

supporting documents. The encyclicals Hinson-Hasty cites use strong language to reject much of her program. While, like Hinson-Hasty, they criticize capitalism and adduce some of the same issues she raises, they do not condemn it as they do socialism. To take an example from one of the referenced documents, Pope Pius XI states that socialism is incompatible with Catholic dogma and, in opposition to one of Hinson-Hasty's central arguments, capitalism "is not to be condemned in itself. And surely it is not of its own nature vicious" (*Quadragesimo Anno*, nos. 101, 117).

Another example is when Hinson-Hasty states, "The ultimate purpose of human labor and the creation of wealth is for the sake of the commons" (160). The Catholic view is that human work is primarily for the sake of the worker, not the commons. While acknowledging that work has a social character Pope John Paul II argues, "work is a good thing for man—a good thing for his humanity—because through work man not only transforms nature, adapting it to his own needs, but he also achieves fulfillment as a human being and indeed, in a sense, becomes 'more a human being'" (*Laborem Exercens*, no. 9).

There is value in what Hinson-Hasty says, and her description of the effects of poverty should resonate strongly with people of goodwill. Her poignant stories show a deep concern for the poor that should be emulated. Her analysis identifies and articulates some of the negative effects of our economic system that mainstream economics tends to ignore. Undoubtedly power comes with wealth and power can be (and often is) abused.

Many will disagree with Zacchaeus economics but all people of goodwill should continue to have a healthy and vigorous debate on poverty. What is missing in this expression of the progressive view is a more fully developed and internally consistent intellectual structure. In the end the reader is still left with the unanswered questions of what is wealth, why wealth equality is desirable, and what is the relationship between the program of wealth redistribution and Christian social thought.

—Emil B. Berendt

Mount St. Mary's University, Emmitsburg, Maryland

How to Survive the Apocalypse: Zombies, Cylons, Faith, and Politics at the End of the World

Robert Joustra and Alissa Wilkinson

Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2016 (206 pages)

Dystopian and apocalyptic stories are certainly not new but are especially popular as of late. *The Hunger Games* franchise, starting with its first book in 2008, seemed to stoke a fire for dystopian literature (and later, films) targeted at young adults. Following the 2016 presidential election, bookstores stocked up on Orwell's classic *1984*, and Amazon reported it as the number one bestseller in the days following the inauguration. And women have publicly protested various issues around the world while dressed as handmaids after Margaret Atwood's popular novel was adapted as a web series by Hulu in 2017. Joustra and Wilkinson's book digs into what is behind the stories of apocalyptic television series and

films, including fan favorites that are more obviously apocalyptic (*Battlestar Galactica* and *The Walking Dead*, for example) and those that are more unexpected (including *Scandal*, *Breaking Bad*, and *Mad Men*). What all these works have in common, they argue, is not just their entertainment value or popularity, but also that they reveal something about the way we think about “our life together—our politics” (4). The book both successfully diagnoses the pervasive pathologies of our modern, secular socio-political life and recommends faithful responses, without rejecting the benefits of modernity.

More than its fun title would suggest, this book is serious and academic. It is largely rooted in the work of philosopher Charles Taylor and is best understood, itself, as a work of political philosophy with theological and pop-culture relevance. Though fans of the particular shows the authors draw upon will likely make their way through the book with some advantage, this is not a light read for even them, apropos to the weighty subject matter. Still, for readers, like myself, who are interested in political philosophy but not themselves experts, Joustra and Wilkinson provide a thorough, nuanced, and tractable assessment of our political reality. One way they accomplish this is by defining terms right from the start. Following Taylor, they define *Secular* (capital *S* intended) to indicate something different from secular, or nonreligious/ignoring the transcendent. A society is Secular when “even those of us who still choose to believe in [transcendent things] live in a world marked by the ability to choose *not* to believe in them” (4). In this way, even people of faith in the modern West are Secular if they experience religion as a choice and, therefore, constituting a particular aspect of their lives, rather than providing the context, or “moral horizon,” for one’s whole life. They argue that this has ramifications for the modern notion of apocalypse. It is no longer an irrevocable change or revelation initiated by the gods or God, but rather a shift, an ending, a new order (or lack thereof) that is caused by humans without even a thought of God, that is, a Secular and therefore anthropocentric apocalypse.

What, then, do these contemporary stories of apocalypse expose about our politics? Using the examples of many recent television series and films, Joustra and Wilkinson identify Taylor’s “conditions of secularity” and evidence of related pathologies. They note, for example, that the modern idea of the individual as “invulnerable to outside forces,” or “buffered” (15), necessitates the individual’s search for authenticity and significance. While the premise of this individualism is that each person has a unique way of being human, it still leaves the individual searching for recognition from others to confirm his significance. The science fiction television series *Battlestar Galactica* provides a case study, of sorts, of this search for authenticity, not by the human survivors of a robot takeover, but by the robots, or Cylons, themselves. The Cylons seek, it seems largely through relationships with others, to determine what makes a person. Though initially less obviously apocalyptic, the antihero genre of *Mad Men*, *Breaking Bad*, and *House of Cards* fits Joustra and Wilkinson’s understanding of Secular apocalypse as well. These shows, they say, reveal “how we get from a pursuit of authenticity, of our full humanity, to the disordered narcissism and degeneracy of the antihero” (83). In these stories agency is critical in establishing one’s significance and, therefore, choice itself is held in the highest

regard. Even the popular political thriller *Scandal*, they say, is a moral dystopia that finds its drama in radically individualistic people, each seeking their individual power rather than the common good, and thus ultimately landing upon another pathology of Secular modernity, instrumentalism.

While in much of contemporary academic and especially political writing individualism (or its caricature) is seen as inherently and unavoidably bad, Joustra and Wilkinson do not paint with a broad-brush individualism nor a number of other modern pathologies they identify. In fact, one of the chief strengths of this book, and one reason their treatment of apocalypse can be optimistic in the face of significant modern pitfalls, is that it avoids deterministic logic. In discussing subjectivity, or its more radical form subjectivism, the authors argue that “subjectivity need not be anthropocentric or instrumentalist.” While they recognize that these three potentially problematic features of Secular modernity can be found in combination, often to our political detriment, they clearly state, “Just because our social conditions give us options does not *mean* that we have to make choices that produce the kind of pathology Taylor fears” (132). Their analysis is further tempered in that they allow from the start that there are also clear benefits to modernity. Though the dangers of individualism are not minimized throughout the book, they write that “Few people today would actually elect to turn back the clock” to premodernity and its pervasive poverty and political oppression, and that, in fact, “the protection and dignity of individual persons is something worth celebrating” (25).

But the book reveals its optimism most in pursuing its second objective, making suggestions about “[moving] toward restoration” (5). One of the strongest arguments Joustra and Wilkinson make is for a civil society thick with mediating institutions that can counter radically atomistic individualism. They avoid putting this responsibility on the state or other centralized powers. Rather, they characterize a faithful institution as one that is “cognizant of its own power” and “recognizes that it functions best not when that power is centralized in one person but distributed appropriately among people in different roles” (175). Offering a hopeful perspective in the face of fragmented individualism, the authors also suggest that the search for authenticity and this equal value ultimately must be found in something shared and so not fragmented. In particular, one’s value is not in her uniqueness (though diversity is valuable and worth pursuing, they say) but in what we share (113). (Christians will recognize this as the image of God.) They also concur with Taylor that the introspection associated with the search for authenticity necessarily, but still authentically, leads the individual to “genuine fulfillment” only in things beyond herself. A final example of Joustra and Wilkinson’s optimistic outlook is the positive (or at least pragmatic) spin they put on the modern preoccupation with personal experience, or what some might call feelings. They recognize the challenges inherent in the loss of a “common language of reference” (153) and shared beliefs that come to unbuffered-self members of a community who sense the influence of forces beyond themselves. But in the absence of this common language, we can effectively communicate, they claim, using “subtler languages” of “intuitions and experiences” that “resonate from within”; in other words, we find commonality by building on that which is broadly felt due to coincident human experience (158).

Though I consider myself an enthusiast for dystopian literature and film, I have to admit I was unfamiliar with the majority of the popular content Joustra and Wilkinson analyze. I would expect that the book would be even more enjoyable for those who have a detailed understanding of the television series and films in consideration. For at least one person who does not, the implications of this work are still clear, compelling, and, judging by the account of Andy Crouch who provides the foreword, easier to navigate than Taylor's seminal works. Though the pop-culture references lighten the mood of the book, especially as they reveal the fun the authors must have had researching and writing it, they educate the reader on more than imaginative fiction. In the words of Joustra and Wilkinson, "The worlds are fantastical and fictional. The pathologies are not" (190).

—Sarah M. Estelle
Hope College, Holland, Michigan

Christian Hospitality and Muslim Immigration in an Age of Fear

Matthew Kaemingk

Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2018 (352 pages)

As I write this review on a flight from Amsterdam to Minneapolis, my wife is playing peekaboo and reaching forward to interlock fingers with the stretched out little hand of a beautiful eighteen-month-old boy with striking Arabian features and big, smiling dark eyes who is sitting facing backward on his mother's lap in the row in front of us. After a few minutes of this, he peers around his mother's seatback to get a better view and sees me, smiles widely, and reaches with fingers wriggling furiously. I look up from my laptop, smile, and tickle his extended fingers. It is not long before the smiling, hijab-wearing young mother stands and passes the little boy between the seats to my wife's lap where he now sits, frenetically pecking at her Kindle to stimulate screen movement, while his mom explains they are returning to the US from Sweden. Her parents saw their grandson Yunus for the first time.

Welcome to the twenty-first-century global village, where every Christian will, at some point, have an opportunity to extend hospitality and, quite literally in my wife's case, embrace.

With *Christian Hospitality and Muslim Immigration in an Age of Fear*, Matthew Kaemingk has given us a highly readable piece of work destined for lasting relevance within the rapidly growing body of literature on Christian-Muslim dynamics. Engaging the matrix of discourses necessitated by so potentially polarizing a topic, Kaemingk aptly navigates through the various social, political, and religious landscapes resulting from the changing social and political experiments of the wrong-headed twentieth-century Dutch experience. Then, guided by Christian principles of hospitality and of treatment of the "other," Kaemingk recommends a workable corrective for today's polarizing and destruc-