought up in

a particular community and culture in a particular time (Brown 2012). Another aspect of this problem is naïve realism, the belief that the way I view the world is the way the world is, and that others, especially in my own society, see and experience the world as I do. The Willy Wonka Facebook post cited above reflects this kind of view. It should be apparent that subcultures in the U.S. have very different experiences, but since American society remains largely racially segregated, those from the dominant group may have little to no knowledge of these differences.

In 1991 the news program *Primetime* produced an exposé titled “True Colors” which demonstrated how members of different racial categories receive fundamentally different treatment in American society.<sup>8</sup> They followed two individuals, one white and the other black, as they attempted to rent an apartment, buy a car, shop in a department store, apply for a job, and even hail a cab. They were both dressed in suits and ties, and had been trained by an organization to be able to present themselves in very similar ways. While the *Primetime* program acknowledged that in the two weeks they followed these men around there were times they were treated the same, they found that every day the white individual received more favorable treatment than did his black counterpart in the same various contexts. For example, when the white man inquired about an apartment, he was shown the unit and told about the neighborhood. In one case, even the description of the neighborhood by the landlord contained negative black racial allusions. In another apartment complex the white person was given the keys to a vacant apartment and allowed to look it over; he was told the unit was ready to rent at any time. When the black individual went in ten minutes later, he was told by the manager that there were no units to let, even though the “For Rent” sign was posted out in front of the apartment complex. When the white male manager was later confronted by the host Diane Sawyer and the film crew, he had no explanation for the discrepancy, other than his insistence that he was “not prejudiced” even though he admitted that there were no blacks living in the apartment complex. These differences were found in each of the situations the program covered. If we are tempted to think that these prejudices have diminished since the 1991 broadcast, more recent studies show that they are, unfortunately, still alive and well (see for example Pager, Western, and Bonikowski 2009; and Pager 2016).

What this program and subsequent studies demonstrate is what I indicated above. As a white male in American society I can go through any given day

---

<sup>7</sup> *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Query 14, Laws.

<sup>8</sup> The program can be viewed on YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8XprcqcZ5-E> (last accessed 11/20/18).  
*Ybarrola*, Why do (White) Evangelicals need to be Reminded that Black Lives Matter?

never having to think about race, whereas those from minority populations are frequently reminded that they are different. But because we still live in a largely segregated society, there are few opportunities for those of us from the dominant society to understand the culture and experiences of those from minority populations except through what we hear on the nightly news, or other news sources, which tend to reinforce our racial stereotypes (social imaginaries) in the way they report “news” (i.e., very superficially). For example, when we hear that someone was killed by a black person (or immigrant, or Muslim), we just put that into our racial stereotype vault to be pulled out whenever other such incidences occur. However, when a white person goes into a black church and kills nine people, wounding many others, as Dylann Roof did in 2015, we tend to see this as a “lone wolf” attack and explain it away as an aberration.<sup>9</sup>

Asbury Seminary has two physical campuses, the main one in Wilmore, Kentucky (where I am located) and the other in Orlando, Florida. Those of us on the Wilmore campus also teach in Orlando through various means of delivery. A few years ago I was teaching a course on the Orlando campus in which I would have students work online, and then I would go to the physical campus for several intensive weekends. The course I was teaching was “Christian Ministry in a Multicultural Society,” and after a month of having the students read on the basic concepts of culture, ethnicity, race, and ethnocentrism, I went to Orlando to teach the first intensive weekend. The vast majority of the students were white and male, but there were a few students who represented minority populations in the U.S. The dominant response that weekend was “Why are we studying this? This is no longer a problem in the United States.” I have to admit that by the end of the weekend session I was somewhat shaken by that response—that white, male evangelicals didn’t see race as a problem or issue for the church today. However, as I was packing up my materials to leave, almost all of the minority students came to me and thanked me for allowing their voice to be heard. I left thinking that if nothing else happened among the majority of students in the class, at least these other students felt like their perspective had been allowed to be presented, and I was encouraged by that. And this brings me to my third anthropological concept—cultural relativism.

## Cultural Relativism

Like the other anthropological concepts I have discussed in this article, cultural relativism can be interpreted in many different ways, but probably more than the others carries a stronger reaction both from anthropologists and Christians alike; the latter are particularly leery of the “R” word (i.e., relativism).<sup>10</sup> For my purposes, I want to focus on its intent, as a response to Western scientific ethnocentrism at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, to mean understanding other cultures on their own terms. The “father” of American anthropology, Franz Boas, didn’t coin the term, but his anthropological studies modeled this approach, particularly with his study of the Kwakiutl of northwestern North America (Boas 1896). A cultural relativistic approach is important primarily, though not exclusively, for those of us who represent the dominant group, as minorities have already had to learn about the dominant culture in which they find themselves. As we have seen, this type of learning has, in general, not been reciprocal.

How can we do this? I am an educator, so I believe in the power of education when it comes to this issue. Let me illustrate this by revisiting that course I taught in Orlando. During the month following my first intensive weekend on the campus, the students read about the history and current issues facing African Americans, Hispanics, and Asian Americans, among others. When I went back to Orlando to teach again, I had low expectations, but found that the white male students were no longer asking, “Why are we studying this,” but now stating “We never knew this” and asking “What can we do about it?” It was a complete turnaround. Learning about the history and experiences of minority populations in the United States dramatically changed their perspective regarding ministry in the U.S.

But more is needed than merely academic study of these issues. A couple of years ago I was co-teaching an adult Sunday School class on race and the church with one of the few African American members of the congregation I attend. I was discussing how the Christian sociologists Michael Emerson and Christian Smith, in their book *Divided by Faith* (2000), argued that white evangelicals tend to, most of the time unwittingly, perpetuate the racial divisions in American society by worshipping with those like themselves (i.e., white). I asked the church members in attendance to

---

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, the Washington Post article, “Lone Wolf: Our Stunning Double Standard When it Comes to Race and Religion” ([https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2017/10/02/lone-wolf-our-stunning-double-standard-when-it-comes-to-race-and-religion/?utm\\_term=.364d49700ef2](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2017/10/02/lone-wolf-our-stunning-double-standard-when-it-comes-to-race-and-religion/?utm_term=.364d49700ef2) (last accessed 12/01/18)). For a more academic discussion of the “criminalization of Blackness” see Calvin John Smiley and David Fakunle, “From ‘Brute’ to ‘Thug’: The Demonization and Criminalization of Unarmed Black Male Victims in America.” *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 26(3-4): 350-366.

<sup>10</sup> For an anthropological response to some of the criticisms of cultural relativism, see Geertz 1984. *Ybarrola*, Why do (White) Evangelicals need to be Reminded that Black Lives Matter?

look around at the racial composition of those in the room, which was almost exclusively white. A female white congregant asked, “What’s wrong with that?” Rather than just dismissing this question as that of an uninformed member of the dominant American society, I believe it gets at an important theological question regarding otherness.

## A Theology of Otherness

Thus far, I have focused on key anthropological concepts that can help mainly white evangelicals (the dominant group) better understand why a movement like Black Lives Matter is important. However, the question as to *why* it matters requires some theological reflection, because in significant ways anthropology can take us just so far. I recall teaching a course to undergraduates on ethnicity and nationalism where we examined several key case studies of ethnic conflict around the world, including Rwanda, the Balkans, Ukraine, the Middle East, and the Basques in Spain. Toward the end of the course we looked at different approaches to conflict resolution, and examined the pros and cons of each. A student who was thinking of majoring in anthropology asked, “What answer does anthropology have to these conflicts?” to which I had to admit that, while anthropology could help us better understand the underlying issues related to these conflicts, it really had no answer as a discipline. I believe right then and there that student decided not to become an anthropology major!

The student in my Sunday School class and the one in “Ethnicity and Nationalism” were asking important interrelated questions that are not easily addressed by the discipline of anthropology—what’s wrong with worshipping with those like ourselves, and how can we solve these seemingly intractable ethnic conflicts—both questions having to do with “otherness.” To address these at a fundamental level I believe we need to turn to theology. The theologian Jürgen Moltmann, sounding much like an anthropologist, argues that “our perceptions and our ideas of ‘the other’ are always shaped by our social relationships to them, and by the public form our community with them takes” (1999, 135). In addressing the first question posed by the congregant in my Sunday School class, Moltmann states, “If I know only what is like me, or what already corresponds to me, then, after all, I know only what I already know” (136). In other words, the response to the question, “What’s wrong with worshipping with people like me?” is that it stifles our development as humans and as Christians. As we read in Scripture, God desires us to be transformed, and Moltmann argues that,

In the others I do not look at what is like myself, but what is different in them, and try to understand it. I can only understand it by changing myself, and adjusting myself to the other. In my perception of others I subject myself to the pains and joys of my own alteration, not in order to adapt myself to the other, but in order to enter into it. There is no true understanding of the other without this empathy (145).

Theologically, then, we need to enter into relationship with the other not only to develop an understanding and empathy with those different from ourselves, but also to be transformed.

Miraslov Volf, a student of Moltmann’s, helps us to address the question posed by my second student, “What can be done to end these conflicts?” Reflecting on the various ethnic and racial conflicts taking place during the early part of the 1990s, Volf argues that “Various kinds of ‘cleansings’ demand of us *to place identity and otherness at the center of theological reflection* on social realities” (1996, 17, emphasis in the original). Volf’s theological approach focuses on our natural tendency to exclude those who are not like us, and argues that we as Christians need to challenge this tendency through the idea of “embracing” the other. He argues that, to begin with, Christians need to see themselves as “aliens” in their own cultures in order to begin to move beyond their own situatedness, to get beyond “us” versus “them.” As Volf puts it, “The ‘difference’ from one’s own culture—from the concrete ‘world’ of inhabitants—is essential to the Christian’s cultural identity” (1992, 236). This is reminiscent of the Scottish historian of missions, Andrew Walls’, articulation of the Pilgrim Principle, “which whispers to him [i.e., the Christian] that he has no abiding city and warns him that to be faithful to Christ will put him out of step with his society” (1996, 7).

Building on this idea of seeing ourselves as aliens, Volf states that, “The Spirit sets a person on the road to becoming what one might call a ‘catholic personality’” by which he means, “one who is enriched by otherness . . .” (1992, 237). It is by seeing ourselves as aliens—critically distanced from our own culture—that we can see, as the anthropological adage puts it, the familiar things as strange, and the strange things as familiar.

But how is one able to embrace the despised other, the perceived enemy? Volf argues that this comes through the concept of “self-donation,” whose clearest manifestation was Christ’s self-donation on the cross to redeem us. Volf states, “Indisputably, the self-giving love manifested on the cross and demanded by it lies at the core of the Christian faith” (1996, 25). How do we as Christians break these seemingly intractable conflicts with the other? First by recognizing and accepting their otherness, and our otherness to them, and then through

the act of self-donation, embracing them, not with a bear hug to try and assimilate them into us, but with an embrace that accepts them in their otherness.

Therefore, in addition to academic knowledge we also need personal experience with those who are culturally and socially different from us. I come to this conclusion not only based on the theologians discussed above and personal experience, but more importantly on the ministry of Jesus. Jesus chose quite a diverse group as his 12 disciples, that is, those who were going to change the world. Although all of them were Jewish, they came from very different backgrounds and professions. There were brothers of course, such as Simon and Andrew, but Jesus drew from fishermen, a profession that Cicero wrote in 44 BC was one of the “most shameful occupations” (*On Duties* 1:42). In addition to these, Jesus chose a tax collector, Matthew, who the fishermen would have had a particularly difficult time with since the tax collectors were notorious exploiters of that profession through taxation in service to the Roman government; he was the traitorous other (see Hanson 1997). And then, just to stir things up a bit more, Jesus brought in a Zealot, who some scholars have referred to as first century terrorists (see, for example, Chaliand and Blin 2007, 55ff). This was quite a diverse and potentially volatile combination. Add to this the people that Jesus ministered to—the marginalized and “unclean” of his day—and we can see that those in his inner circle, as well as the masses that followed him, would have been in contact and fellowship with persons from quite diverse, and often mutually antagonistic, backgrounds.

John Wesley took a similar approach when it came to issues of social class and human suffering. My Asbury colleague, Christine Pohl, argues that for Wesley, the “complicated wickedness” that he saw negatively affecting the society of his day referred “not only [to] those who directly abused others, but . . . [to] those who did not recognize any connection between their lifestyle and the ongoing misery of other human beings” (2007, 12). Though still within the Church of England (i.e., Anglican), Wesley believed that the small group meetings he started, and which became an important part of the “Methodist” movement (i.e., societies, classes, bands), needed to be socially and culturally diverse for true transformation to take place. As Pohl puts it,

[Wesley] discovered that significant change occurred at the level of sustained interpersonal relationships. Here, attitudes and behaviors could be challenged, status boundaries could be addressed and transcended, and people could understand and enter each other’s worlds. At this level, formerly voiceless persons could learn to speak, and socially blind persons could learn to see and to feel (2007, 29).

## Conclusion

Why do (white) evangelicals need to be reminded that Black Lives Matter? Because we still live in largely segregated communities and churches (Emerson and Kim 2003), thus having limited contact with those who are racially and culturally different from us, and therefore continuing to view them through our well-developed but narrow social imaginaries. Also, because of our ethnocentrism, we are more “comfortable” with those who are culturally like us, and therefore we must be intentional in breaking down social barriers and get to know those from other racial communities and cultures on their own terms, not expecting them to conform to our values or understanding of social reality. Rather, we need to take a biblically intercultural approach in which we humble ourselves, love one another with sincerity, and honor others as higher than ourselves (Romans 12:3, 9, 10).

Years ago, when I was a young man with a mission organization, I took a “Spiritual Gifts” inventory. This was essentially a quantitative exam to determine one’s strongest spiritual gifts. After completing the inventory, my two strongest areas were prophecy and mercy. I remember during the debriefing I had with one of the leaders that I was told quite clearly that these two gifts were incompatible, and therefore I had done something wrong! Now, let me first state that I think these types of quantitative “inventories” are problematic. However, as I reflect on this connection today, I believe the two gifts, prophecy and mercy, fit perfectly well with what I am addressing in this article. *We must* be prophetic in the area of race and the church in the United States; but we *must also* move forward in love, mercy, and grace. In this way, we can better heed Paul’s admonition to “not conform to the patterns of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind. Then you will be able to test and approve what God’s will is—his good, pleasing, and perfect will” (Romans 12:2).

## References

- Boas, Franz. 1896. The Limits of the Comparative Method of Anthropology. *Science* 4(103): 901-908.
- Brigham, John and Adina Wasserman. 1999. The Impact of Race, Racial Attitude, and Gender on Reactions to the Criminal Trial of O.J. Simpson. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 29(7): 1333-1370.
- Brown, Donald E. 2012. Ethnicity and Ethnocentrism: Are They Natural? In, *Race and Ethnicity: The United States and the World*, second edition. Raymond Scupin, ed. Pp. 90-101. Boston: Pearson.

Chaliand, Gerard and Amaud Blin, eds. 2007. *The History of Terrorism: From Antiquity to al Qaeda*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Emerson, Michael and Karen Chai Kim. 2003. Multiracial Congregations: An Analysis of their Development and a Typology. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42(2): 217-227.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. Thick Description: On the Nature of Anthropological Analysis. In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. Pp. 3-32. New York: Basic Books.

———. 1984. Anti Anti-Relativism. *American Anthropologist* 86(2):263-278.

Hanson, K.C. 1997. The Galilean Fishing Economy and the Jesus Tradition. *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 27: 99-111.

MacEachem, Scott. 2012. The Concept of Race in Contemporary Anthropology. In *Race and Ethnicity: The United States and the World*, second edition. Raymond Scupin, ed. Pp. 34-57. Boston: Pearson.

Moltmann, Jürgen. 1999. *God for a Secular Society: The Public Relevance of Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Pager, Devah. 2016. Are Firms That Discriminate More Likely to Go Out of Business? *Sociological Science* 3:849-859, 2016.

Pager, Devah, Bruce Western, and Bart Bonikowski. 2009. Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market: A Field Experiment. *American Sociological Review* 74:777-799.

Pohl, Christine. 2007. Practicing Hospitality in the Face of 'Complicated Wickedness.' *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 42(1): 7-31.

Robbins, Richard. 2009. *Cultural Anthropology: A Problem Based Approach*, fifth edition. Belmont, CA: Thomson.

Spradley, James. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Taylor, Charles. 2003. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Volf, Miraslov. 1992. Exclusion and Embrace: Theological Reflections in the Wake of 'Ethnic Cleansing.' *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 29(2): 230-248.

———. 1996. *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Walls, Andrew. 1996. *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of the Faith*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Williams Paris, Jenell. 2007. Race: Critical Thinking and Transformative Possibilities. In *This Side of Heaven: Race, Ethnicity, and Christian Faith*. Robert Priest and Alvaro Nieves, eds. Pp. 19-32. New York: Oxford University Press.



**Steven Ybarrola** is Professor of Cultural Anthropology at Asbury Theological Seminary. He has researched and taught on issues of immigration, ethnicity, and race for over 30 years. Currently he is doing research and writing in the area of diaspora missiology.

Author email: [steve.ybarrola@asburyseminary.edu](mailto:steve.ybarrola@asburyseminary.edu)

---